

Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species

Table of Contents

1.	Darwin Project Information.....	1
2.	Project Background/Rationale.....	1
3.	Project Summary	2
4.	Scientific, Training, and Technical Assessment	5
5.	Project Impacts	7
6.	Project Outputs	9
7.	Project Expenditure.....	10
8.	Project Operation and Partnerships	12
9.	Monitoring and Evaluation, Lesson learning	13
10.	Actions taken in response to annual report reviews (if applicable)	15
11.	Darwin Identity	16
12.	Leverage.....	16
13.	Sustainability and Legacy	17
14.	Value for money.....	18

Appendices

Appendix I	Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
Appendix II	Outputs
Appendix III	Publications
Appendix IV	Darwin Contacts
Appendix V	Log Frame
Appendix VI	Project Evaluation

Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species

Final Report

1. Darwin Project Information

Project Reference No.	162/11/003
Project title	Kenyan Important Biodiversity Areas: Improving monitoring, management and conservation action
Country	Kenya
UK Contractor	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Partner Organisation (s)	Nature Kenya plus National Museums of Kenya, Forest Department, Kenya Wildlife Service and other members of the Kenya IBA National Liaison Committee
Darwin Grant Value	£98,337
Start/End date	1 April 2002 to 30 June 2005
Project website	http://www.rspb.org.uk/international/conservation/kenya/index.asp http://www.naturekenya.org/conservationconstituency.htm
Author(s), date	Paul Buckley/Paul Matiku/Enock Kanyanya/Anthony Kiragu/ Adrian Oates September 2005

2. Project Background/Rationale

The project has established and co-ordinated an effective, sustainable monitoring system at 60 Important Bird (Biodiversity) Areas (IBAs) throughout Kenya, tracked the status of the IBA network and will feedback directly into improved site management, conservation action and national reporting. Nature Kenya considers the conservation of IBAs as a key part of its conservation programme to conserve birds and wider biodiversity. This current project built on earlier local initiatives to conserve some of the most threatened sites and also on successes in developing a functioning national conservation network.

Government and non-government organisations and institutions concerned with biodiversity conservation in Kenya have recognised the key importance of IBA monitoring for conservation planning, evaluation and timely targeting of intervention efforts. Unfortunately, the capacity for monitoring in Kenya was weak at the start of this project. This need was emphasised by the data gaps and skills shortages made apparent during development of the World Bird Database, which seeks to generate and maintain long-term information about the status of the world's birds and the key sites that they inhabit. Outside of work by the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) monitoring team, what monitoring information existed was not being collated at the national level and was seldom used to inform conservation decision-making.

The need for this project was identified through the work of the IBA National Liaison Committee, a forum of government and non government organisations established and serviced by NatureKenya since 1998. Nature Kenya therefore requested support for relevant training and technical support towards establishing this system. Partners would be trained in ecological survey, data management, management planning, project management, advocacy and training skills. They in turn would then train and support a network of local people and government field staff. Particular focus was to be on priority sites where community-based Site Support Groups (SSGs) were already established or establishing.

3. Project Summary

The purpose of the project was *'Improved monitoring, management and conservation action is taking place in Kenya's Important Biodiversity Areas'*

The outputs were:

1. *Project systems in place*
2. *National site monitoring system established and covering all IBAs*
3. *Detailed monitoring carried out at key IBAs feeds into improved management planning*
4. *Effective feedback loops established between monitoring and national conservation action and reporting*
5. *Conservation interventions made as a result of threats or opportunities identified by monitoring*
6. *Mechanisms identified and capacity built to sustain the collection and use of practical monitoring information in the longer term*

These objectives were not modified, and the great majority of the activities planned were implemented as described. However at the suggestion of the Darwin evaluation undertaken in February 2004 a number of adjustments were proposed, in particular to the project indicators and subsequently to the Year three workplan. The review in Appendix V takes place against this revised logical framework, although the original indicators are noted in italics. The major changes to the indicators were as follows:

- Project purpose - baseline monitoring at 60 IBAs reduced to 50 IBAs
- Project purpose - Number of sites expected to benefit from enhanced conservation measures reduced from 6 to 3
- Output 5 – number of site interventions expected to use data reduced from 5 to 3
- Output 5 – number of managing agencies adopted changes in site actions reduced from 3 to 2

The project period saw substantive changes in the context in which the project operated, including a change of national Government and major restructuring within the three key Government agencies concerned with the natural environment in Kenya (Kenya Wildlife Service, Forest Department and NES now the National Environment Management Authority). The project implementation team adopted a flexible approach throughout in order to adapt to changing circumstances, although these changes were in approach rather than in activities per se, for example in changes to the project monitoring form and adjustments to the training programme and its follow up to place ownership more firmly with the managing agencies. Substantive changes including those to the indicators in response to external reviews and budget carry over were submitted to the Darwin Initiative for approval in April 2004 while some minor changes in budget and workplan were sought in April 2005.

Application to CBD Articles

Identification and monitoring of biological diversity is a significant part of the process to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its objectives. **Article 7** asks contracting parties to 'Monitor, through sampling and other techniques, the components of biological diversity identified, paying particular attention to those requiring urgent conservation measures and those which offer the greatest potential for sustainable use...' The project has therefore been a major step in implementing article 7 at the national level. In Kenya, the role of the IBA programme in assisting with the implementation of the CBD was already recognised by Government and Nature Kenya has been requested to prepare draft national reports to be chapters of Kenya's 2nd National Report to the CBD. Nature Kenya is also a member of the CBD national implementation committee that derives membership from the key national biodiversity stakeholders.

The training programme for professional staff and volunteers will support the implementation of **Article 12**: "...to establish and maintain programmes for scientific and technical education and

training in measures for the identification, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and its components and provide support for such education and training for the specific needs of developing countries”.

By working with Site Support Groups, the monitoring programme for IBAs assists **Article 8j** of the convention “...to respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities and promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of the holders of such knowledge, innovations and practices....’

Overview of Project performance

In summary, the project has been successful with the project objectives met and indicators mainly achieved. A successful launch of the first annual review of IBA status and trends was held and the report was used effectively in Kenya’s second and third reports to the CBD. Strong government – NGO partnerships have been greatly enhanced by the project and the level of collaboration bodes well for future sustainability. There was increasingly good ownership of the project by managing agencies.

Detailed monitoring is underway and emerging data is being used to inform management. We were extremely successful at disseminating information from the project to both national and international audiences and at least two peer reviewed articles have resulted from the project. The formal training has been completed including two substantive courses on survey and monitoring, a course on management planning, training of trainers, principles of ecotourism. Nineteen people from local site support groups attended week long ornithological training and six groups were given detailed training and support on monitoring processes. An additional output was to support attendance on an MSc course by one of the key project participants from National Museums of Kenya.

The main difficulties were associated with ensuring the return of basic monitoring forms and the greater amount of support needed than anticipated for field personnel undertaking both basic and detailed monitoring. The extent to which data could be used at this early stage had proven to be ambitious in terms of management planning, while difficulties are still apparent in effecting a good electronic database to make optimal use of the information gathered.

Output 1. Project systems in place

Project structures have worked well, in particular the Advisory Group and the Project Implementation Team. The National Liaison Committee has met regularly although less often than expected but its members have worked well informally. Project partnerships and structure as outlined in Annex 3 of our application have worked exceptionally well. The project staff have worked effectively and gained good experience from their involvement in the project. There has been good continuity of staff in most cases, although the original IBA Research Fellows have moved on as they were given other training and opportunities. Whilst their departure from the project was a loss, those arriving have learned quickly and the previous fellows are still in Kenyan conservation so we view this in a positive light. Two very useful evaluations were completed, one by Darwin consultants and one by an independent Kenyan consultant.

2. National site monitoring system established and covering all IBAs

An effective monitoring system has been established assessing basic trends in state, pressure and response more than 50 of Kenya’s 60 IBAs. Most of these sites are managed by Government agencies - primarily Kenya Wildlife Service, Forest Department and also National Museums of Kenya. There is much better ownership by these key agencies although organisational change and uncertainty caused some delays with each of them. Overall responsible institutions were identified at 88% of sites, while contact individuals were also agreed at 88%. The few remaining sites are mostly remote and poorly surveyed areas such as Didi Galgalla and Lake Turkana, although gradually these gaps are being filled. The information

was used as the basis for the annual status report produced for the first time in August 2004. Effort will need to be made to maintain as well as expand this network.

3. Detailed monitoring carried out at key IBAs feeds into improved management planning

Management plans instigated through the project are well advanced at 2 sites – Dunga Swamp and Kereita Forest. One other plan is underway at Mukurwe-ini. Additional training to assist this process has been provided, including one RSPB staff member who spent his sabbatical assisting in Dunga. Input has also been given to a number of revisions of existing plans, for example at Tsavo National park, to ensure that monitoring is incorporated into the plan and that trends emerging from this project are used to inform the plan. More detailed monitoring is now well underway at 6 sites following substantial training and follow up – feedback on results and initial analysis has been given to 3 groups. Some follow up funds have been obtained to continue this work through projects at 4 of these sites (Kinangop, Kikuyu Escarpment, Kakamega and Arabuko-Sokoke). We expect the network of sites with detailed monitoring to grow and prospective plans have been made and funds obtained at 2 of these (Taita Hills Forest, Dakatcha Woodlands).

4. Effective feedback loops established between monitoring and national conservation action and reporting

A National Liaison Committee monitoring sub-committee is in place and has met regularly. The IBA Status and Trends report launched in August 2004 was widely circulated to over 200 decision makers and practitioners in Kenya and widely elsewhere in the world. The report was extensively used for the second and third National CBD reports and a second status report is due later in 2005.

Training was carried out to assist staff with developing more effective database management, this included two visits by UK experts, a regional IBA monitoring workshop hosted in Kenya and some in house and locally sourced training e.g. on the use of the Access software. The IBA database has largely been populated but much monitoring data still remains as paper copy. Site specific databases have been developed and input of detailed monitoring data is ongoing for 3 sites, at Kikuyu Escarpment Forest, Kinangop and Kakamega Forest. The museum has a plethora of scientific databases and an assessment of database compatibility within NMK and other agencies was undertaken to seek to improve the use and value of data. This is an area where progress has been more limited than we hoped and will be a focus for improvement in the next two years.

5. Conservation interventions made as a result of threats or opportunities identified by monitoring

The monitoring programme has confirmed well known threats to conservation and also highlighted emerging ones at lesser known sites. A series of recommendations has resulted from the work of the project so far relating both to site level recommendations and wider policy based actions, and these were highlighted in the 2004 status report. Nature Kenya are purchasing land at Kinangop Plateau in response to negative trends shown. Other agencies are also starting to use the data to inform their conservation programme – for example data feeding effectively into reviews of management plans at Aberdares Forest IBA, Nairobi National Park, Tsavo East and West and the Amboseli Ecosystem. Many of the policy based recommendations in the status report have also been acted upon, for example the suspension of the shamba based crop growing system in forest reserves. Publicity for the project has proved difficult in the popular media but very effective at policy levels where NatureKenya and other project partners have been successful in highlighting issues and threats at key sites.

6. Mechanisms identified and capacity built to sustain the collection and use of practical monitoring information in the longer term

There are many encouraging signs that the partnerships, capacity, determination and at least some of the funding exist to secure the project's achievements into the future. Fundraising and project development training was completed for 3 staff and has been used to good effect. The project has thus far been successful in obtaining funds to continue some of this work, including Darwin post project funds. Most other funds secured are at the site level to allow continued detailed monitoring as well as conservation interventions responding to the highlighted threats. In parallel with the Darwin project we leveraged funds through the EU at Kinangop and Kikuyu Escarpment, USAID at Sokoke and from DANIDA to strengthen the SSG network. New funding has been obtained through the Eastern Arc and Coastal forests hotspot programme for new detailed monitoring programmes at Taita Hills Forests and Dakatcha. Steps have been taken to promote ecotourism at some sites e.g. Kereita and Kinangop – this has the potential to provide long term financing of monitoring and conservation work.

The project has been seen as a pilot with the potential for adaptation to many other countries, including outside of Africa. The experience from this project has formed the basis for BirdLife International's global guidelines for monitoring Important Bird Areas. Outputs and lessons from the project have been discussed at a large number of international meetings including

- At the CBD CoP in Malaysia in February 2004
- At the BirdLife International World Conference in South Africa in March 2004,
- At a Royal Society meeting in London in July 2004 on developing global biodiversity indicators,
- At a meeting on building local monitoring schemes in Copenhagen in July 2004,
- At the 11th Pan African Ornithological Congress in Tunisia in November 2004 and
- At a National Darwin Initiative seminar in London in April 2005.

4. Scientific, Training, and Technical Assessment

The project's overall objective has been to set in place a robust scientifically based monitoring programme based on global standards and with strong local ownership. The major research outputs were a set of guidelines for undertaking basic site integrity monitoring across all 60 Important Bird Areas, and a set of protocols dealing with specific habitats, namely forest, grasslands and wetlands. These have strongly influenced BirdLife International's global IBA monitoring guidelines.

The main staff involved on the research side on the Kenyan side from the Department of Ornithology of the National Museums of Kenya, alongside other colleagues from other museum Departments and site based officers. Four staff in particular – two research fellows, one database coordinator and one overall project coordinator were all trained and in turn undertook training, developed guidelines and provided field based support to ensure high standards and consistency. Staff from the RSPB's Conservation Science Department, along with BirdLife International and the University of East Anglia undertook training, follow up field and remote support and advised on data analysis. The Advisory Group for the project included senior scientists from NatureKenya, National Museums of Kenya, Kenya Wildlife Service, University of East Anglia, BirdLife International as well as the RSPB.

The aim was to develop and implement a simple but robust monitoring system which was scientifically defensible and yet which could be sustained after the end of external financing. These guidelines were explained and practiced during formal training with participants throughout the project, in particular two formal monitoring and survey workshops delivered by UK and Kenyan staff and similar training for site support groups delivered predominantly by Kenyans.

Results so far have included two years worth of basic monitoring data for 53 out of the 60 sites. These have been analysed and summarised in the IBA Status and Trends report. For the six sites where detailed monitoring has been undertaken, between one and three years worth of data exist for each. While these need longer to be statistically meaningful, some preliminary

analysis was carried to give the monitoring groups some encouragement and to show them the kind of information that could be obtained.

Two papers describing the working methods and results have been approved for publication – one in *Ostrich* and one in *Biodiversity and Conservation*, Neither has yet been published although the latter was placed on the journal's website in October 2005. Copies will be supplied to Darwin once they appear.

- **Training and capacity building activities**

The following training activities were included in the project. They were selected on the basis of extensive discussion between RSPB, NatureKenya and National Museums of Kenya but in particular between the Kenyan institutions themselves through the working of the National Liaison Committee. The themes and content of the courses was further discussed during the project start up/workplan development workshop held in May 2002. The main training activities were:

- Formal on the job training for two Research Fellows in the Department of Ornithology
Fellows were exposed to all the training listed below and given 1:1 mentoring by UK and Kenyan project staff. A flexible approach allowed them to take advantage of other training opportunities when they occurred, and although some moved on to other jobs, all (five) project research fellows are now actively engaged in Kenyan conservation. These staff played a very substantial role in delivering the project at the same time and so contributed to project outputs 2,3 and 4 in particular.
- Support towards costs of one Masters thesis for one NK staff member
We provided opportunistic and very limited support to help Alfred Owino member of project advisory group and Head of Ornithology Dept, to attend an MSc course in South Africa. His thesis focused on Dunga Swamp so helping to achieve output 3.
- Two international courses on monitoring and survey methods for government field staff and NGO/institution staff
These courses provided the core training to field officers from the IBAs around Kenya – around 50 in total which would ensure they were able to complete the basic monitoring procedures and help others at their sites to do so. At the same time substantial scientific content ensured that the principles of rigorous survey and monitoring methods were understood and that participants would be in a position to implement more detailed monitoring schemes, should resources become available. These courses were fundamental to achieving outputs 2 and 3.
- Five courses on monitoring and survey methods for site support groups plus refresher training
These were undertaken by Kenyan project staff with some assistance on preparation and on one occasion delivery by UK Research staff. They were tailored to the habitat type and to the level of experience of the group. They were delivered to the individuals actively involved in monitoring and followed up regularly through support visits. This helped to achieve output 3.
- One course on training for trainers for Government and NGO staff
This was led by the RSPB's Youth and Volunteers Training officer and delivered to the key individuals who attended the first monitoring and survey course who were in a position to transfer their knowledge. It was held in Nairobi for three days and was very well received, although we learned some lessons about adequate follow up with the trained field staff to ensure that they passed this training on. The course helped Kenyan project staff to feel more confident about the major role they played in subsequent training delivery, in particular to fulfil outputs 2 and 3.
- One course on management planning for Government and NGO staff

This course was held in Year 2 delivered by the RSPB's Reserves Ecologist and a senior member of the Kenya Forest Department. It focused on training in the objectives and structure of a management plan, adapting global models to the Kenyan situation and on ensuring implementation and monitoring of the plan followed. This helped to achieve output 3.

- Training in database management and analysis, plus in access and other software for Government and NGO staff

Short courses were held for key project staff and interested parties from other agencies in database management and analysis in Year 2. Key participants were sent on external courses while follow up support was given by Birdlife and RSPB staff, thus helping to achieve output 4.

- Training in ecotourism principles for Government and NGO staff

A two day course was organised in Year 2 covering issues of ethics, principles, infrastructure and visitor services. Participants from site support groups attended. After this preliminary seminar it was concluded that the two next steps were site specific discussions focused on financing, infrastructure and marketing which were to be pursued at individual sites through funding leveraged in parallel to this project, and thus helping to achieve output 6. Secondly for training in principles of ornithology to be given to prospective ecotourism leaders and guides so that they technically better equipped to carry out these services. This was pursued through the training outlined below.

- Attendance for 19 people on ornithological training courses for local community representatives.

A number of places were sponsored on annual courses covering fundamental principles of bird biology, ecology and conservation to provide site support groups with a better technical grounding in their work.

Selection of attendees was according to the different needs of the project. Most courses involved members of the project team, members of the government conservation agencies who are responsible for each of the 60 IBAs, other stakeholders and local community groups. To ensure appropriate representation and to ensure ownership, government agencies were asked to nominate and invite their own staff to the meetings so that it became part of their official duties sanctioned by senior staff.

5. Project Impacts

We believe there is strong evidence that the project has achieved the project purpose and also that there are encouraging signs that these achievements will be maintained in the long term. A functioning monitoring network has been established in more than fifty of the sixty sites in the IBA network. There is good stakeholder ownership involvement in this process and if the process is not yet fully institutionalised it is becoming increasingly so. The information is already been used to guide conservation thinking, even if it is rather early for trends to become apparent. In particular the information has been used as the basis for two management plans, has informed revisions of others and has influenced the conservation actions of NatureKenya including the decision to purchase areas of highly threatened grassland habitats on Kinangop plateau.

The impact in relation to the individual outputs is stated in the logframe. In summary:

- A status and trends report was produced and influenced policy formulation, and in particular the 2nd and 3rd national reports to the CBD
- High quality training has been delivered and the monitoring network is in place and functioning
- Detailed monitoring is underway and has informed the development of three management

plans, while information has been used for the review of others such as National parks by Kenya Wildlife service

- Strong partnerships and structures are in place to continue the work in future and some funds have been obtained for both running the network and to develop more detailed monitoring and management at key sites
- NatureKenya's (and increasingly other project partners) work programme is heavily influenced in terms of conservation action and advocacy by the outcomes of this project – already land has been purchased in response to monitoring trends, while the need for policy changes has been highlighted and acted upon.

Despite considerable instability within some of the government institutions involved in the project, there is strong evidence that they are increasingly supportive of the project and interested to use the information. The Forest Department has decided to use the basic monitoring instrument as a key monitoring tool through which to collect data on all of its forest reserves, not just those identified as IBAs and included in this project. The Kenya Wildlife Service has proactively used the information arising from the project in the revisions of their management plans.

The project has had an exceptionally positive impact on the relationships between project partners both within Kenya and between UK and Kenya. It has cemented still further the already excellent relationships between RSPB (and Birdlife International and Darwin Initiative) and NatureKenya, and enhanced our relationships with Kenyan government and other stakeholders, especially following the visit by Kenyan stakeholders to the UK in April 2005. It has greatly strengthened NatureKenya's credibility as a 'doing' organisation in Kenya generally and with specific government agencies. The willingness of two senior government officials to participate in a NatureKenya mission to the UK was evidence of this. Domestically it has strengthened the IBA National Liaison Committee, enabled NGOs to have effective inputs into e.g. the managing agencies management plans and provided them with access to decision makers.

The two year follow up funding will help greatly to maintain the momentum of this monitoring network and ensure the work becomes entrenched into regular operational workplans. While funding of some kind will still be required and many challenges remain, we are confident that all agencies have a commitment in principle to maintaining the system that this project has built.

The project has deliberately tried to ensure that the capacity building benefits ensue to organisations more than specific individuals. We believe that all of the institutions involved in the project, including the community groups, have greater capacity to undertake monitoring and associated conservation work than at the start of this project. Specifically this is because their staff have received training and hands on experience, because organisational representatives have worked together to develop this system and to adapt and evolve it in the light of experience and because organisationally they have a better understanding of and commitment to the role of monitoring in the work that they do. In some cases they have also received equipment and resources which helps them to do this work more efficiently.

We have not tracked the current status of all of the beneficiaries of training. The vast majority of government officials trained under the project are still with those agencies although some are transferred periodically from one site to another. This need not be a problem provided their skills are both left behind and transferred to their new station. We believe this to be the case but will make greater efforts to track it in the future. Among the main project trainees and beneficiaries we can state the following:

- A number are still in post – all of the advisory group members remain with their original institutions. The project coordinator and database coordinator, Ronald Mulwa and John Musina are still at Dept of Ornithology. All of the Site Assistants are still in place or have moved onto other roles within Naturekenya.
- Of the five Research fellows, the latest two remain in post. Nickson Otieno is currently undertaking a MSc course, Wanyoike Wamiti is in a different position in the Ornithology

Dept and Fabian Musilla is with WWF.

- After completing this project, the Project Manager Solomon Mwangi left NatureKenya in July 2005 to take up a position with the EU Biodiversity Support Programme team in Nairobi. Anthony Kiragu became a Darwin scholar and will spend one year in UK before returning to Kenya. Both of these staff have been promptly replaced. Alfred Owino who was Acting Head of Ornithology in NMK returned from successfully completing his MSc and is now back with the Department.

The project did not explicitly anticipate producing social or economic benefits to local communities, nor did we develop indicators to measure this. This was raised by the reviewer of our second annual report. We stated then 'The need for this is borne out by recent comments from some of the SSGs re the linkage between this work and their livelihoods work. We did not feel it was appropriate to do this as part of THIS project per se. However many of the groups do already have associated livelihoods project and NatureKenya have redoubled their efforts to connect with these sectors. Funding is in place for such work at several sites and more is being sought'. In addition this project was always intended as the scientific part of their work which while not directly raising livelihood standards would provide them with information which they could use to strengthen their case for other programmes to support such improvements. The experience, training and confidence gained by SSGs through this project has certainly strengthened their ability to advocate both for natural resource protection and for their social and economic needs to be given more attention.

6. Project Outputs

Project outputs have been quantified using the coding and format of the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures. These are stated in full in the Table in Appendix II.

Most targeted outputs were achieved and some were exceeded. For example more people were trained than expected although some courses e.g. on databases and ecotourism were shorter than anticipated. We managed to send 19 local community group members on ornithological training courses. We also were able to contribute to one MSc course by a leading Kenyan scientist who was on the advisory group of the project.

The number of management plans resulting from the project that we originally hoped for was not reached. This was recognised in the mid term review and the indicator amended downwards. It was simply too early for detailed actions of this kind to be easy and for meaningful data to arise from one or two years of monitoring. Nonetheless two are in an advanced stage of production, another has been started, and a number of other plans produced by managing agencies were influenced through the work and outputs from the project. No specific publications dealing with identification or methodology although monitoring protocols could be published in the future after further testing. We did not develop any reference collections.

Publicity in the popular media was quite hard to achieve and although we did eventually achieve our targets this took a lot of work and some articles were partly about the project and partly about the wider conservation work of NatureKenya and the site support groups. Conversely we managed to disseminate information from the project at at least 7 international meetings and conferences, mostly using funding leveraged from elsewhere.

Full details are provided in Appendix III of all publications that can be publicly accessed.

Information relating to project outputs and outcomes has been very widely disseminated. Targeted audiences have been a combination of those internally to BirdLife, to decision makers nationally and internationally and to other programme managers and conservation practitioners. This high profile resulted from the high quality of the project outputs, the interest in the project as a pilot for activities elsewhere in Africa and globally and the high profile of some of the project staff in national and international conservation. In particular these involved:

Internally to BirdLife: an IBA regional Workshop (Kenya, August 2003), BirdLife Africa

partnership meeting (Tanzania, Sept 2003), Birdlife World Conference (South Africa March 2004)

To decision makers: World Congress on Protected Areas (South Africa, Sept 2003), CBD CoP (Malaysia Feb 2004), Royal Society Global Biodiversity Indicators meeting (July 2004), National IBA Status and Trends report (Kenya August 2004).

To other practitioners: Monitoring workshop in Copenhagen (Denmark August 2004), Pan African Ornithological Congress (Tunisia November 2004), Darwin seminar (UK April 2005).

A small brochure was published for the CBD CoP in 2004. Two articles arising from the meetings in Denmark and Tunisia are scheduled to appear shortly in peer-reviewed journals. Publicity was achieved in the Kenya popular media and in RSPB publications in the UK. All of the above made reference to the contribution of Darwin.

We expect that will continue after the project completion, especially in the light of the Darwin follow on grant awarded. Substantial material from the project can still be used for publicity and dissemination, for example we have drafted articles for popular magazines and the project was further discussed at the BirdLife Africa meeting in July 2005, just after the project close.

It is expected that the cost of this and the responsibility will be borne primarily by NatureKenya with support in some cases from RSPB. It is intended and expected that the project will lead onto other programmes both thematic and site based – disseminating the outputs from these will be part of the continuing legacy of the Darwin programme.

7. Project Expenditure

The total expenditure by the Darwin Initiative on the project is shown in the Table and equals the grant offer of £98,337. We had some underspends in Year 1 and Year 2 and small carry overs were requested and granted by Darwin Initiative. The Year 2 grant underspend was held over to the 2005/6 year which enabled us to have a small operational budget during the important closing phase between 1 April and 30 June 2005. This also formed part of the 10% held back until the completion of our final report.

We did have some substantial variances between agreed and actual expenditure on budget lines in particular years. These were explained in each annual report. However over the project as a whole, the expenditure on particular budget lines have closely matched the original projections. The only figure which varies by more than 10% is on postage, telephone and stationary where there is a 28.22% overspend, although the actual overspend is only £592 since it was a small budget item. This mainly occurred in Year 2 when there was a heavy load in terms of events being organised, monitoring forms being distributed and trainees being contacted. However in general we underestimated the costs of administering this programme. In hindsight we should have transferred some of this expenditure to the printing line (which was underspent) since some of the stationary costs were actually printing of materials.

8. Project Operation and Partnerships

The Kenya project partners were as anticipated in the original project (as per the structure outlined in Annex 3 of our original application) and remained so throughout the project and beyond. Our principal partner is the Birdlife partner NGO NatureKenya. Other principal partners throughout the project were three Government managing agencies the National Museums of Kenya (particularly but by no means exclusively the Department of Ornithology), Kenya Wildlife service, Forest Department and a number of local community based conservation and site support groups in particular the Friends of Kinangop Plateau, Kijabe Environment Volunteers, Mukurwe-ini Environment Volunteers, South Nandi Biodiversity Conservation Group, Kakamega Environment Education Programme and Lake Victoria Sunset Birders.

Other Kenya partners participated strongly either in specific activities or at particular sites. These included the National Environment Management Agency, Wildlife Clubs of Kenya, World Wide Fund for Nature and Ecotourism Society of Kenya. A number of other agencies participated in the project through their inputs to meetings of the IBA National liaison Committee and its monitoring sub-committee. There has also been close collaboration with the national focal point of the CBD, in particular in the context of inputting project results into the second and third national reports to the CBD.

The main UK partners have been scientists from the Secretariat of BirdLife International and the University of East Anglia. Both were represented on the advisory group and provided training and other valuable inputs to the project. We also met regularly with staff of the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust in view of their close involvement in monitoring in East Africa through their Darwin project, also with NMK.

The relationship between RSPB and Nature Kenya our principal partner in the project has continued to be excellent. Staff at Nature Kenya are extremely busy with a range of programmes but equally very committed and have risen to the challenge of ensuring the project works to plan. The working relationship with the Ornithology Department has also continued to be very good with great commitment shown by core staff.

The relationships with other critical partners, especially KWS and FD have continued to improve, although both have been hampered a little by changes in staff responsibilities and restructuring. However, excellent cooperation with senior staff ensured that plans were amended to get the follow up visits completed and reports submitted. Relations with NEMA have improved through the project and assisted by the presence of their Director General at the launch of the IBA status report. Both NEMA and FD will, we hope, sit on the Advisory Group in future, alongside the existing Kenyan partners.

The project has continued to assist Nature Kenya in particular with their networking with other organisations and projects. This has happened most formally through the network created by the IBA NLC Monitoring Sub-Committee. A project of this nature has inevitably interacted with a range of other conservation projects run by other organisations, either at the national coordination level or at the site level, including other Naturekenya projects and Darwin projects, for example that implemented by Earthwatch at Lake Naivasha . It will be important that follow up work seeks to instill the principle of this project into other site based initiatives so that monitoring programmes are complementary, can be interpreted to a common standard and that they are carried out in a manner which has some hope of being maintained beyond the funding cycle.

The project has been regularly reported to other members of the BirdLife African partnership (and also globally) who are developing, or seeking to develop, monitoring programmes for IBAs in their own countries. Kenya is the most developed country in the region in this respect, thanks to the Darwin project, so many lessons learned can be applied elsewhere in Africa (and beyond). In particular, this experience has helped to develop a joint programme between

NatureKenya and the Wildlife Conservation Society of Tanzania for IBA monitoring in the Eastern Arc and Coastal Forests.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation, Lesson learning

A number of mechanisms were established to monitor the progress of the project. Its nature as a highly interactive and developmental project resulted in a very active and ongoing system of monitoring, review and adaptation both within Kenya and from the RSPB project management. Monitoring as far as outputs and targets followed the Darwin model and the project logframe i.e. based around the project indicators and standard outputs. We can say that the monitoring completed, alongside that undertaken for associated projects, demonstrates that the project indicators have largely been achieved. However there are many intangibles beyond these figures based around three questions:

- is the project actually working effectively?
- is it achieving the conservation benefits we set out to achieve?
- and is it likely to continue once funding ends?.

The project management group as a whole invested considerable time in discussing these questions based on a thorough understanding of the project, its successes and challenges and sought to constantly adapt practices to ensure that the outcome would be positive. We believe that the substantial information collected through the project is already being used for conservation and will be still more in future, both at site and policy level.

The main review bodies were firstly the Project Advisory Group comprised of the main project partners from UK and Kenya. This group met in full four times, in November 2002, November 2003, August 2004 (all in Kenya) and April 2005 (in UK). We also met on several other occasions when at least some of the group was present, the Kenyan members were in active contact with Nature Kenya and we had an active exchange by e mail. This group proved very useful in making informed policy decisions and in particular in securing the assistance of government members to ensuring the smooth running of the programme. In future it will continue with a greater emphasis on Kenyan representation.

Secondly the existing IBA National Liaison Committee and the monitoring sub-committee of this group proved invaluable in gaining the active support of many organisations not involved in the day to day running of this programme. Although the project was just one part of its remit, it helped to cement the monitoring programme into the wider national conservation picture and should help to ensure a smooth transition to the post project/funding situation.

Finally the Project Implementation Team met regularly (approx once every six weeks), this being the project officers in NatureKenya and NMK who were involved in day to day implementation of the project. This group was invaluable in day to day coordination, maintaining collaboration between the two organisations and in ensuring efficient working practices. The project leader visited Kenya three to four times a year during the project, to undertake overall project monitoring and guidance, and joined the PIT group whenever he was in Kenya.

We were fortunate to have two project evaluations during the three year phase, the first a mid term review conducted in March 2004 by Alex Forbes of the Darwin initiative which raised a number of issues and made some very valuable recommendations. A final project evaluation was undertaken by Mine Pabari in March 2005. These are reported in Appendix VI. Since we had already had one review, the second one concentrated more on the way forward for the future. This evaluation helped greatly in refining the plans for the future functioning of the network, in particular for the next two years of post project funding.

Overcoming difficulties

The project faced a number of difficulties over its lifetime, which we believe our monitoring system managed to identify and react to promptly.

The major challenge facing the project throughout has been securing institutionalisation and ownership of the project from the key managing agencies, and then securing all reports from

field staff. The second year showed a significant improvement and we believe that ownership is growing, although internal reorganisations hampered progress and were probably responsible for a fall in the proportion of forms returned in 2005. We continue efforts to broaden support for the programme throughout those agencies so that individuals are less critical to its success. We still have some difficult gaps where we have not been able to locate people to take on monitoring at remote sites.

The database aspects of the programme have not made as much progress as we hoped. We are waiting for some generic models that will be applied globally from which Kenya's more external national model should ideally stem. A review in February 2005 and the evaluation in March 2005 both concluded that existing databases could be improved and that greater harmonisation between the various databases should be developed. Additional training and further reviews will we hope lead to action to improve things during the post project phase.

The detailed monitoring is proceeding well and beginning to feed into management planning and conservation decision making. However we gain the impression that groups having gone through the 'first flush of enthusiasm' are now wanting to review what they do and to see clearer feedback on what it all means and how it links to the rest of the work of the group and to potential revenue earning programmes. It is still early to make scientifically robust analyses of the data but we will improve feedback and try and undertake some initial analysis to show them how we can use data in the future. Nature Kenya's projects need to better link the monitoring and income generating facets of the SSG's work so that can better see that each benefits from the other.

Lessons learned

Both the final project advisory meeting, closing discussions and the final project evaluation considered the lessons learned in some detail. The following were thought to be the key lessons of the project:

1. Monitoring activities can be an extremely effective mechanism to raise awareness and capacity for conservation. However, to be effective and sustainable, participants need first to understand the conservation and material benefits of doing the work, and design must take into account the social, economic and political realities of those involved.
2. Institutionalisation and integration are key features of sustainability, however, the two processes require time and effort. Capacity and processes need to be strengthened at the institutional level, rather than the individual level. A key ingredient to achieve this is the buy in of senior managers.
3. Capacity building is best achieved through "learning by doing"
4. Demonstrating "impact" through monitoring, either in relation to quantifying damage or demonstrating benefits of response actions, is a powerful catalyst for positive action.
5. A strong motivating factor can be the demonstration of the linkages between good conservation and livelihood benefits
6. Make monitoring simple and focused, avoiding any compromises in scientific credibility
7. Making monitoring relevant to the needs of the partner institutions is key to achieving sustainability
8. Providing follow-up support/mentoring and ensuring regular two way feedback is critical in achieving a common understanding of the short and long-term objectives

Perhaps an overriding lesson is the need to be more realistic about what can be achieved in a short periods, to face up to the need to sometimes put long term sustainability ahead of short term achievement and to improve the level of advance planning and consultation with key stakeholder groups. The project strives to recognise all of these lessons and will apply them during the follow up phase.

10. Actions taken in response to annual report reviews (if applicable)

We have received recommendations from reviews of the first and second annual reports and also from the mid term review undertaken by Darwin and from the final evaluation. Each of these was discussed in Kenya with both the advisory group and the project implementation team. We have responded to the first three reviews as outlined below. We will use the findings of the final evaluation and any review of our third annual report (not yet received) to inform our work in the follow up project and beyond.

Changes in project implementation and operations included:

- The baseline status report was succeeded by a more concise published status and trends report which has been very well received. This report in future will include an analysis of action undertaken at sites as result of monitoring.
- Following the recommendations of the annual review and of the MTR we proposed some amendments to the logframe indicators. As part of this we developed an exit strategy and a set of prioritised actions to ensure embedding of monitoring principles into conservation actions and management planned beyond the three years of the project.
- The working of the project implementation team was reviewed and their terms of reference amended to include communication issues
- The monitoring forms were amended to give greater prominence to and include logos of the specific institution for which it is intended. This change was one part of a substantive initiative to get greater buy in, ownership and leadership by other agencies.
- The need to strengthen linkages between this programme and the livelihoods work undertaken by the SSGs as part of other related projects was recognised and approaches adapted
- The linkages and potential follow up with WWT and NMK in respect of the Darwin-funded project on developing wetland monitoring schemes in East African was discussed. Aspects from the work of this project were included in our follow up proposal

We also made a number of amendments to our reporting practices:

- We gave more explanation of the roles of the UK staff and included more reports as annexes.
- We have kept Darwin more fully informed of major changes to budgets and have also tried to give a fuller account of and explanation of any predicted changes in future years expenditure
- Improved reporting against the logframe, which subsequently became a standard requirement

In future we will seek to implement a number of actions arising from these earlier reviews but particularly from the final evaluation. These to include:

- We will improve feedback to those who monitor and produce guidance on how to improve the linkage between monitoring and management planning and action
- Adopt a more participatory approach to initial project planning, development of monitoring plans and to decision making
- Further improve risk planning and aversion, especially to counter unpredictable, but possibly inevitable, events such as organisational restructuring etc
- Further understand the information needs of various stakeholders as part of improving data collection, management and dissemination.
- Further institutionalise the system by increasing the number of people both within organisations and at field level who understand, support and participate in the monitoring network
- Seek more robust ways of confirming the scientific integrity of the system, probably including more follow up visits and ground truthing, and also through integration with remote sensing programmes as another tier of monitoring

- Continue to improve publicity about the project, dissemination of its findings and advocacy of the results emerging and in support of the further strengthening of the network.

11. Darwin Identity

We achieved a high profile for this project among practitioners and decision makers and succeeded in promoting Darwin quite widely. Among the opportunities taken to promote the Darwin identity to the project have been:

- In project promotional work including articles in the RSPB magazine and annual report, in the special edition of the *Nature East Africa* magazine, in a brochure produced for the CBD CoP in Malaysia in 2004 and on the RSPB and NatureKenya websites
- In project publications notably the Kenya IBA Annual Status and Trends reports, the monitoring forms themselves and two peer reviewed publications in press.
- At a series of presentations in Kenya and overseas outlined in section 6 above

The monitoring programme funded by Darwin is a specific project with its own identity although it is loosely part of larger conservation initiatives, especially in so far as it seeks to build conservation capacity amongst local site conservation groups. However we have been careful to avoid the feeling that this is a stand alone funded project, since people often associate this with initiatives which stop once the funding has ended. Rather we have tried to promote the initiative as a longer term programme of monitoring which we wish to institutionalise within the normal operations of the participating organisations, and for which initial assistance is being given by Darwin.

Darwin has quite a high profile in Kenya as a result of several projects being funded and also through publicity events such as the visit of Rt Hon Elliot Morley in 2003. This means that the Darwin Initiative and the UK Government as a whole are seen as major contributors to funding biodiversity conservation in Kenya. In the main this assists in publicising the programme and its execution although some individuals can end up being involved in or contacted by more than one Darwin funded project at a time, which means that some explanation about which Darwin project we are may be necessary!

12. Leverage

RSPB has a long term programme of support with NatureKenya going back to 1994 and which will continue after the end of this current and the follow on project. This programme has focused on capacity building and has helped to establish NatureKenya as a well staffed professional organisation who is able to play a leading role in Kenyan conservation. While it is their primary responsibility to secure the means of continuing this programme, it is also a key part of RSPB's work to be of assistance in helping them to do so if we can. As part of this responsibility we have worked with NatureKenya on a number of projects which have leveraged funding for parallel work during the course of the project or sought to secure funds to follow up. In particular we secured the two year follow up grant from Darwin Initiative.

Attempts to leverage funds alongside Darwin funding have three components

Co-financing from the project partners

Through the course of the project the key partners have co-funded the project to the tune of at least £78,897 from RSPB and £19,617.44 from Nature Kenya and NMK. The contribution of other project partners has not been costed but is very substantial in terms of manpower and other in kind support.

Mainstreaming monitoring in all new and ongoing project proposals

This is now a standard practice in the Nature Kenya fund-raising strategy, where monitoring is mainstreamed as a cross-cutting issue. The focus has been but not limited to: supporting minimal running costs, supporting purchase of basic monitoring equipment, support for the

coordination structure, support for refresher training and establishment and strengthening of partnership with the managing agencies locally. So far success has been registered with at least four programmes:

Kikuyu Escarpment and Kinangop Grasslands – project supported by EU
Arabuko-Sokoke Forest – project supported by USAID
Sabaki River Mouth/Mida Creek - A Rocha Kenya
DANIDA site support group strengthening programme.

Developing site-specific monitoring proposals in collaboration with ongoing programmes

Developing site-specific proposals for critical detailed monitoring sites targeting existing opportunities i.e. ongoing research, monitoring and/or conservation action programmes and projects. Successes registered in Kakamega Forest where a German-based research programme (Biota) has agreed to support detailed monitoring for a period of three years. In the Mukurwe-ini Valleys, a small grant from Club 300 is supporting minimal monitoring activities, working with the local SSG members. Finally funds have been received through CI's Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund for monitoring work in the Eastern Arc and Coastal forests hotspot, especially at Dakatcha Woodland and Taita Hills.

In addition we can say that this project has leveraged considerable activity on monitoring at the African regional scale. The application to CEPF above was inspired to a large degree by the success of this project, as is an application to the European Union 'Environment in Developing Countries' budget line involving similar work in at least eight African countries, due for submission in November 2005. RSPB has funded the commencement of a three year research programme looking at the potential for monitoring using remote sensing techniques and its integration with ground truth techniques such as this.

13. Sustainability and Legacy

The training, resourcing and mentoring functions of the project have certainly increased the capacity for, understanding of and participation in and therefore the amount of biodiversity monitoring being undertaken in Kenya. Translating that into clear conservation benefits is starting to happen but it will take time for people to appreciate the use that the data can be put to and for it to show long enough trends to provide reliable information. The project's outputs have already demonstrably been used for informing conservation action and we are confident that this will increase in time.

We are absolutely convinced that the excellent relationships engendered by the project will continue and confident that the monitoring network established will continue through the post project phase and beyond. The resources purchased through the project will remain the property of NatureKenya and the other project partners where such field equipment has been distributed, and continues to be used for project purposes. No staff employed through or involved in the project have left the positions involuntarily since the project ended.

An exit strategy was developed as part of the post project process. Key elements of this included:

- ensuring greater input of resources into the maintenance of the network by Kenyan project partners
- mainstreaming monitoring in all new and ongoing large project proposals, so that an increasing number of sites will benefit from specific monitoring resources
- expanding training to new groups such as Forest Guards who may be able to assist in monitoring
- developing site-specific monitoring and management proposals for critical sites not otherwise funded
- filling gaps in IBA coverage through monitoring visits and seeking new contacts among local agencies

- working with other institutions with long-term objectives and presence in specific areas – e.g. the A Rocha Trust near Malindi, which is involved in monitoring at up to 5 IBAs.

Following the success of the Darwin Initiative follow up bid and other site based project proposals, the exit strategy is of course an evolving one. We will review this throughout the two year period of post project funding.

The impacts of the follow-up Darwin project will be as follows.

- Institutionalisation of monitoring within managing agencies, creating extra capacity and awareness within each agency through targeted support.
- Development of a standard training module for people new to the network (incorporating wetland monitoring from project 11/002) which can be delivered by the individual agencies themselves.
- Further development of and sharing between project and allied databases (including the KWS, wetland and Birdfinder databases), to ensure more efficient and effective analysis and use of monitoring data to a common standard across the Kenyan network. This will strengthen reporting to the CBD and assist in the use of data in developing indicators and policy formulation.
- Further capacity building of Site Support Groups to enable them integrate monitoring even more closely into their work programmes.
- An increase in the number of management plans making active use of monitoring data, with a particular focus on wetlands (building on the legacy of WWT project 11/002).
- Regional (using the WWT Regional Monitoring Network) and national dissemination through seminars, publications and the media, to promote the programme and encourage its replication elsewhere.

We will continue to work with NatureKenya to secure additional support where it needed, especially at the site level where an expansion of the detailed monitoring programme would be of benefit. We are also looking to submit a proposal to the EU based on experience in this project, to expand and assist monitoring work in a number of African countries, including Kenya.

In conclusion we believe that the legacy from this project is strong and perhaps not much more could have done. The prevailing poor conditions in the Kenyan economy means that hopes of full institutionalisation and funding from within Kenya remain limited, while organisational restructuring, which may or may not be necessary, nonetheless continues to slow the ability of organisations to maintain commitments to programmes such as this in the phase of frequent loss of or transfers of responsible staff.

14. Value for money

We modestly submit that the proposal has provided very good value for money. Considering a relatively modest investment of less than £100,000 from Darwin Initiative and a similar level of direct financial input from the key project partners, the following has been achieved

- Substantial conservation capacity has been developed throughout both government and non government sectors, at national and local in a range of conservation interventions but specifically in biological monitoring
- A network of monitoring focal points has been established across more than 50 of Kenya's most important sites for biodiversity
- Information has been gathered which is already informing conservation decision making in Kenya
- Strong relationships between organisations – government and non government – have been established which we are confident will endure
- The project has assisted in the national CBD reporting process, been widely promoted and has already informed similar initiatives in other countries

By way of evidence, we quote from the mid term review in March 2004:

“Overall the project is progressing according to original plans, has completed activities as planned, and resulted in a number achievements contributing to the overall outputs, purpose and overall goal. The project benefits from strong local institutional leadership, good institutional partnerships within Kenya and with the UK Institution, and an appropriate biodiversity monitoring methodology that is user-friendly, simple and yet scientifically robust. This positive project serves as an excellent example of a good project for the Darwin Initiative”

and from the final review completed in March 2005:

“Overall, this is an extremely good project. It has achieved significant impacts in a very short space of time, and in spite of a number of obstacles. This in itself signifies strong commitment at all levels, and that project outcomes are relevant locally and nationally. The project has also established a foundation on which measures for sustainability can be built, including institutional partnerships, capacity and the willingness of local communities and national actors. Through its experiences, a number of lessons have been learnt which should be used both to strengthen future implementation (especially with regards to sustainability), and to inform other relevant initiatives regionally and globally”

Appendix I:

Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity		
Article No./Title	Project %	Article Description
6. General Measures for Conservation & Sustainable Use		Develop national strategies that integrate conservation and sustainable use.
7. Identification and Monitoring	40	Identify and monitor components of biological diversity, particularly those requiring urgent conservation; identify processes and activities that have adverse effects; maintain and organise relevant data.
8. In-situ Conservation	15	Establish systems of protected areas with guidelines for selection and management; regulate biological resources, promote protection of habitats; manage areas adjacent to protected areas; restore degraded ecosystems and recovery of threatened species; control risks associated with organisms modified by biotechnology; control spread of alien species; ensure compatibility between sustainable use of resources and their conservation; protect traditional lifestyles and knowledge on biological resources.
9. Ex-situ Conservation		Adopt ex-situ measures to conserve and research components of biological diversity, preferably in country of origin; facilitate recovery of threatened species; regulate and manage collection of biological resources.
10. Sustainable Use of Components of Biological Diversity		Integrate conservation and sustainable use in national decisions; protect sustainable customary uses; support local populations to implement remedial actions; encourage co-operation between governments and the private sector.
11. Incentive Measures		Establish economically and socially sound incentives to conserve and promote sustainable use of biological diversity.
12. Research and Training	25	Establish programmes for scientific and technical education in identification, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity components; promote research contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, particularly in developing countries (in accordance with SBSTTA recommendations).
13. Public Education and Awareness	10	Promote understanding of the importance of measures to conserve biological diversity and propagate these measures through the media; cooperate with other states and organisations in developing awareness programmes.
14. Impact Assessment and		Introduce EIAs of appropriate projects and allow public participation; take into account environmental

Minimizing Adverse Impacts		consequences of policies; exchange information on impacts beyond State boundaries and work to reduce hazards; promote emergency responses to hazards; examine mechanisms for re-dress of international damage.
15. Access to Genetic Resources		Whilst governments control access to their genetic resources they should also facilitate access of environmentally sound uses on mutually agreed terms; scientific research based on a country's genetic resources should ensure sharing in a fair and equitable way of results and benefits.
16. Access to and Transfer of Technology		Countries shall ensure access to technologies relevant to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity under fair and most favourable terms to the source countries (subject to patents and intellectual property rights) and ensure the private sector facilitates such assess and joint development of technologies.
17. Exchange of Information	10	Countries shall facilitate information exchange and repatriation including technical scientific and socio-economic research, information on training and surveying programmes and local knowledge
19. Bio-safety Protocol		Countries shall take legislative, administrative or policy measures to provide for the effective participation in biotechnological research activities and to ensure all practicable measures to promote and advance priority access on a fair and equitable basis, especially where they provide the genetic resources for such research.
Total %	100%	Check % = total 100

Appendix II

Outputs

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
Training Outputs		
1a	Number of people to submit PhD thesis	None – none planned
1b	Number of PhD qualifications obtained	None – none planned
2	Number of Masters qualifications obtained	One , Alfred Owino was assisted by the project and successfully completed his MSc at Cape Town University
3	Number of other qualifications obtained	None – none planned
4a	Number of undergraduate students receiving training	None – none planned
4b	Number of training weeks provided to undergraduate students	None – none planned
4c	Number of postgraduate students receiving training (not 1-3 above)	None – none planned
4d	Number of training weeks for postgraduate students	None – none planned
5	Number of people receiving other forms of long-term (>1yr) training not leading to formal qualification(i.e not categories 1-4 above)	Nine people associated with the project received this kind of long term training. 2 Field Officers positions were continued throughout the project but due to staff turnover 5 people, Fabian Musilla, Steven Wamiti, Nickson Otieno, Simon Musila and Martin Mwema held these positions. All got substantial training and are still active in Kenyan conservation. The interns at Mukurweini, Kinangop, Mt Kenya, Arabuko-Sokoke Forest, Kakamega and South Nandi (some funded through other leveraged programmes) worked well throughout – strengthening and providing technical guidance to SSGs and ensuring adherence to monitoring standards
6a	Number of people receiving other forms of short-term education/training (i.e not categories 1-5 above)	19 SSG members attended a one-week training course in Fundamentals of Ornithology Six Kenyan staff received one week's training on IBA monitoring and database handling and analysis. Two staff received one week's training in Access databases. 29 Kenyan staff received 4 days' training on management planning 60 government field staff received one week's training in survey and monitoring

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
		<p>Three Nature Kenya/NMK staff received two weeks' training in fundraising (plus in-country follow-up)</p> <p>20 Kenyans received training in project development and training needs assessment</p> <p>127 members of SSGs received a total of 378 days' training on aspects on survey and monitoring pertinent to their 'home IBAs'</p> <p>24 members of SSGs trained in Environmental education and Group management and leadership</p> <p>15 SSG members received 2 days' training in ecotourism with related follow up.</p>
6b	Number of training weeks not leading to formal qualification	The total number of training activities for all of the above was 43 weeks in Year 1, 212 weeks in Year 2 and 56 weeks in Year 3. This is a total of 311 weeks of training. The target was 259 weeks.
7	Number of types of training materials produced for use by host country(s)	Two training manuals were produced – one on monitoring and survey and one on management planning. These will be consolidated in the future.
Research Outputs		
8	Number of weeks spent by UK project staff on project work in host country(s)	<p>The project leader spent Ten weeks on project related activities in Kenya</p> <p>Research Trainers spent a total of 11 weeks on work in Kenya</p> <p>Other advisory Group members spent a total of 4.4 weeks in Kenya</p> <p>The management planning adviser spent 1.6 weeks in Kenya</p> <p>Our Training Coordinator spent 1 week in Kenya</p> <p>Four database advisers spent a total of 4.4 weeks in Kenya.</p> <p>Total UK staff time 32.4 weeks</p>
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) produced for Governments, public authorities or other implementing agencies in the host country (s)	Two site management plans generated by the project are in the final stages of completion. The content of another 4 have been influenced via this project.
10	Number of formal documents produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording.	None – one summary publication was proposed but was not deemed necessary
11a	Number of papers published or accepted for publication in peer	Two One paper accepted for publication in Conservation Biology,

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
	reviewed journals	another accepted for publication in Ostrich - a special edition re the proceedings of the XI Pan African Ornithological Congress
11b	Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere	None – one or two were anticipated and may happen later
12a	Number of computer-based databases established (containing species/generic information) and handed over to host country	Two new databases were established relating to site-specific monitoring data.
12b	Number of computer-based databases enhanced (containing species/genetic information) and handed over to host country	One The World Bird database has been established and operational throughout the project period
13a	Number of species reference collections established and handed over to host country(s)	None – it was expected that some might be but this did not transpire.
13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced and handed over to host country(s)	None – none planned

Dissemination Outputs		
14a	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops organised to present/disseminate findings from Darwin project work	Two. IBA status report launch Nairobi August 2004. Darwin Initiative National Seminar April 2005
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	Seven - Project information was disseminated at IBA regional Workshop (August 2003), BirdLife partnership meeting (Sept 2003), WCPA (Sept 2003), CBD CoP (Feb 2004), Birdlife World Conference (March 2004), Royal Society Global Biodiversity Indicators meeting (July 2004), Monitoring workshop in Copenhagen (August 2004).
15a	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	Two press releases and five publicity articles in Kenyan national papers
15b	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	None – none planned
15c	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in UK	Three. One press release issued 2002. One article in Birds magazine 2002. One article in RSPB Annual report 2004.
15d	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in UK	None – none planned
16a	Number of issues of newsletters produced in the host country(s)	Three. Two special editions of the Nature East Africa magazine produced in 2004 and 2005 One feature in BirdLife Africa newsletter
16b	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(s)	1500

16c	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the UK	100
17a	Number of dissemination networks established	One IBA monitoring sub-committee established as part of National Liaison Committee. They have met 8 times, individual members have also met severally informally during other conservation fora where monitoring issues have been discussed.
17b	Number of dissemination networks enhanced or extended	Two. One wider network of active field staff has been developing subsequent to the monitoring and survey training/ Workshop material was distributed to 103 field staff through this network The community based site support groups have also seen their network enhanced through this project. These are both informal but functional networks
18a	Number of national TV programmes/features in host country(s)	Four. 2 in 2003 and 2 in 2004.
18b	Number of national TV programme/features in the UK	None – none planned
18c	Number of local TV programme/features in host country	None – none planned
18d	Number of local TV programme features in the UK	None – none planned
19a	Number of national radio interviews/features in host country(s)	Three Radio features, the focus was on community and involvement in conservation and the role of Nature Kenya in conservation
19b	Number of national radio interviews/features in the UK	None – none planned
19c	Number of local radio interviews/features in host country (s)	None – none planned
19d	Number of local radio interviews/features in the UK	None – none planned

Physical Outputs		
20	Estimated value (£s) of physical assets handed over to host country(s)	Equipment to the value of £8,886 already handed over and is still functioning.
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisation established	None – none planned
22	Number of permanent field plots established	One hundred and ninety eight plots established. 120 sampling plots established in Kinangop Plateau; 30 Permanent Sampling Plots in Kikuyu Escarpment Forest and 48 PSPs in Kakamega Forest
23	Value of additional resources raised for project	This includes at least £78,897 from RSPB and £19,617.44 from Nature Kenya and NMK. Other inputs of staff time and volunteer time from other collaborators is not included, nor is funding leveraged for related projects from other donors.

Appendix III:

Publications

Provide full details of all publications and material that can be publicly accessed, e.g. title, name of publisher, contact details, cost. Details will be recorded on the Darwin Monitoring Website Publications Database that is currently being compiled.

Mark (*) all publications and other material that you have included with this report

Type * (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. contact address, website)	Cost £
Publication* (hard copy only)	Kenya's IBAs Status and Trends 2004 <i>Otieno et al</i>	NatureKenya, Nairobi	NatureKenya www.birdlife.org . www.naturekenya.org	Free
Publication – Special Editions of NatureKenya Journal (Hard copy only)	Nature East Africa 2004 and 2005	NatureKenya, Nairobi	NatureKenya	Membership Subscription
Paper in (Biodiversity and Conservation)*	<i>Bennun et al</i> Monitoring Important Bird Areas in Africa: Towards a Sustainable and Scaleable System	SpringerLink Online version October 2005	In press Online version at www.springerlink.com	Subscription
Monitoring and training survey manual* (hard copy only)	'Survey and monitoring training report' <i>Lead author: Chris Bowden</i>	Nature Kenya/RSPB	paul.buckley@rspb.org.uk office@naturekenya.org	Free
Management plans manual*	Management planning workshop for Kenyan IBAs <i>Malcolm Ausden and Anthony Ochino, Nature Kenya/RSPB</i>	Nature Kenya/RSPB	paul.buckley@rspb.org.uk office@naturekenya.org	Free
Unpublished Report *	'Current IBA monitoring and conservation status' <i>Lead author: Wanyoike Wamiti March 2003</i>	Nature Kenya/National Museums of Kenya	Nature Kenya	Free
Draft publication*	Kenya's IBAs Status and Trends 2005 <i>Ng'weno et al</i>	NatureKenya, Nairobi	NatureKenya www.birdlife.org . www.naturekenya.org	Free
Leaflet* (hard copy)	Project leaflet produced for CBD	NatureKenya, Nairobi	NatureKenya www.naturekenya.org	Free

only)				
-------	--	--	--	--

Appendix IV:

Darwin Contacts

To assist us with future evaluation work and feedback on your report, please provide contact details below.

Project Title	Kenyan Important Biodiversity Areas: Improving monitoring, management and conservation action
Ref. No.	162/11/003
UK Leader Details	
Name	Paul Buckley
Role within Darwin Project	Project Leader (Head of Global Country programmes Unit in RSPB)
Address	RSPB, The Lodge, Sandy, Beds SG19 2DL
Phone	
Fax	
Email	
Other UK Contact (if relevant)	
Name	Leon Bennun
Role within Darwin Project	Advisory Group member, Director Science and Policy of BirdLife International
Address	Birdlife International, Wellbrook Court, Cambridge
Phone	
Fax	
Email	
Partner 1	
Name	Paul Matiku
Organisation	Nature Kenya
Role within Darwin Project	NK Executive Director/Advisory group member
Address	Nature Kenya, PO Box 44486, Nairobi, Kenya
Fax	
Email	
Partner 2 (if relevant)	
Name	Ronald Mulwa
Organisation	Department of Ornithology, National Museums of Kenya
Role within Darwin Project	Project Coordinator
Address	Department of Ornithology, PO Box 44486, Nairobi, Kenya
Fax	
Email	

Appendix V:

Log Frame

Appendix VI:
Project Evaluation