











Acknowledgements

Consulting Firm: Biotope Consultancy Services, Nairobi

Supervisors: Fence Steering Committee:

Rhino Ark (Colin Church & Eric Kihiu)

United Nations Environment Programme (Henry Ndede &

Christian Lambrechts)

Kenya Forests Working Group (Rudolph Makhanu & Michael Gachanja)

Kenya Wildlife Service (Julius Kipng'etich) Kenya Forest Service (David Mbugua)

Biotope Consultancy Services:

T. Thenya – Project Director

Study Team: Prof. David Mungai – Environmental Assessment Expert (Team Leader)

Dr. Thuita Thenya — Socio-economist (Deputy Team Leader)

Dr. Alfred Muthee – Natural Resource Economist

Dr. Gerald Muchemi – Wildlife Expert

Dr. J.K. Mworia – Ecologist

Mr. G. Oduori / Mr. J. Kimani – Remote Sensing/GIS Experts

Support Personnel: V. Gathima

Design and Layout: Michael Jones Software, Nairobi, Kenya

Copies of the final draft of this report were submitted to the ACA Fence Steering Committee on 25th March, 2011 for review. A presentation of the report was done on 10th March at the East African Wild Life Society. The corrections and suggestions of the Steering Committee members were received on 25th March, 2011 and have been incorporated into this final report.











Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACA - Aberdare Conservation Area

BCR - Benefit Cost Ratio

BCS - Biotope Consultancy Services

Bi - Billion

CBA - Cost Benefit Analysis

CFA - Community Forest Association
CSR - Community Social Responsibility

ECF - East Coast Fever

EIA - Environmental Impact Assessment

EMCA - Environment Management and Coordination Act

ERR - Economic Rate of Return
FAO - Food Agricultural Organization

FORREMS - Forest/Range Rehabilitation and Environmental Management Strengthening Initiative of USAID

GIS - Geographical Information System
GPS - Geographical Position System

GWh - Gigawatt Hour

GWC - Green Water Credits (GWC)

GZDSP - Green Zones Development Support Project

Ha - Hectare **HH** - Household

HWC - Human Wildlife Conflict
IGA - Income Generating Activity
IRR - Internal Rate of Return

KEFRI - Kenya Forestry Research Institute
KenGen - Kenya Electricity Generation Company

KFS - Kenya Forest Service **KFWG** - Kenya Forests Working Group

KG - Kilogramme

KIFCON - Kenya Indigenous Forest Conservation Program

KM - Kilometre

KPLC - Kenya Power and Lighting Company

Kshs-Kenya ShillingsKwh-Kilowatt HourKWS-Kenya Wildlife ServiceM&E-Monitoring and Evaluation

MEMR - Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources

mi - Million

MT/ha/yr - Metric Tonnes per Hectare per Year
NDVI - Normalized Difference Vegetation Index

NIR - Near Infra-red NPV - Net Present Value

NRM - Natural Resources Management NTFP - Non Timber Forest Products

PA - Per Annum

PELIS - Plantation Establishment and Livelihood Systems

RA - Rhino Ark

SNRM - Sustainable Natural Resource Management
SPSS - Statistical Package for Social Scientist

TM - Thematic Mapper

UNEP - United Nations Environment Programme

USD - United State Dollar

WRUAS - Water Evaluation and Planning
WRUAS - Water Resource User Associations
WARMA - Water Resources Management Authority

Table of Contents

| ACK | MOWLE | JGEWIEN | 115 | <u> </u> | |
|------|----------|--|--|----------|--|
| ACR | ONYMS | AND AB | BREVIATIONS | 2 | |
| TAB | LE OF CO | NTENTS | 3 | 3 | |
| TAB | LES | | | 6 | |
| PLA | ΓES | | | 8 | |
| FIGU | IRES | | | 9 | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | INTR | ODUCTIO | ON | 10 | |
| | 1.1 | Backgr | round to the Rhino Ark Aberdare Fence | 10 | |
| | 1.2 | Ration | nale for this impact assessment | 15 | |
| | 1.3 | The st | udy and its outputs | 16 | |
| | | 1.3.1 | Main aspects of the study | 16 | |
| | | 1.3.2 | Main outputs of the study | 16 | |
| | | 1.3.3 | The research effort | 16 | |
| | | 1.3.4 | The Research Team | 18 | |
| | 1.4 | Structi | ure of Report | 18 | |
| | | | | | |
| 2 | MET | HODOLO | GY | 20 | |
| | 2.1 | Conce | ptual Framework | 20 | |
| | 2.2 | Metho | odology for the land use/cover change study | 21 | |
| | | 2.2.1 | Image Processing and Interpretation | 23 | |
| | | 2.2.2 | Image preparation | 23 | |
| | | 2.2.3 | Image classification | 23 | |
| | | 2.2.4 | Further research | 24 | |
| | 2.3 | Metho | 24 | | |
| | 2.4 | | | | |
| | 2.5 | Methodology for the socio-economic study | | | |
| | 2.6 | Metho | Methodology for economic analysis | | |
| | | 2.6.1 | Tools of Analysis | 26 | |
| | 2.7 | Source | es of data | 27 | |
| | | 2.7.1 | Secondary sources | 27 | |
| | | 2.7.2 | Primary sources | 27 | |
| | | | · | | |
| 3 | IMP/ | CT ASSI | ESSMENT OF THE ABERDARE FENCE | 28 | |
| | 3.1 | Impact | ts of the Aberdare Fence on Land Use/Cover | 28 | |
| | | 3.1.1 | ACA level impacts | 28 | |
| | | 3.1.2 | Phase level impacts | 33 | |
| | | 3.1.3 | Impacts in the forest margin landscape | 45 | |
| | 3.2 | Impact | ts of the Aberdare Fence on flora and fauna | 59 | |
| | | 3.2.1 | ACA level impacts | 59 | |
| | | 3.2.2 | Phase level Impacts | 59 | |
| | 3.3 | · | | | |
| | 3.4 | Socio-economic impacts of the Aberdare Fence | | 62 65 | |
| | | 3.4.1 | Phases 1, 2 and parts of 4 (Nyeri district) | 65 | |
| | | 3.4.2 | Parts of phase 4 and 5 (Muranga north district) | 67 | |
| | | 3.4.3 | Phase 5 (Thika district) | 68 | |
| | | 3.4.4 | Part of phase 5 and phase 6 (Kiambu district) | 69 | |
| | | 3.4.5 | Phase 3, part of 6, 7, 8 and Kipipiri Extra-Section (Nyandarua district) | 71 | |
| | | | | | |

Table of Contents

| ECON | IOMIC EFF | ECTS OF THE ABERDARE FENCE | 72 |
|------|-----------|---|----|
| 4.1 | Baseline | conditions for the benefit-cost analysis | 72 |
| | 4.1.1 | Identifying Benefits | 72 |
| | 4.1.2 | Economic Valuation of Benefits | 73 |
| | 4.1.3 | Benefits of the Aberdare Fence | 73 |
| | 4.1.4 | Cost of the Aberdare Fence | 73 |
| 4.2 | Analysis | of benefits | 74 |
| | 4.2.1 | Ecosystem Conservation | 74 |
| | 4.2.2 | Estimates of benefits of forested areas | 74 |
| | 4.2.3 | Water Conservation | 75 |
| | 4.2.4 | Water Uses | 76 |
| | 4.2.5 | Domestic Water Consumption | 76 |
| | 4.2.6 | Nairobi City Water Usage | 77 |
| | 4.2.7 | Water for Rift Valley Side Towns and Northern Ranches | 77 |
| | 4.2.8 | Water for Irrigation | 78 |
| | 4.2.9 | Irrigation and Agriculture in L. Naivasha Basin | 78 |
| | 4.2.10 | Water for Hydropower Generation | 78 |
| | 4.2.11 | Water for Crop and Livestock in Central Province | 78 |
| | 4.2.12 | Value of Crop Production | 79 |
| | 4.2.13 | Value of Livestock Products | 79 |
| | 4.2.14 | Value of Water to Livestock in other Districts | 80 |
| | 4.2.15 | Carbon Sequestration | 80 |
| | 4.2.16 | Soil Erosion Control | 80 |
| | 4.2.17 | Tourism and Ecotourism Benefits | 80 |
| | 4.2.18 | Timber and Non-Timber Products | 83 |
| | 4.2.19 | Benefits from Small-scale Agriculture in Excised Land | 85 |
| | 4.2.20 | Annual Valuation of Bio-diversity and Related Climate Change Benefits | 85 |
| 1.3 | Estimate | s of Costs | 85 |
| | | Fence Construction Costs | 85 |
| | | Costs of biomass loss in fence line strip | 87 |
| | | Maintenance Costs | 87 |
| | | Compensation Costs in HWC | 87 |
| | | Opportunity costs foregone | 87 |
| | | Agricultural Land foregone | 87 |
| | | Shamba/non-resident cultivation | 87 |
| | | Charcoal Burning | 88 |
| | | Illegal Logging | 89 |
| | | Marijuana Production | 89 |
| | | Loss of Revenue due to uncut timber | 90 |
| | | Estimated Cost of Conservation | 90 |
| 1.4 | | enefits and impacts | 90 |
| 7.7 | | Contingent Valuation of Total Value of Aberdares | 90 |
| | | Membership of CFAs | 90 |
| | | Distance from the fence | 91 |
| | | Value of agricultural land | 91 |
| | | Community willingness to pay for fence maintenance and ACA management | 91 |
| | | Community's valuation of the Aberdare Conservation Area | 92 |
| | | Actual impacts observed by Foresters | 92 |
| | 1.7.7 | Autuan impauto oboor voa by i orostoro | JL |

Table of Contents

| | | 4.4.8 Actual benefits and impacts identified by farmers | 96 |
|------|--------|---|-----|
| | | 4.4.9 Potential (future) benefits | 100 |
| | | 4.4.10 Summary of current and potential (future) benefits | 101 |
| | 4.5 | Findings of Cost-Benefit Analysis | 102 |
| | | 4.5.1 Baseline Cost-Benefit Analysis | 102 |
| | | 4.5.2 CBA of Community Adjacent to the Fence | 104 |
| | | 4.5.3 Community, regional, national and global impacts and benefits | 107 |
| | | 4.5.4 Concept of distributional Analysis | 108 |
| | | 4.5.5 Forest Adjacent Communities | 109 |
| | | 4.5.6 Regional Benefits | 109 |
| | | 4.5.7 National benefits | 109 |
| | | 4.5.8 Global Community | 109 |
| | | 4.5.9 Overall distribution of Aberdares Benefits | 110 |
| | | 4.5.10 Commercial Stakeholders benefiting from Aberdares Water | 110 |
| | 4.6 | Key Findings of Economic Analysis | 111 |
| | | | |
| j | FUTU | RE MANAGEMENT OF THE FENCE AND THE ACA | 116 |
| | 5.1 | Current situation | 116 |
| | 5.2 | Stakeholders and their roles | 116 |
| | 5.3 | Fence management | 118 |
| | 5.4 | Management of the ACA | 120 |
| | 5.5 | Management of the forest margin landscapes | 120 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| j | | CLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 122 |
| | 6.1 | Conclusions | 122 |
| | | 6.1.1 Conclusions on ACA-wide changes and effects | 122 |
| | | 6.1.2 Conclusions on changes and effects by fence phase or section | 122 |
| | | 6.1.3 Conclusions on human-wildlife conflicts | 122 |
| | | 6.1.4 Conclusions on illegal activities | 123 |
| | | 6.1.5 Conclusions on socio-economic changes and effects | 123 |
| | | 6.1.6 Conclusions on water resources | 123 |
| | | 6.1.7 Conclusions on fence management | 123 |
| | | 6.1.8 Conclusions on changes and effects in the forest margin landscape | 123 |
| | | 6.1.9 Conclusions on cost-benefit analysis | 124 |
| | | 6.1.10 Conclusions on community awareness | 124 |
| | 6.2 | Recommendations | 124 |
| REFF | RENCES | | 126 |
| | EXES | | 128 |
| | | of participants in the stakeholders' meetings | 128 |
| | | p-economic Questionnaire used in the study | 133 |

| Table 1: | Extent of illegal activities and degradation in the ACA in 2002 | 11 |
|-----------|--|----|
| Table 2: | Description of the various phases of the fence (See also Fig. 1) | 12 |
| Table 3: | Stakeholders consulted during the study | 17 |
| Table 4: | Landsat Images specification | 23 |
| Table 5: | SPOT Image specification | 23 |
| Table 6: | Location of study transects | 24 |
| Table 7: | Sources of data on benefits | 27 |
| Table 8: | Sources of data on costs | 27 |
| Table 9: | Summary of land cover types (1987 – 2010) | 29 |
| Table 10: | Land use/cover areas of Phase 1 | 33 |
| Table 11: | Land use/cover areas of Phase 2 | 34 |
| Table 12: | Land use/cover for Phase 3 | 34 |
| Table 13: | Land use/cover for Phase 4 | 35 |
| Table 14: | Baseline land use/cover of Phase 5 | 35 |
| Table 15: | Baseline land use/cover for Phase 6 | 40 |
| Table 16: | Land use/cover for Phase 7 | 42 |
| Table 17: | Land use/cover for Phase 8 | 44 |
| Table 18: | Land Cover types in Kipipiri Extra Section | 46 |
| Table 19: | Land Use change Matrix | 48 |
| Table 20: | Land cover types in Phase 1 and 2 Forest margin landscape zone | 50 |
| Table 21: | Forest margin landscape zone – Phase 3 & 4 | 52 |
| Table 22: | Forest margin landscape zone – Phase 5 and 6 | 54 |
| Table 23: | Forest margin landscape zone – Phase 7 and 8 | 56 |
| Table 24: | Forest margin landscape area — Kipipiri | 58 |
| Table 25: | Registered Connection as at May 2009 for WSP Abstracting water from Aberdare Catchment | 63 |
| Table 26: | Sources of domestic water around ACA | 63 |
| Table 27: | Proportion of respondents obtaining water from indicated sources | 63 |
| Table 28: | Proportion of respondents paying indicated water charges | 63 |
| Table 29: | Benefits of a Protected Area | 72 |
| Table 30: | Summary of Key Methods in Economic Valuation | 73 |
| Table 31: | Regional Differences in Water Resources and Consumption | 74 |
| Table 32: | Estimated Water Demand in Kenya | 75 |
| - · · · | | |

预览已结束, 完整报告链接和二维码如下:

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_9627



