



Final Report

**Ensuring legacy and conservation impact within
Kenya's biodiversity monitoring network EIDPO 7**

Table of Contents

1.	Darwin Project Information.....	1
2.	Project Background/Rationale.....	1
3.	Project Summary	2
4.	Scientific, Training, and Technical Assessment.....	7
5.	Project Impacts	8
6.	Project Outputs	9
7.	Project Expenditure	10
8.	Project Operation and Partnerships	11
9.	Monitoring and Evaluation, Lesson learning	12
10.	Actions taken in response to annual report reviews (if applicable).....	14
11.	Darwin Identity	16
12.	Leverage.....	16
13.	Sustainability and Legacy	18
14.	Value for money	20
15.	Appendix I: Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).....	21
16.	Appendix II Outputs	23
17.	Appendix III: Publications.....	28
18.	Appendix IV: Darwin Contacts	29

Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species

Final Report

1. Darwin Project Information

<i>Project Ref. Number</i>	EIDPO7 (follow up to 162/11/003)
<i>Project Title</i>	Ensuring legacy and conservation impact within Kenya's biodiversity monitoring network
<i>Country(ies)</i>	Kenya
<i>UK Contractor</i>	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
<i>Partner Organisation(s)</i>	Nature Kenya (East African Natural History Society) in collaboration with National Museums of Kenya, Kenya Wildlife Service, Kenya Forest Service, NEMA
<i>Darwin Grant Value</i>	£49,144
<i>Start/End dates</i>	1 July 2005 to 30 June 2007
<i>Reporting period (1 Apr 200x to 31 Mar 200y) and annual report number (1,2,3..)</i>	1 July 2005 to 30 June 2007 Final Report
<i>Author(s), date</i>	Paul Buckley, Adrian Oates, Enock Kanyanya, Joel Siele, Ronald Mulwa

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 project follow up 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.

After a successful implementation of the first phase of this project, there was a need for

a follow up project in order to take conservation activities to a higher level by strengthening the linkages between Nature Kenya and project partners, ensuring institutionalisation of monitoring. In the follow up project support was requested for 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 continued 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 '*A functioning national monitoring system is demonstrably assisting Kenyan conservation by informing and inspiring sound and long term conservation actions*'

The outputs were:

- 1 Greater institutionalisation of monitoring within managing agencies creates extra capacity and awareness within each agency
2. A standard training module for people new to the network is delivered through the key agencies
3. Project databases ensure more efficient and effective analysis and use of monitoring data to a common standard across the Kenyan network
4. Site Support Groups' ability to integrate monitoring programmes into their core work is enhanced
5. An increased number of management plans are making active use of monitoring data, with a particular focus on wetlands
6. Regional and national dissemination carried out to promote use of data from the programme and encourage its replication elsewhere

The objectives were not modified, and the great majority of the activities planned were implemented as described. An assessment against the Logical Framework is included as Appendix 5 and overall progress is described below.

Application to CBD Articles (see also Appendix I)

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 continued to play a major role 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 through the monitoring reports generated, the information has most recently been used in Kenya's 3rd National Report to the CBD.

The training programme for professional staff and volunteers has supported 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 has assisted **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

This follow up project has been successful with the project objectives achieved and indicators mainly met. The Project Implementation Team feels that the monitoring programme is substantially stronger than two years ago and more firmly embedded within and owned by the key institutions. A successful launch of the second annual IBA status and trends report 2005 was held at Kenya Forest Service (which replaced the Forest Department in early 2007) headquarters. It has also been widely distributed around the world (see Appendix 6.1 and 6.2). Strong government – NGO partnerships have been greatly enhanced by the project and the level of collaboration bodies well for future sustainability.

Greater ownership on IBA monitoring has been achieved by increasing their identification with the project through adaptation of the forms and expansion of the local participation in the advisory group. At the local level the profile gained by the project has led to seven Site Support Groups being nominated in their respective districts as members of the District Environment Committee. It is through this committee that SSGs can influence decision making on environmental issues affecting their respective districts. The numbers of sites being monitored at both basic and detailed levels has increased. Sites where detailed monitoring is being conducted regularly have increased to seven and another three sites are being trained to conduct monitoring.

Emerging data from the monitoring is being used to inform management. Good progress with using the data to inform management plans and conservation action especially plans at Dunga Swamp, Mukurweini Valleys and Kinangop Grassland Plateau, and the data has been used to develop new proposals for conservation action and to inform Environment Impact Assessments into proposed developments.

The experience gained during the preparation of the Kereita Forest Management plan and other site action plans has been very useful in the process of developing guidelines for preparation of forest management plans. Nature Kenya and Kijabe Environment Volunteers (KENVO) are represented on the Forest Department participatory forest management (PFM) team due to the experience gained, and they invited the Project Leader to attend a meeting of all District Forest Officer's and to train senior officers in PFM.

Output 1. Greater institutionalisation of monitoring within managing agencies creates extra capacity and awareness within each agency

The involvement of key agencies in the programme has continued to grow. They are taking greater responsibility for collecting monitoring forms and ensuring quality than before. They have become more involved in work at some sites where Nature Kenya are working with SSGs - working closely with SSGs during the collection of detailed monitoring data, at sites including Kakamega Forest, Kereita Forest, South Nandi Forest and Dunga Swamp. KWS and NEMA staff have been participating in the January and July waterbird counts, supported in part by this project. It has proved difficult to organise actions to spread awareness more deeply within the agencies, such as lunchtime seminars and in-house newsletters, although we did attend a meeting of all District Forest Officers in Kenya and at some agency training events. We built awareness at KFS headquarters during the launch of Status and Trends Report 2005 where more than

10 staff from the HQs attended the function. Management staff from across the National Museum of Kenya (NMK) were sensitised on the IBA monitoring during a NMK scientific conference that was held in November 2006 and we presented the project to an international conference organised by KWS in April 2007. A number of individuals from the agencies were trained in a major course in February 2007 while others have been trained by the agency staff themselves at in-house training courses for new recruits.

Parallel work has been undertaken with co-finance from RSPB and the EC to investigate the potential for remote sensing methods to contribute to the IBA monitoring system. A report together with case studies from Kenya appears in Appendix 7.3. We conclude that RS will be particularly important in quantifying some of the major changes identified by ground truthing work such as is undertaken in this project. In more remote parts of Kenya but especially in other countries with less observers it will supplement our knowledge where ground truthing proves not to be possible. Generally we have achieved good coverage with the monitoring but some still some gaps need urgently to be filled.

Output 2. A standard training module for people new to the network is delivered through the key agencies

Standard power-point talks on IBA concept and monitoring framework (incorporating monitoring protocols at the international level) were developed and each partner got a copy of the talk in a CD (see Appendix 8.2). These are the talks the project partners have been using as they conduct their training and awareness to other staff in their institutions.

A monitoring manual was drafted, based on the earlier monitoring and survey training courses and on the emerging experience of the project. However the Kenyan experience led to the production of global guidelines (see Appendix 8.3) on baseline IBA monitoring in late 2006 which in turn proposed some amendments to the monitoring system which partners, including Kenya, were asked to adopt. These were considered by the IBA National Liaison Committee on 12th June 2007 and are now being finalised (see Appendix 9.1). A 'Kenyan' adaptation of these global guidelines will now form a training manual for the basic monitoring. A more detailed manual on detailed monitoring will be produced as a separate document for wider and more general dissemination. The East African wetland monitoring manual, from which we hoped to incorporate key issues, is still not available in its final form.

The training for trainers course was held in April 2006 (see Appendix 8.1). The skills gained from this course that was offered to 15 senior staff from the 3 project partners and 2 staff each from Nature Kenya and NMK has already be utilised in training others on their respective institutions. Out of this training project partners are now actively sensitizing their staff at HQs and at the District level wherever they have a function.

Output 3. Project databases ensure more efficient and effective analysis and use of monitoring data to a common standard across the Kenyan network

The long awaited re-development of the BirdLife International World Bird data Base to incorporate monitoring information was completed and training rolled out in October 2006. Process data on World Bird Database (WBDB) is available on the website (restricted site). The raw data is accessible at the National Museum of Kenya through the Database Manager who has the password. Monitoring data are accessible to project partners at NMK both in soft and hard copy (examples are shown in Appendix 9.2)

The Forest Department through technical support from US Forestry Service held a two days workshop where key partners presented the kind of data they generate and discussed possibilities of sharing. A report of the proceedings was produced and circulated. The project reviewed the report and initiated discussions for developing guidelines to enhance data sharing. However it became clear that the project had again been overambitious in anticipating a willingness to share data in this way.

There has been some progress with enhancing and integrating NMK/Naturekenya data bases and the new Kenya Birdfinder system is running well. The information generated from the Kenya Birdfinder will in future be incorporated into the IBA monitoring reports. Additionally, all the detailed monitored sites are being updated continuously once information from those sites is submitted to NMK (see Appendix 9.4).

Output 4. Site Support Groups' ability to integrate monitoring programmes into their core work is enhanced

Detailed monitoring continued to be received from 7 SSGs at Nature Kenya. The IBA sites where detailed monitoring occurs are Kinangop grassland plateau, Kakamega forest, Mukurweini river valleys, Dunga papyrus swamp, Kikuyu escarpment (Kereita forest), Arabuko-sokoke Forest and South Nandi Forest. The SSGs in North Nandi Forest, Cherangani Hills and Busia grassland have been trained on both basic and detailed monitoring and soon they will be submitting data to Nature Kenya.

Members of upcoming SSG in Dakatcha Woodland are being involved in monitoring of Clarke's Weaver and transect disturbance through co-financing through the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF). They have gained skills on monitoring and should soon be in a position to contribute data without assistance.

Refresher training has been undertaken for SSGs at Kakamega, Dunga Swamp, Mukurweini River Valleys and Kinangop Grassland. The project contributed towards supporting stakeholders including the bird committee for water bird counts in Lakes Nakuru, Magadi, Baringo, Lake Victoria and Dandora sewage ponds. The presentations in Appendices 10.1 and 10.2 outline the content and outcomes of some of these courses.

A key issue highlighted in earlier reviews was providing feedback to the SSGs and providing greater evidence of how this work would ultimately provide benefits to the groups and its constituent members. While the beneficiary programmes are funded separately, for example ecotourism work at Kereita, Kakamega and Kinangop, and work on participatory forest management at South Nandi and Arabuko Sokoke, those programmes are increasingly using data collected by this project. At other sites such as Dunga Swamp, the processes of data collection, management planning and community action are already more integrated. We are making greater efforts to provide good feedback to the SSGs on what their work means and should be able to provide some more scientifically robust analysis of what trends are emerging from the monitoring during the coming year (see example in Appendix 10.3).

Output 5. An increased number of management plans are making active use of monitoring data, with a particular focus on wetlands

Monitoring data was used extensively in order to develop the Dunga Wetland draft Action plan and the Mukurweini Valley action plan (see Appendix 11). The Dunga draft were discussed at a stakeholders meeting and circulated for inputs. The action plan has been given to Kisumu City Council who is the custodian of the wetland for endorsement.

The information generated at Kinangop grasslands was used to develop a management/business plan for the NatureKenya owned Nature Reserve there. The experience gained during the preparation of the Kereita Forest Management plan and other site action plans has been very useful in contributing to the process of developing statutory guidelines for preparation of forest management plans. Nature Kenya and KENVO are represented on the Kenya Forest Service participatory forest management (PFM) team due to the experience gained, and they invited the Project Leader to attend a meeting of all DFOs and to train senior officers in PFM.

We have produced guidelines on integrating monitoring data into management plans in Kenya (Appendix 11.4). We have continued to input data for use by other agencies in their management interventions. However, aside from the new initiatives by KFS under the Forest Act, it has become clear that most protected IBAs in Kenya either do not have management plans or else those plans are not being updated. This is an issue which is beyond the scope of this project but which we will continue to tackle through our collaboration with NatureKenya and with the assistance of a RSPB staff member who specialises in management planning.

Output 6. Regional and national dissemination carried out to promote use of data from the programme and encourage its replication elsewhere

Nature Kenya have continued to make good use of dissemination opportunities, for example the African BirdLife partnership meetings in July 2005 and June 2006, through the meeting of the Society for Conservation Biology in South Africa in June 2007 and through a presentation at the CBD CoP in Curitiba, Brazil in March 2006. National presentations were given at several fora including national conferences organised by Kenya Wildlife Service in April 2007, National Museums of Kenya in November 2006, and Kenya Forest Service, as well as a national workshop for site support groups organised by NatureKenya. Some examples of outputs including two formal publications are shown in Appendix 12.

Staff from BirdLife partners in Nigeria, South Africa, Uganda (as well as Canada and UK) visited the conservation programme, as did several staff from Wildlife Conservation Society of Tanzania with a view to learning about the IBA monitoring system. Among other activities they were taken through the process from detailed monitoring at Kereita and Kinangop grassland, to data analysis at NMK through to report preparation and dissemination at Nature Kenya. IBA monitoring is underway in Tanzania and South Africa, while considerable effort has been taken in disseminating experiences from this project to 7 other partner organisations (Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe) who will emulate this project with funding from the European Commission. These partners also visited Kenya in July 2007, just outside the period of this project. Lessons learned will be widely disseminated – a report has been drafted (see Appendix 12.7).

The second Kenya IBA status and trends report 2005 was published and 1500 copies of this report were distributed to various stakeholders including key government institutions (Kenya Forest Service, Kenya Wildlife Service, National Environment Management Authority), high learning institutions (Universities) NGOs and donor community and those who contributed towards the production of the report. Copies have been widely distributed internationally including to BirdLife partners undertaking comparable initiatives elsewhere in Africa, in Asia and in Latin America. The report is accessible on the Nature Kenya website www.naturekenya.org. To supplement the information in the executive summary there is a detailed site account report for each of the 60 Important Bird Areas in Kenya. The detailed accounts were distributed to each site and can

also be accessed at Nature Kenya and Ornithology Department of National Museums of Kenya.

4. Scientific, Training, and Technical Assessment

The project's overall objective has been to set in place a simple, repeatable yet 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, which were revised and re-issued during 2006. The global guidelines and revised Kenyan monitoring form are shown in Appendices 8.3 and 9.1).

The main staff involved on the research side are from the Department of Ornithology of the National Museums of Kenya, alongside other colleagues from other museum Departments and site based officers. Detailed monitoring work (under this project) as well as other ecological research (under other programmes) is ongoing in some of the IBA sites being conducted among these scientists. Methodology varies according to the site but follows habitat protocols developed during the original project. The Research Fellows have been assisted by the IBA monitoring coordinator from Department of Ornithology and RSPB staff on how to analyse data that are being submitted to department both basic and detailed monitoring data. One of the research fellow and Nature Kenya database manager has been trained in the new World Bird Database (WBDB) that was conducted in October 2006 at Birdlife African Secretariat. The result from analysis is the production of status and trends reports and preliminary analysis for detailed monitoring data in order to feedback to the monitoring groups. Provision of this data has provided some encouragement and shown them the kind of information that can be generated, as well as starting to feed into decision making and habitat management.

Training and capacity building activities

From the previous project phase one it was that seen there was a need for more training for the project partners and Site Support Group (SSG) on the follow-up phase and the following training activities were included in this project.

- Build broader volunteer base: in the SSG national workshop held in November 2006, SSG representatives from 14 IBA sites were trained on basic monitoring and detailed monitoring analysis were presented to those monitoring groups who are doing it. The gaps that were there in detailed monitoring were highlighted so that the groups could take note on that. After that there has been consistent submission of monitoring data by the groups. This is fulfilment of output 4
- Refresher training courses for SSGs monitoring team on-site. This training has kept the monitoring group update on the new monitoring techniques and training for the new members joining the team. From the training there has been efficiency on data collection and improvement of its quality and so contributing to project outputs 1 and 4
- Training on basic and detailed monitoring were conducted in other 5 sites; South Nandi Forest, Busia Grassland, Dakatcha Woodland, Cherangani Hills and North Nandi Forest. Out of these, the monitoring group in South Nandi have started submitting data for detailed monitoring to Nature Kenya and the other 4 will be

submitting their data soon.

- Kenyan led 'training for trainers' course for institutions, 23 participants from the government institutions (KFS, KWS, NEMA and NMK) and 2 conservation officers from Nature Kenya were trained on 'training for trainers' the skills gained during the training has been used by the trainers to train others on their institutions. KFS trainers have so far used the skills to train District Forest Officers and the forest guards, NMK and Nature Kenya trained the volunteers and the SSGs. The main facilitator was from RSPB-UK and assisted by Research scientist from NMK and Conservation Programme Manager from Nature Kenya. This help to achieve output 2
- Training for new staff in the network; 28 people from the government institutions (KFS, KWS, NEMA and NMK) and Nature Kenya Site Interns new to IBA monitoring scheme were trained in Naivasha, Kenya in February 2007. The training emphasised on filling of basic monitoring forms and submitting them to Nature Kenya through their focal points. During the training some participants filled the forms for the IBAs they were from. The facilitators were from RSPB, National Museum of Kenya, Department of Ornithology and Nature Kenya
- Three staff – one Research fellow, a research scientist from NMK and the Nature Kenya Database manager attended a training course on World Bird Database and have since been able to update the databases based at NMK Department of Ornithology and Nature Kenya

The 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

- Still greater ownership among participating Kenyan institutions. This has been achieved by increasing their identification with the project through adaptation of the forms and expansion of the local participation in the advisory group. The involvement of these agencies in wider site conservation and their working relationship with the NGO NatureKenya has improved greatly through the project. At the local level the profile gained by the project has led to all Site Support Groups being nominated in their respective districts as members of the District Environment Committee.
- Further increase in the numbers of sites being monitored at both basic and detailed levels. The number of field officers engaged in basic monitoring has grown steadily although some gaps still remain.
- Monitoring is proving to be an excellent activity to use as the basis of establishment of new site support groups, provided we recognise the need to improve awareness of how it can benefit them, links with other beneficiary programmes and feedback on results and analysis. Having the same individuals and site support groups engaged in both site monitoring and in income generating actions such as participatory forest management, beekeeping and eco-tourism provides strong understanding through which to ensure the potential environmental impacts of the income generating activities impacts are understood and mitigated.
- Good progress with using the data to inform management plans, especially plans at

Dunga Swamp, Mukurweini Valleys and Kinangop. Plateau. It has been used to inspire and inform proposals for conservation action including at Arabuko Sokoke, Kinangop Plateau, Cherangani Hills and Busia grasslands. In addition the status reports in particular have informed reporting to the national and international environmental processes, including the formal instruments of the CBD.

- The experience gained during the preparation of the Kereita Forest Management plan and other site action plans has been very useful in the process of developing guidelines for preparation of forest management plans. Nature Kenya and KENVO are represented on the Forest Department participatory forest management (PFM) team due to the experience gained, and they invited the Project Leader to attend a meeting of all DFOs and to train senior officers in PFM.
- The project has been very extensively disseminated through distribution of the status reports to a global audience, a range of presentations in Kenya and across Africa and through visits to Kenya by professional staff from four other African partners. The experience of the project has been used to inform a successful application to the European Commission to roll out IBA monitoring to a further seven African countries

6. Project Outputs

- Quantify all project outputs in the table in Appendix II using the coding and format of the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures.
- Explain differences in actual outputs against those in the agreed schedule, i.e. what outputs were not achieved or only partly achieved? Were additional outputs achieved? Give details in the table in Appendix II.
- Provide full details in Appendix III 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 database.
- How has information relating to project outputs and outcomes been disseminated, and who was/is the target audience? Will this continue or develop after project completion and, if so, who will be responsible and bear the cost of further information dissemination?

Project outputs are shown as requested in Appendix II. The majority of outputs were achieved or exceeded. The project (or the fellowship scheme) additionally supported attendance at two masters course by members of the project implementation team. We exceeded targets for training of field staff and site support groups. We were able to present the outputs of the programme at many more conferences and workshops and to considerable more partners from other African countries than anticipated. We got involved in developing more management plans than anticipated, although it proved hard to get these to the stage of formal adoption.

We did not manage to publish a project training manual or a lessons learned document, although both of these will be completed within the next few months. The second status and trends report planned during the project period is still at a draft stage. We did not manage to achieve any (popular) publicity for the project within the UK during the follow up phase, other than on websites, although targets for within Kenya were exceeded.

As discussed above the project has raised a lot of interest both within Kenya and internationally. The global revision of the IBA monitoring guidelines was based in large part on the Kenyan experience. The status and trends reports have been sent to BirdLife partners and other audiences all around the world, especially in Africa, Asia,

Europe and Latin America. Partly as a result of the success of the project, a number of regional meetings and workshops have been held in Kenya – world bird data base meeting in October 2006 and EC project launch in July 2007 (just after the project ended). This and bespoke visits by staff from at least 6 other countries has provided further opportunities to spread the outcomes of the project.

Within Kenya key opportunities for dissemination to primarily national audiences have been the launch of the second status and trends report in October 2006, the national site support groups workshop in November 2007, and scientific conferences organised by NMK, KWS and KFS. The launch of the status report was captured as news at <http://www.birdlife.org/news> on 7th December 2006.

7. Project Expenditure

<i>Expenditure Category</i>	<i>Budget (£)</i>		<i>Expenditure (£)</i>				<i>Variance</i>
	<i>Original</i>	<i>Final</i>	<i>Y1 (05-06)</i>	<i>Y2 (06-07)</i>	<i>Y3 (07-08)</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>(%)</i>
Rent, rates...							
Office costs							
Travel and subsistence							
Printing							
Conferences							
Capital items							
Others							
<i>Staff costs</i>							
TOTAL							

The following amendments from the original budget were implemented during the course of the project.

- An under spend of £1,703.61 was observed at the end of 05/06. This amount was transferred to the grant budget for 06-07 after approval was given from the Darwin Secretariat. The transferred under spend were sourced from whatever categories were not fully spent at the end of 05-06. Furthermore, we were allowed to apply the transferred amount to whatever category we felt appropriate on the 06-07 grant budget. This had the net effect of extensively altering the budget for the majority of expenditure categories.

- A Transfer of £450.37 from the “Travel and Subsistence” to the “Capital Items” category was approved during 05-06.
- A Transfer of £1,000.00 from the ‘Printing’ category to the ‘Conferences’ category was approved during 06-07.
- A Transfer of £700 from the “Staff costs” to the “Travel and Subsistence” category was approved during 07-08.

Variations in expenditure of +/- 10% of budget were observed on the following categories:

- Capital Items (18% under budget). This was because a laptop computer, which was due to be purchased in 06-07, had to be purchased in 05-06 as the original computer being used stopped working completely earlier than expected. In order to cover this cost in 05-06 a budget transfer from Travel & Subsistence was approved. A second laptop computer was purchased in 2006-07 though at considerably less than the anticipated budget.

8. Project Operation and Partnerships

The relationship between RSPB and Nature Kenya, our principal partner in the project, has continued to be excellent. The working relationship with the Ornithology Department at National Museums has also continued to be very good with great commitment shown by core staff. The RSPB Project Manager has visited the project five times since commencement of the post project phase – in November 2005, March, June and September 2006 and March 2007. He also met and discussed the project in July 2005, in the company of RSPB’s Head of International Research, with the Nature Kenya Director and the outgoing Project Leader, and with the NatureKenya Director in UK in April 2007. The change in staff at the beginning of the project necessitated the establishment of new relationships and briefing on some of the project history and past achievements. This was accomplished smoothly. Other RSPB staff and collaborators from BirdLife International, have also visited the project primarily for training purposes, and they and University of East Anglia, have been supportive in offering informal support and advice to Kenyan colleagues.

Relations with the Government agencies have improved greatly with the impact of this project leading to a wider relationship of increasing strength between Nature Kenya and their government colleagues, for example now working closely with the new Kenya Forest Service on a number of initiatives. NEMA are increasingly active on the project and all three agencies have sat on the advisory committee and form the basis of the NLC Monitoring Sub-committee which will act as the advisory group for this programme in the future. The relationships still have their ups and downs and staff turnover is still a problem, but we now seem to have support from a larger number of people in each agency and each has formally assigned a Deputy as well as a Focal Point.

NEMA also acts as the focal point for CBD and for the production and reporting of the national biodiversity strategy. There are good links and the status and trends report and the data therein is expected to feed in routinely to the reports as they are produced.

The project interfaces with a number of other projects including those led by NatureKenya, for example those at Kereita and Kinangop (funded by the EU), at Arabuko Sokoke (funded by USAID), at Mount Kenya (funded by GEF Small Grants) at Kakamega (funded by UNDP), at Dakatcha Woodland (funded by Conservation International’s Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund) and now at South Nandi (funded by DFID) and Cherengani funded by EU.

The project continued to be reported to other members of the Birdlife African partnership who are developing, or seeking to develop monitoring programmes for IBAs in their own countries. This included presentations at the partnership meetings held in Cameroon in July 2005 and Ethiopia in June 2006. This interaction especially with the BirdLife network in Africa led to a successful bid to the EC for a parallel programme in Kenya and seven other African countries which began in April 2007. This programme will be managed by RSPB and the BirdLife partnership office in Africa (based in Nairobi), and will rely heavily on advice and experience sharing from the Kenyan programme.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation, Lesson learning

The major monitoring tools adopted in the first project proved to be successful and were continued in this project. These have been fully described in earlier reports but they include:

The project advisory group, which was expanded to include all the five major Kenyan institutions, bringing on board Kenya Forest Service and NEMA as well as Nature Kenya, NMK and KWS. We reduced the UK membership to just RSPB and Birdlife International. The group met twice during the project in November 2005 and June 2006, although individual members have been active throughout offering advice and helping with particular issues in their institutions. The group will be replaced for the future programme by the IBA National Liaison Monitoring Sub-committee which has a similar but slightly larger membership and provides a more formal and long term focus for site monitoring.

The IBA National Liaison Committee itself will also continue to oversee the project – this ensures wider awareness of the programme amongst other key institutions. The group met twice over the past year and will continue to be called to an appropriate schedule by NatureKenya acting as the secretariat.

The Project Implementation Team which has met approximately monthly during the project period. Regular visits by the RSPB's Programme Manager (5 during this follow up project) has given the chance for him and the NatureKenya Project Leader to discuss and address project progress both in the formal mechanisms above but also informally with all major stakeholders.

The Project Logical Framework, together with the annual workplan has continued to form the basis of project review and monitoring. Within this the principal monitoring tools are the indicators. The validity of these indicators and the various risks and assumptions outlined in the project planning process are also regularly assessed by the Project Managers and the PIT. The recommendations of the Final evaluation of the original Darwin funded project and the review of the annual report presented in mid 2006 have also provided important material for review, and have been built into the project logframe and workplan respectively wherever possible.

A full analysis of performance against indicators and activities in the logframe is in Annex 1. In brief, we believe that most of the indicators outlined in the project logframe have been achieved. In particular we have demonstrated the use of the data in a range of management plans, conservation initiatives and policy documents and processes. We have shown that partners in Kenya are more committed to the project and are contributing their own resources to make it run. We have developed and maintained a well trained network of field staff who are monitoring sites regularly, and the data collected has been entered to a data base and the results published and disseminated.

Community based site support groups have continued to develop their skills and experience in monitoring and the work is making an increasing contribution to their overall work programme of site conservation and community empowerment. We have been able to widely disseminate the findings of the project and have stimulated the commencement of similar programmes elsewhere.

Difficulties facing the project during this follow up project have included:

- NatureKenya underwent substantial staff changes at the beginning of the follow up phase. Solomon Mwangi, Project Leader since the project inception, took up a new role working for the European Union although he has been able to maintain some working links with NatureKenya. But his position was replaced by Enock Kanyanya who joined Nature Kenya from the Kenya Forest Working Group. Anthony Kiragu the Project officer obtained a Darwin scholarship and was replaced by Jacob Machekele who was working with NatureKenya already in their programme at Arabuko Sokoke. We have been lucky to find two excellent replacements who already had a working knowledge of this project through earlier involvement. However they had a lot to master in a short time on both this project and others that they are responsible for and this inevitable caused some delays. Other project staff in Kenya has done an excellent job in helping this transition.
- Although there is ever improving ownership by managing agencies we have continued to suffer from changes in focal points. It was difficult to find times to organise awareness seminars at government agencies headquarters, although focal points have helped to take advantage of already prepared meetings e.g. the national meeting of District Forest officers. The focal points have also been supported to make field trips to make follow ups and hold discussions with field staff. We hope that the appointment of deputies and the issue of standard power point presentations will help. This turnover remains a feature at the individual site level as well as staff are frequently reassigned. We are been able to spread the basic training much more widely but some ongoing training will always be needed, hopefully undertaken in house.
- Numbers of forms filled in has steadily increased but securing completed forms inevitably takes quite a lot of time and there are still more gaps in the network than we would like. A high priority for the next year is to find ways to plug these but it is important that we find ways which are sustainable and which provide consistent information. Experience shows that forms filled in by irregular visitors to sites are valuable for pointing out specific threats and responses but less so for providing information on trends between years
- Management plans developed through the project have taken a long time to formalise and agree, although they are being used. It is obvious that managing agencies are not preparing many management plans - this forecloses the option to ensure the integration of monitoring data (!). However it is hoped that Kenya Forest Service at least is intending to rectify this, and NatureKenya is heavily involved in that process.
- We have not made much progress in formalising data sharing. Again data provision is working well in practice but it has proved hard to formalise things and may be counter-productive at this stage

We have commented extensively on lessons learned in both the final report of the original project and in last year's annual report. These still hold true and we have tried to bear them in mind throughout the project. We are currently synthesising them into a

short report which we will make freely available (see draft at Appendix 12.7). We will also produce a video if funds (from the new EC programme) permit. In advising new countries entering into monitoring the Project Manager (Enock Kanyanya) highlighted the following points when addressing the seven new project managers for the EC funded project

- Building ownership from the start by treating it as a joint project of all the organisations involved and, for example, ensuring the monitoring forms are seen as being issued by the particular managing agency rather than the NGO partner
- Having some early successes and products which show why the monitoring is important and relevant
- Monitoring must take into account the social and economic realities of those involved. Demonstrating linkages between the results of the monitoring and programmes to enhance livelihoods will help enormously, but it must be genuine.
- Giving agency focal points adequate support and encouraging them to visit their field staff rather than it being done by NGO personnel
- Trying to spread the knowledge broadly throughout the managing agencies through seminars and training helps. Appointing a deputy as well as a focal point has been of considerable benefit.
- Get advice in place early – we would have saved time if we had had monitoring guidance, protocols, management plan formats in place early, although the latter especially need to be developed in a consultative manner
- Tailor the ambitions on formalising agreements, especially the data issues. Getting a workable system in place is more important than an MoU which will be very time consuming and may actually hamper progress on the ground
- Prompt feedback to people filling in the forms – field officers and site support groups – is essential, as is ensuring they feel supported and that they can ask for help if its needed.

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

A number of comments were made in the Annual Report Review issued in response to our first Annual report in April 2006. We have tried to deal with these in our implementation of the project and elsewhere in this report. However a brief response to each is summarised below

1. Could you please clarify who will be responsible for longer-term efforts to promote the relevance of biodiversity monitoring to livelihood development, and to develop monitoring training and quality control with SSGs?

- Both IBA monitoring and the development of SSGs are activities that NatureKenya consider central to their conservation programme and therefore there is strong organizational commitment to continue this work to the best of their ability irrespective of donor funding (although they are inevitably severely constrained without it). The recent award of EC funding will enable this to continue to an extent although it is focused specifically on protected areas whereas many of the SSGs are by their nature working in unprotected sites. It is NatureKenya's policy to seek to build both monitoring and SSG capacity building components into all site specific proposals for funding, which are often centrally focused on developing local advocacy skills and promoting income generating activities – a good example being the recent award of a grant for South Nandi Forest from DFID to

RSPB/NatureKenya.

We would also note that as the network of SSGs develops, they are getting more assistance firstly from Government agencies who see the benefits of working with these organized community groups on site monitoring, protection and benefit sharing activities. Secondly the groups themselves are becoming a more cohesive network and are interested in helping each other for example the strong groups in Dunga Swamp and Kakamega Forest are both interested in assisting the group at nearby South Nandi.

2. Earlier reports referred to the need to improve compatibility of the large number of databases within NMK, also to address the problem of large amount of data that remained as paper copy only. Please provide more information on progress towards these earlier issues, as well as the rate of return of monitoring forms over the last year.

- We have made good progress with the input of data from paper into the new world bird data base such that all new and most of the backlog of data is now entered in and the information accessible. We have discussed ongoing problems with compatibility of data elsewhere although we have made good progress with developing and integrating the new Kenya Birdfinder database, which is the other most active database which stores relevant information. A report on this is in Appendix 9.

The rate of return of monitoring forms grew from 70% in 2005 to 75% in 2006. We were able to supplement this with information for the other IBAs from a range of sources.

3. There is reference in the Annual Report to a paper (published in Biodiversity and Conservation) and we would ask that you append a copy of this to your next report.

- This is included in Appendix 12

4. The full involvement of all partners within the Project Advisory Group is very welcome. However, it is not clear from your reports how this level of co-ordination will continue when the project finishes. If this is to become a role within the IBA National Liaison Committee, are all partner agencies to be fully (and equally) included?

- We have concluded that there is a high degree of overlap between the project advisory group and the monitoring sub-committee of the NLC. The latter will therefore continue to be the body which oversees this programme. This is not a NatureKenya committee as such but a consultative body chaired on a rotating basis, which NatureKenya currently provides a secretariat for. As such it holds equal representation and does not depend on any funded project for its maintenance.

5. If the project experiences slippage again this year, it would be prudent to focus attention more on weaker areas (such as data management), even if this means that some of the less essential outputs are only part/not achieved.

- We made a decision to tailor our ambitions as far as data management was concerned. Our original objectives spread beyond the immediate needs of this project. While people were happy to share data there seemed little immediate prospect of or benefit from formal agreements. We have therefore focused a lot of effort in ensuring basic data systems for the data generated by the project are functioning effectively and in this we have been fairly successful. Other work has not

been disadvantaged in following this approach.

6. However, this reviewer would suggest that one complementary or alternative approach would be to produce a video that uses the project to demonstrate the potential value of biodiversity monitoring.

- Thanks. We have not been able to pursue this idea immediately since funding was not adequate under the Darwin project. However we are actively investigating it as an early product of the EC programme so as to provide immediate assistance to the seven countries now seeking to take advantage of the lessons learned by Kenya in implementing this programme.

11. Darwin Identity

This project has continued to enjoy a high profile for this project among practitioners and decision makers and as such succeeded in promoting Darwin quite widely in particular through the numerous presentations made over the past two years. Among the opportunities taken to promote the Darwin identity to the project have been:

- In project promotional work including articles in newsletters, the RSPB, Birdlife International, African Wildlife Foundation and NatureKenya websites, and in the two posters that were presented during the conferences organised by Kenya Wildlife Service and Kenya Forest Service
- In project publications notably the two Kenya IBA Annual Status and Trends reports and the monitoring forms themselves. These reports have been circulated very widely both within Kenya and in many other countries around the world
- At a series of presentations at national and international level as is outlined in discussion of project output 6.
- All publications including monitoring forms used by all project participants contain the Darwin logo
- Acknowledgements of Darwin support have been made wherever possible in other publications, for example scientific publications
- The project generated a Darwin fellowship from previous project officer Anthony Kiragu. (EIDPS 10). A full report of this fellowship was submitted separately. He also was able to strongly promote the Darwin identity. He is currently continuing to work on IBA and monitoring issues through an internship at the BirdLife office in the UK and has continued to promote the project within this position, most recently through a talk at the SCB conference in South Africa (see Appendix 12.1) he is expecting to return to Kenya in October 2007.

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 significant initial assistance is being given by Darwin. We are optimistic that the monitoring system will become a permanent part of Kenyan conservation and everyone associated with the work is very aware that it is Darwin Initiative which enabled this to happen.

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 follow-up 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 Nature Kenya's 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 this project follow up.

Attempts to leverage funds alongside Darwin funding have three components

Co-financing from the project partners

In delivering the strict objectives of this project, the main project partners – RSPB, Nature Kenya and NMK have co-funded the project to the tune of at least £60,864. The contribution of other project partners has not been properly costed but is very substantial in terms of manpower and other in kind support. We estimate that the contribution towards actual filling and in and collating of the basic monitoring forms alone has been around £6,900.

Mainstreaming monitoring in all new and ongoing project proposals

NatureKenya continues to have an active programme of site based conservation work, based primarily but not exclusively on the site support groups who are involved in the monitoring work. It is standard practice in the Nature Kenya fund-raising strategy to raise funds for monitoring as part of all project proposals. This aims to ensure support for both basic and detailed site monitoring and includes 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.

At the same time these site specific proposals also provide the mechanism whereby broader site conservation objectives can be achieved. Critically in the context of the SSGs this includes opportunities to develop income generating initiatives through which the SSGs can use the data generated from monitoring to enhance the livelihoods and their communities and themselves (as part of that community). Examples of projects operating in this manner over the past two years has been

- Arabuko-Sokoke Forest – project supported by USAID, which has supported forest monitoring as part of a pilot for participatory forest management, and has enabled establishment of community based initiatives including beekeeping, butterfly farming, aloe vera cultivation, mushroom harvesting and eco-tourism.
- Kinangop Plateau with support by the EC, Jensen Foundation and SWEDBIO which has enabled the establishment of a resource centre and ecotourism activities, wool spinning and beekeeping enterprises, as well as supporting the monitoring programme.

Additional support was leveraged for the following sites during the past two years

- SWEDBIO site support group strengthening programme, EC and DFID forest and community development programme at South Nandi Forest
- Support from EC at Cherangani Hills
- Support from CEPF at Dakatcha Woodlands
- Support from EC, UNEP, and other small grants at Kikuyu Escarpment
- Other small grant support at Dunga Swamp, Mukurweini Valleys, Mount Kenya, Mwingi Forest and Sabaki River

- Community Environment Facility (EC) support at Mt. Kenya, Cherengani, and North and South Nandi.

Developing site-specific and nationwide monitoring proposals

The RSPB and BirdLife African Partnership submitted an application in November 2005 to the European Commission 'Environment in developing countries' budget line entitled '*Instituting effective monitoring of protected areas (Important Bird Areas) as a contribution to reducing the rate of biodiversity loss in Africa*'. This was approved and commenced in April 2007 with a total regional budget of 1.8 million euros. This enables the development of monitoring networks in seven new countries – Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe, as well as allowing the continuation of work in Kenya. The seven other project managers visited Nairobi for a workshop in July 2007. This programme will provide around £85,000 to continue coordination and development of the Kenyan programme over the next 4 years which should allow the same broad structure established under the Darwin programme to continue and firmly establish its legacy.

RSPB has funded 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. This has worked alongside the Darwin project and an analysis of the integration of the two programmes is included as Appendix 7.3

NatureKenya has previously included substantive components of support towards national monitoring programmes in a medium grant proposal placed before Global Environment Facility in 2001 although this proposal is still passing through internal GEF processes. A proposal incorporating monitoring has also recently been submitted to DANIDA and this is as yet undetermined.

There are relatively few opportunities to develop site-specific proposals for detailed monitoring sites. However we did achieve one funding success at Kakamega Forest where a German-based research programme (Biota) has agreed to support detailed monitoring for a period of three years entitled '*Investing in Community Based Capacity to Monitor Kakamega Forest*'.

13. Sustainability and Legacy

We are confident that the legacy of this project is assured, both in terms of the maintenance of the project within Kenya, and its use as an inspiration to projects elsewhere.

Key components relating to future work and a successful legacy include:

- Securing of programme funds to maintain co-ordination of a programme for the next four years, through the EC. It is widely accepted that projects everywhere, but especially in resource poor countries such as Kenya, will take many years to be truly sustainable. Thanks to Darwin and the EC this project will have had funding for nine continuous years thus giving it the best possible chance of being maintained.
- Greater institutionalisation of monitoring within managing agencies, especially within NEMA. All five main Kenyan partners seem now to be committed to the

programme, understand its value and are prepared to commit at least some internal resources to its maintenance. They have a standard powerpoint presentation to use for internal presentations and training courses etc, and a more detailed guidance manual will follow. They will continue to coordinate the programme through the IBA National Liaison Monitoring Sub-committee.

- Many of the data management problems hampering earlier progress have been resolved and although our ambitions have had to be tailored, we do now have a properly functioning and fully populated monitoring database available to all partners. The imminent publication of a third annual status report will give additional feed back both to local and national policy processes and to the contributors from the field. We have built on the IBA data to establish a web-based bird recording/monitoring system (Kenya Birdfinder)
- Further capacity building of existing and new Site Support Groups to enable them to integrate monitoring even more closely into their work programmes, and are beginning to use the information to provide more visible benefits through income generating programmes
- An increase in the conservation projects making active use of monitoring data, and indeed being developed as a result of trends exposed by the data. Guidance has been prepared on integrating the field monitoring into site management plans
- Use of the data in a number of funding proposals
- Successful national and international exposure of the success of the programme, through conference presentations and publications, as well as popular publicity
- Visits by partners from other countries in Africa and elsewhere, wide dissemination of project publications especially to Africa, Asia and Latin America and stimulation of parallel programmes in at least seven other African countries.

Outstanding tasks to help to ensure legacy include:

- More attention still needs to be paid to 'plugging the gaps' so that all the 60 IBAs are covered. This will mean more systematic following up of contacts at remote sites, and will also probably involve the use of remote sensing technology where coverage is impossible and also at larger sites where quantifying of ground data is needed
- Completion of a standard training manual for people new to the network (incorporating if possible wetland monitoring from project 11/002) which can be delivered by the individual agencies themselves. This has been delayed until the new monitoring form is agreed and will confine itself mainly to basic monitoring, with a more comprehensive monitoring manual following
- Building on the considerable amount already achieved to ensure basic monitoring is a feature of a wide range of training courses introducing new field staff to their core operating functions, especially in KWS, KFS and NEMA
- Further development of and sharing between project and allied databases to ensure more efficient and effective analysis and use of monitoring data to a common standard across the Kenyan network.
- Advocacy as to the use and the value of having up to date management plans for Kenya's IBAs, so that monitoring and other data can be used systematically
- Development of a best practice manual (and possibly a video) highlighting

lessons learned and key recommendations for other agencies developing similar programmes in Kenya or elsewhere

14. Value for money

In our final report on the original Darwin project, we explained why we felt that project, costing just under £100,000, had offered good value for money. We quoted from the final project evaluation report

“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”

This follow up phase costing a further £50,000 has inevitably been something of a consolidation phase which may have less ‘highlights’ than phase 1. We are confident that despite that it has provided excellent value for money and indeed reinforced the value of the first project through ensuring its legacy and development. We would offer the following as evidence for this view

- The achievements of the first phase have all been maintained and enhanced, with collection of data continued, a further status report produced and much greater signs of financial and logistical support by all key participating agencies
- There is evidence of the information being used in conservation initiatives right across Kenya, especially those undertaken by NatureKenya, but also by government agencies
- Strong partnerships have been developed under the project and these are having an impact on initiatives outside the immediate sphere of the programme, for example joint PFM initiatives between NatureKenya and Kenya Forest Service
- Excellent opportunities have arisen in this second phase to disseminate the achievements of the project, through wide distribution of project publications to at least four continents, a number of high profile presentations and field visits to the project sites by conservationists from at least four other African countries as well as Canada.
- The securing of a grant of 1.8 million euros from the EC to commence similar work in seven other African countries would certainly not have happened without the example set by and experiences of the Darwin Initiative project

15. Appendix I: Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

Please complete the table below to show the extent of project contribution to the different measures for biodiversity conservation defined in the CBD Articles. This will enable us to tie Darwin projects more directly into CBD areas and to see if the underlying objective of the Darwin Initiative has been met. We have focused on CBD Articles that are most relevant to biodiversity conservation initiatives by small projects in developing countries. However, certain Articles have been omitted where they apply across the board. Where there is overlap between measures described by two different Articles, allocate the % to the most appropriate one.

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	35	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	20	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	20	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 Minimizing Adverse Impacts		Introduce EIAs of appropriate projects and allow public participation; take into account environmental 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	15	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

16. Appendix II Outputs

Please quantify and briefly describe all project outputs using the coding and format of the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures.

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
Training Outputs		
2	Number of Masters qualifications obtained None planned	Two , Antony Kiragu was assisted as a Darwin scholar allied to this project and successfully completed his MSc at University of East Anglia. Simon Musila currently pursuing his MSc at Kenyatta University
5	2 Kenyan Field Officers and 2 Site Assistants continue to receive on-the-job training	Eight people associated with the project received this kind of long term training. 2 Research Fellow positions were continued throughout the project when Simon Musila, Martin Mwema and Maurice Ogoma left for further studies Fred Barasa and Ireene Madindou took over the positions and the two got substantial training and are still active in Kenyan conservation. The interns at Kinangop, Kakamega and Dakatcha Woodland (some funded through other leveraged programmes) worked well throughout – strengthening and providing technical guidance to SSGs and ensuring adherence to monitoring standards

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
6b	25 person-weeks of formal training will be delivered to baseline network members on monitoring and survey techniques (25 people x 1 week), along with 60 person-weeks to SSGs (120 people x 0.5 weeks) and 25 person-weeks to network members (50 people x 0.5 weeks) by in-house agency staff. 6 person-weeks of 'training for trainers' will be provided (9 people x 0.67 weeks). This totals 116 person-weeks and 204 persons.	<p>80 SSG members inducted on detailed monitoring at the sites.</p> <p>23 Kenyan staff received one week's training on IBA monitoring emphasis on basic monitoring. Two staff from NMK and one from Nature Kenya received one week's training in World Bird Databases.</p> <p>4 SSGs trained on basic and detailed monitoring. The total number of days for this training were 16 days</p> <p>28 Kenyan staff received 5 days 'Training for Trainers course'</p> <p>21 members of SSGs including Nature site interns sensitised on IBA Monitoring during 4 days SSG National Workshop</p> <p>Half day seminars given to 200 KFS staff and 100 KWS staff = 20 person weeks</p> <p>Total = 143 person weeks</p>
7	1 standard training manual on the Kenyan monitoring scheme 1 brochure on experiences of the project will be produced	Not completed Report drafted (Appendix 12.7)
Research Outputs		
8	Over the project, Project Leader to spend 4 weeks in Kenya Research Trainer and the Management Planning Adviser to spend 2 weeks in Kenya Database Adviser to spend 2 weeks in Kenya Advisory Group member to spend 2 weeks in Kenya	<p>The Project Leader spend 5 weeks in Kenya in years 1 and 2</p> <p>The Research Trainer spent 1 week in Kenya in February 2007</p> <p>Two management plans advisers each spent 2 weeks in Kenya in April 2006</p> <p>Facilitator of Training for Trainers spend 1 week in Kenya in April 2006</p> <p>The Database Adviser to spent 1 week in Kenya in October 2006</p> <p>The Advisory Group member spent 1 week in Kenya</p> <p>Total = 13 person weeks of training</p>

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
9	2 annual monitoring status reports produced 2 site management plans will be completed in year 2 1 review of remote sensing in year 2	One status report produced in 2006 1 produced to draft stage in 2007 Four management plans at adopted draft stage One review of remote sensing produced.
11a	At least 1 paper summarising the methods and outcomes of developing the monitoring systems to be published	Two Paper published November 2005 in <i>Biodiversity and Conservation</i> Paper (Abstract) published in <i>Ostrich</i> 2007
12b	Existing IBA (WBDB) database will be substantially enhanced. KWS monitoring database and Kenya Birdfinder databases will also be enhanced. Total = 3.	Three. WBDB and Kenya Birdfinder enhanced KWS database enhanced in collaboration with project

Dissemination Outputs		
14a	1 seminar will be organised in Kenya in year 2 to disseminate results from the project	One. IBA status report launch Nairobi October 2006.
14b	3 other meetings will be attended where presentations will be made: 1 in Kenya and 2 elsewhere	Nine - Project information was disseminated at CBD CoP (October 2005) A meeting of all District foresters in Kenya held at Nakuru BirdLife partnership, CAP meetings (July 2005 and June 2006 2006) NMK scientific conference (November 2006)), SSG National workshop (November 2006), Kenya Wildlife Service scientific research conference (April 2007), Kenya Forest Service PFM Conference (June 2007), SCB conference, South Africa June 2007
15a	2 national press articles or press releases in Kenya in each of years 1 and 2 giving a total of 4	Three 1 press release on Amboseli 1 article in Nation Newspaper on monitoring water birds at Thika sewage 1 article on community forest monitoring to prevent illegal logging and charcoal making in Nandi forest

15c	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in UK	One. The launch of the status report was captured as news at http://www.birdlife.org/news on 7th December 2006.
16a	Number of issues of newsletters produced in the host country(s)	Two. Nature East Africa magazine produced in 2005 and the articles written for the Kenya Birds produced 2006
16b	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(s)	2000
17b	The established IBA monitoring network in Kenya will continue to be strengthened The national IBA monitoring committee will also continue to operate <i>Some regional networking will be undertaken</i> <i>Total is 3.</i>	Three The IBA monitoring sub-committee of National Liaison Committee met twice, individual members have also met informally during other conservation fora The community based site support groups have also seen their network enhanced through this project. A 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 regional monitoring network within BirdLife African partnership has continued and flourished with visits to Kenya by other partners and then granting of EC funds for eight countries (who all visited Kenya in July 2007). These are both informal but functional networks
18a	We intend to ensure at least 1 TV feature in Kenya in each of years 1 and 2, giving a total of 2	Three - Nation TV covered activities in Kinangop IBA Nature Kenya Conservation Programme Manager interviewed by two national TV station (Kenya Broadcast Corporation and Kenya Television Network)

19a	We intend to ensure at least 1 radio feature in Kenya in each of years 1 and 2, giving a total of 2	Two A local vernacular radio covered activities in Kinangop IBA During the launch of IBA status and trends report Nature Executive Director interviewed by one of national radio station Capital FM, he briefly talk about the event and the partners involved in the monitoring.
Physical Outputs		
20	1 computer together with software 3 GPS units Field equipment Books	2 computers with soft ware, binoculars, GPS units, field equipment including First Aid Kits and books
22	Number of permanent field plots established	During project follow up, additional One hundred and twenty one plots established. 40 sampling plots established in Kinangop Plateau;18 PSPs in South Nandi Forest, 24 PSPs in North Nandi Forest, 24 in Cherangani hill, 15 in Dakatcha Woodland
23	Value of additional resources raised for project	At least £60,864 not including other in-kind contributions by Kenyan project partners

17. 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 £
Paper in (Biodiversity and Conservation)*	<i>Bennun et al</i> Monitoring Important Bird Areas in Africa: Towards a Sustainable and Scaleable System	<i>SpringerLink</i> November 2005	www.springerlink.com	Subscription
Publication* (hard copy and pdf only)	Musila,S.N.,Ng 'weno,F.,Matiku,P., Mwema,M.,Kanyanya,E., Mulwa,R.,Musina,J.,Buckley,P.and Njehia,S.(2006) <i>Kenya 's Important Bird Areas,status and Trends 2005 .</i> Nature Kenya, Nairobi.	NatureKenya, Nairobi	NatureKenya www.birdlife.org . www.naturekenya.org	Free
Paper (Abstract) in Ostrich	Mulwa et al (2007)	NISC/BirdLife South Africa	info@birdlife.org.za www.ingentaconnect.com	Subscription

18. Appendix IV: Darwin Contacts

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

Project Title	Ensuring legacy and conservation impact within Kenya's biodiversity monitoring network
Ref. No.	EIDPO7 (follow up to 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/Head of Section
Address	Department of Ornithology, PO Box 44486, Nairobi, Kenya
Fax	
Email	