

# CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Baseline Carbon Storage Assessment of Kenya's Coastal Forests

**Implementation Partners for This Project:** Arabuko Sokoke Field Guides Association (ASFGA), ICRAF, Kenya Forest Research Institute (KEFRI), KWS, Kenya Forest Department, NatureKenya, NEMA, Tana and Athi River Development Agency (TARDA)

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** October 1, 2004 - May 31, 2005

**Date of Report (month/year):** August 2005

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

(Please note an extension of the project date was requested during the project period, but further unforeseen delays prevented on time completion)

## III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

1. What was the initial objective of this project?

The initial objective of this project was to complete a carbon storage assessment of key areas of Kenya's Coastal Forest hotspot to assess the possibility of establishing carbon emissions offset trading projects in these areas and similar ecosystems. The assessment results were to be made public and discussed with shareholders.

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

The scope of the area analysis part was narrowed to two pilot areas: the Arabuko Sokoke Forest and the Lower Tana River Forests. This was mostly due to feasibility constraints of doing an analysis with sufficient depth in the time available. These areas were chosen as pilot areas because of the infrastructure present that could make implementation of a relatively complex endeavor such as long term carbon stock monitoring possible.

The scope of the conference in which results were presented and discussed with stakeholders was broadened to a general conference regarding carbon trading and forestry. The conference included presentations by NEMA Climate Change office and ICRAF. This was done because, in conversing with related organizations during the course of the work, it was clear that there needed to be a more embedded

understanding of carbon emissions offsets and trading before any action could be taken by stakeholders in this field.

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

The data collection, much of the analysis, and conferences proceeded successfully as planned.

Estimated mean carbon density values for the various forest types sampled were generally ascertained with 95% confidence intervals that were within 10% of the mean indicating fair accuracy for the effort put into the field work. The analysis of satellite imagery was less helpful than anticipated in terms of discerning and mapping different vegetative covers that also had notably different carbon densities with accuracy. This would have eased the extension of the results of this study to nearby areas. It may be possible to do this given more time to work with the images or it may be that different mapping techniques would be needed (more groundwork, aerial photos, etc)

The Nairobi conference was successful in that representatives of many relevant NGOs and GOs participated, were able to ask and answer questions regarding carbon trading mechanisms, heard about the methods and results used in this study, and were able to effectively brainstorm possible conservation promoting carbon offset projects. Meetings with local stakeholder groups at the sampled sites went well although with less enthusiasm for continued related activity without more promotion and capacity building.

Local partners have been left with hands on knowledge of forest surveying techniques and interested parties have further grasped the data analysis methods. These are detailed in the final project reports so that anyone can replicate the process.

4. Did your team experience any disappointments or failures during implementation? If so, please explain and comment on how the team addressed these disappointments and/or failures.

The majority of the setbacks in this project were technical delays, which curtailed some analyses and delayed finishing and publicizing final results. There was little to be done about back-ups in the soil laboratories and delays in receiving satellite imagery, except to keep in consistent contact with those who were to be taking care of these tasks. To deal with the delayed output of the finished final reports, I made a point of meeting with and staying in touch with those who were supposed to receive them in the interim so that their context would not be forgotten.

5. Describe any positive or negative lessons learned from this project that would be useful to share with other organizations interested in implementing a similar project.

Between former researchers, PhD studies, and reports of various organizations there is a wealth of information and data already collected on Arabuko Sokoke and the Tana River, but it was very difficult and time consuming to get a hold of and consolidate this information and access relevant raw data. Much of it is scattered between various organizational libraries, personal collections, or has been lost. As a result it was necessary to redo some field and mapping work that had already been done simply because the raw data or methods of previous work could not be found. Spending more time gathering and assessing this information and if possible digitizing it would be a

great help for future research and for making research results accessible to those making management decisions.

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

At present follow-up activity is being left in the hands the partner institutions who attended the conference, the local meetings/presentation, and/or have received the final reports and data. It is hoped that the discussions and results will promote continued forest monitoring and help groups interested in reforestation efforts be able to seek out some new funding avenues for activities through carbon trading, or at least by quantifying a carbon store benefit to an interested donor.

Currently the final carbon assessment reports are being summarized into a journal format for possible publication, hopefully drawing more attention to these hotspots from a wider audience.

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

Final carbon assessment reports and conference outcomes have been sent to CEPF and ICIPE. The data and GIS files are also being distributed with metadata. It is hoped this is all self explanatory, but if more explanation is needed please email Julia.Glenday@Gmail.com

**IV. ADDITIONAL FUNDING**

*Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.*

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>

**\*Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)*
- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.

**V. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**VI. INFORMATION SHARING**

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

Yes \_\_\_yes\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please also complete the following:

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

Name: Julia Glenday

Mailing address: 2614 Augusta Dr., Durham, NC 2007 USA

Tel: (919)-493-4299

Fax:

E-mail: Julia.Glenday@gmail.com