The ABCG partners survey on Climate Change Adaptation
by the ABCG partners

compiled by
Anton Seimon and James Watson, Global Conservation WCS
Why this report?

- Africa-focused assessment of adaptation initiatives in conservation not yet performed
- All ABCG partners are actively working on adaptation initiatives
- Opportunity to share experiences and lessons learned based on several years of work
- Improve efficiency and effectiveness in our respective future initiatives
- Explore opportunities for further collaborative work
Methods

Completed
• In-person interviews with ABCG leads on climate change adaptation
• Questionnaire
• Preliminary report

In process
• This workshop
• Final report
• Use results to plan activities for 2012 and beyond
Principal project work
summarized in report and to be introduced at this meeting

AWF- mountain gorilla work with IGCP;
Kenya/Samburu landscape vulnerability assessment
CI – Madagascar and South Africa initiatives
JGI & TNC – western Tanzania project
WCS – Albertine Rift and Coral Reef initiatives
WRI – World Resources Report and case studies
WWF – mangrove projects and others
Geographical coverage of principal projects by ABCG partners
Evaluating frameworks

The survey examined how the diverse array of projects could be evaluated collectively according to published frameworks

- There is as yet no widely accepted methodology on climate change adaptation for conservation
- Convergence towards a paradigm for effective adaptation is suggested by commonalities among several published frameworks
A framework for adapting conservation planning for climate change developed by the National Wildlife Federation that reflects elements from several preceding versions by other groups. From Glick et al. (2009).
Framework examples
Hole et al. (2011)

(1) Set conservation targets

(2) Conservation action

(3) System response

(4) Monitoring system
- Change in behaviour
- Benefits (e.g., rehabilitation of ecosystem services)
- Costs (e.g., opportunity costs)

(5) Assessment and analysis

Other factors external to the conservation action

Targets set within a realistic range
Framework examples
Adaptation for Conservation Targets (ACT)

From Cross et al. (in review)
Steps in the ACT framework

• Identify features targeted for conservation (e.g., species, ecological processes, ecosystem services, ecosystems, or social communities) and specify explicit, measurable management objectives for each feature.

• Build a conceptual model that illustrates the climatic, ecological, social, and economic drivers of each feature.

• Examine how the feature(s) may be affected by multiple plausible climate change scenarios. This can be a threats-based analysis of current and future states, and often takes the form of a vulnerability assessment.

• Identify intervention points and potential actions required to achieve objectives for each feature under each scenario.

• Evaluate potential actions for feasibility and tradeoffs. Applying on-the-ground actions or shifting conservation strategies as adaptive responses towards improving outcomes under future climatic conditions.

• Implement priority actions, monitor the efficacy of actions and progress toward objectives, and reevaluate to address system changes or ineffective actions.
Qualitative assessment of ABCG partner project structure and activities relative to the six stages of the Adaptation for Conservation Targets (ACT) framework.

Color key:
green = developed/completed
tan = partially developed/incomplete
red = not yet developed or not included among objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Qualitative assessment of ABCG partner projects according to the Adaptation for Conservation Targets (ACT) framework.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify features targeted for conservation (e.g., species, ecological processes, or ecosystems) and specify explicit, measurable management objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a conceptual model that illustrates the climatic, ecological, social, and economic drivers of each feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine how the feature may be affected by multiple plausible climate change scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify intervention points and potential actions required to achieve objectives for each feature under each scenario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate potential actions for feasibility and tradeoffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement priority actions, monitor the efficacy of actions and progress toward objectives, and reevaluate to address system changes or ineffective actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABCG organization</th>
<th>AWF</th>
<th>AWF</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>JGI + TNC</th>
<th>WCS</th>
<th>WCS</th>
<th>WWF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project</strong></td>
<td>mountain gorilla project</td>
<td>Samburu project</td>
<td>Island-wide biodiversity vulnerability assessment</td>
<td>CAS role in Climate Action Partnership</td>
<td>Gombe-Masito-Ugalla project</td>
<td>Albertine Rift project</td>
<td>West Indian Ocean coral reef project</td>
<td>Coastal wetlands-mangrove project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Rwanda, Uganda, DR Congo</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, Tanzania, DR Congo</td>
<td>Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, Madagascar and islands</td>
<td>Madagascar, Tanzania, Cameroon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Themes considered in ABCG partner projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife species</th>
<th>Wildlife health</th>
<th>Humanity &amp; livelihoods</th>
<th>Ecosystems</th>
<th>Ecological processes</th>
<th>Landscapes/seascapes</th>
<th>National level planning</th>
<th>National level policy</th>
<th>International policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWF</td>
<td>AWF</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>JGI + TNC</td>
<td>WCS</td>
<td>WCS</td>
<td>WRI</td>
<td>WWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>mountain gorilla project</td>
<td>Samhuru project</td>
<td>Island-wide biodiversity assessment</td>
<td>CAS role in Climate Action Partnership</td>
<td>Gombe-Mosito-Ugalla project</td>
<td>Albertine Rift project</td>
<td>West Indian Ocean coral reef project</td>
<td>World Resources Institute Reports &amp; Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rwanda, Uganda, &amp; Congo</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, Tanzania, DR Congo</td>
<td>Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, Madagascar, and islands</td>
<td>Mali, Namibia, Rwanda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Spatial Scales of ABCG Partners in Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.G.O.</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local - Protected Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWF</td>
<td>Mountain Gorilla Project</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWF</td>
<td>Samburu Project</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Island-wide Biodiversity Assessment</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CAS Role in Climate Action Partnership</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JGI/TNC</td>
<td>Gombe-Masito Ugalla Project</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCS</td>
<td>Albertine Rift Project</td>
<td>Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, Tanzania, DR Congo</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCS</td>
<td>West Indian Ocean Coral Reef Project</td>
<td>Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, Madagascar and Islands</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRI</td>
<td>World Resources Reports and Surveys</td>
<td>Mali, Namibia, Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>Coastal Wetlands Mangrove Project</td>
<td>Madagascar, Tanzania, Cameroon</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

• Projects being conducted independently share some common traits
• Evidence of donor agendas shaping adaptation work (geographic foci, timing of work)
• In general, project outputs have yet to drive on the ground actions on adaptation
• Ecosystems, people/livelihoods have most attention
• Spectrum of spatial scales
What is missing?

• Geographic coverage has large gaps
• Efforts are hindered by poor baseline knowledge, absence of comprehensive monitoring networks
• Consideration of human and wildlife disease
• Consideration of implications of human population increase
• Implementing findings through actions that change conservation planning and management
• Others?
Emerging Infectious Disease origin regions

Global distribution of relative risk of an EID events caused by zoonotic pathogens. The relative risk is mapped on a linear scale from green (lower values) to red (higher values).

Source: Dr. Kate Jones, Zoological Society of London
Recommendations for future work

- Expand geographic coverage to all major targets for biodiversity conservation in Africa
- Increase monitoring to detect changes and understand their dynamic causation
- Address the “implementation gap”
- Increase attention to disease as factor in conservation under climate change
- Increase integration of ecosystem and human adaptation, and increase partnerships to achieve adaptation, particularly with the development and disaster risk reduction sectors
- Engagement with the energy, transport and agricultural sectors to promote green infrastructure through ecosystem services where appropriate, and avoid foreclosing future options with development of large-scale hard infrastructure
- Engagement in regional, national and local policy and planning processes to mainstream adaptation, providing environmental inputs to vulnerability assessments and encouraging multi-disciplinary approaches
Break out group questions – to be discussed in the afternoon session

1. Is the report structure adequate? Does it miss any key components?
2. Does the introduction to the report adequately cover the major themes of climate change and adaptation?
3. How do people feel about the evaluation methodology? If there are problems, what needs to be done?
4. Is the results section adequate? Were any questions not asked that should be? Are there other important results that were overlooked?
5. Is there any feedback or additions on the section around lessons learnt?
6. Are there any other questions about the future pathways/opportunities section?
7. any other feedback?