



## Darwin Initiative Annual Report

Important note:

To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders: it is expected that this report will be about 10 pages in length, excluding annexes  
Submission Deadline: 30 April 2013



### 1. Darwin Project Information

Project Reference	19-025
Project Title	Conservation of Ethiopia's Wild Coffee using Participatory Forest Management
Host Country/ies	Ethiopia
UK contract holder institution	University of Huddersfield (UoH)
Host country partner institutions	Ethio-Wetlands and Natural Resources Association (EWNRA) Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (IBC) Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional Government (SNNPRS)
Other partner institutions	Sustainable Livelihood Action (SLA) (in the Netherlands)
Darwin Grant Value	£246,507
Start/end dates of project	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2012 / 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2015
Reporting period (eg Apr 2012 – Mar 2013) and number (eg Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	Apr 2012 – Mar 2013 Report 1.
Project Leader name	Professor Adrian Wood
Project website	<a href="http://wetlandsandforests.hud.ac.uk">http://wetlandsandforests.hud.ac.uk</a>
Report authors, main contributors and date	Adrian Wood, April 2013

### 2. Project Background

*Coffea arabica* evolved as an understory shrub in the Afromontane forests of south-west Ethiopia. Despite being a global commodity, conservation of the genetic birthplace of coffee has been poor. Over the last 25 years 40% of these Afromontane forests have been lost. This is due to a lack of secure forest rights for communities, allocation of land to investors and resettlement of drought victims. Further, while the importance of conserving the coffee forests is now recognised, conservation policies, which exclude local people from forests where they have co-existed with coffee, and have alienated these communities. Agricultural policies that favour improved coffee varieties in intensively managed areas of coffee forest also threaten to displace the wild coffee agro-biodiversity.

With resettlement ended and changes being made by the regional government to forestry laws so as to improve access and use rights for local communities, there are opportunities for participatory forest management (PFM) to be applied across Southern Nations, Nationalities and People's Regional State (SNNPRS) and specifically adapted for community-based conservation of forest biodiversity, especially wild coffee.

In Sheko wereda of SNNPRS two major areas of "natural" forest exist Kontir Berhan and Amora Gedel, totalling over 10,000 ha, where wild coffee exists. These are government forests where despite legislation there is effectively open access. This has led to the degradation of these forests. Around the "natural" forest there are extensive areas of coffee forest which has been developed over the last 30 years through the replanting of wild coffee seedling from the "natural" forest. This coffee forest has been progressing into the natural forest and concern has existed for a long time about the way in which this coffee forest expansion and the open access will destroy the areas where the wild coffee still remains in the natural forest, in a situation where it can evolve in response to climate change and other environmental challenges. Hence the need has been identified for arrangements which can support *in situ* conservation of wild coffee.

Participatory forest management (PFM) has been identified as one potential method which could support and sustain *in situ* conservation. PFM methods have been developed for the south-west forests over ten years since 2003 by three of the partners in this project (UoH, EWNRA and SLA) in collaboration with the relevant agencies of the government of SNNPRS. Applying these to *in situ* conservation of wild coffee began in 2010 with support from the EU. Additional funding from DI has released more of the EU funds and has allowed additional technical support for the project to better document and disseminate the experience. The overall project within which the DI Project No 19-025 fits is known locally as the Wild Coffee Conservation by Participatory Forest Management Project, WCC-PFM Project.

The project is located between 35 18 E and 35 37 E and 6 95 N and 7 12 N.

### 3. Project Partnerships

This WCC-PFM Project is the result of long term collaborative partnership of 3 organisations: UoH, EWNRA and SLA which goes back to 2000 when they were working on sustainable wetland management in south-west Ethiopia. These three partners have legal responsibilities for the project under the EU contract. Additional partners for this project are IBC and SNNPRS Bureau of Agriculture. The former brings in country biodiversity expertise and links to international reporting, while the latter is essential for field activities, forests being the responsibility of this Bureau.

The partnership has developed positively over the last year despite a problem cause by the departing Project Coordinator. Once that matter was addressed a very positive relationship has developed with the wereda and zonal administrations, including collaboration with them to explore how politically imposed decision about biosphere reserves can best be managed in a way which does not undermine PFM and builds on the community based / grass roots empowerment which is the basis of PFM. In addition the three original partners (UoH, EWNRA and SLA) have established the "South-west Forests and Landscape Grouping" in order to raise the profile of the work they are doing together.

The management structure of the project in terms of the roles and responsibilities of main partners is as follows:

**UoH:** is overall lead and responsible to DI and to the EU for technical and financial reporting.

**EWNRA:** registers the project in country and employs all field staff

**SLA:** employs all of the international consultants and provides support in project operations

**IBC:** provides local technical support and links to national biodiversity database and reporting, also a key beneficiary of the lessons from this work. Also this is where the project links to the national biodiversity focal point. Through IBC the project will help Ethiopia meet its international commitments.

**SNNPRS:** provides the field staff on the ground with whom the project works and the institutions into which trained capacity will go and in which the new processes for biodiversity conservation will be institutionalised.

The first three partners have been working together on forest related project in this part of Ethiopia since 2003 and have established a good division of labour and method for cooperation. There have been no major changes to the management structure of the project over the reporting period. Project management is by email and phone communications with management meetings three times a year in Ethiopia.

Other Collaboration:

The project is in contact with Kew Gardens, specifically Dr Aaron Davies who heads their project on Wild Coffee Conservation. So far this collaboration has confirmed that the project is correct to work on *in situ* conservation in Sheko and has identified additional areas into which the project should expand.

## 4. Project Progress

Note: This report refers to the project activities in total which are specified in the LF and Workplan, although many of them are not implemented with DI resources. Final output figures reflect the total achieved to date since the project started on the ground in late 2010. (DI total costs in Year 1 were c £43k.)

Reporting in this section follows the structure of the Log Frame, focusing first on the groups of activities and then on the six outputs to which these activity groups contribute.

### 4.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

Introduction:

The project started in 2010 with funding from the EU delegation. Two project offices in the field are established and a guest house /extension office for use by consultants and for meetings. After a slow start for logistical reasons in 2010 and 2011, the project has progressed more rapidly in 2012/13.

However, the new regulations against NGOs – which include our local partner in Ethiopia, have created problems and the agreement for additional field staff supported by DI has been turned down. Our alternative strategy, as agreed in the budget revision in December 2012, is to use DI funds for specific bio-cultural, PFM / Forest Management and project dissemination work with highly qualified staff appointed as local advisers and researchers. The field staffing will be adjusted in 2013 in the light of a review of the project and its funding undertaken by both the regional government and the EU. Adjustments to the project, and their implication for DI related work will be discussed in June 2013, but no major implications for DI are envisaged.

During 2012 the field Project Coordinator (PC) had to be replaced; he was the major cause of much of the slow progress. The new PC is making successful efforts to bring the project back on schedule.

The total beneficiaries in the present areas of work, 38 got of the 13 kebeles, are 34,201 of whom 16,572 are women. The “natural” forest totals 10,112 ha, coffee forest covers 10,399 ha while agricultural and settlement areas are 3,876 ha.

#### 1. Forest and Biodiversity Maintained as PFM Applied

##### 1.1 PFM Training

##### 1.2 Forest Demarcation for PFM Groups

##### 1.3 PFM Agreements Signed

The PFM process, to bring forest under community management and to end the *de facto* open access situation of government management, involves 7 steps as follows:

- awareness raising,
- boundary demarcation,
- forest management planning
- forest institutional development,
- agreement signing
- implementation and forest enterprise development, and
- monitoring and evaluation. (See Documentation Annex, Item 1).

Working in 13 kebeles, and within them 38 got level forest user communities, the project has undertaken over 100 training and awareness raising sessions related to PFM during the year. A total of 2,703 people (with 440 of them women) have been engaged in these trainings. In addition a specific awareness raising session was provided for the wereda government administration (cabinet) and specific training for nine government technical staff who are the project's field partners.

As a result by the end of this year forest demarcation has been completed in most of the 38 gots with a total of 5,110ha of “natural” forest, 7,459ha of “coffee” forest and 1,843ha of agricultural and settlement land identified and mapped on the GIS system.

Forest resource assessment has been completed in 35 of the 38 gots where the project is working.

PFM agreements are almost ready to be signed between the wereda (district) government and got level PFM Groups in the 20 first priority gots.

## 2. PFM Fine-Tuned for in situ Conservation

2.1 PFM fine tuned with respect to community-based biodiversity conservation

2.2 Appropriate extension materials developed, distributed and applied

2.3 Baseline mapping for the application of PFM

The process of applying PFM in this project involves continual trial and testing and adjustment of the steps and process. What it does not do is change from the principles of PFM that communities are the key decision-makers and owners of the PFM process. (This of course is subject to signed agreements with the government which include agreement over forest uses and the maintenance of present boundaries between the natural and coffee forest.) To date the main areas of adjustment to the simplified PFM method, established by the three lead partners in this project in their former work, has been with respect to Forest Management Planning. This has developed specific planning processes for different forest areas, coffee forest and natural forest. The agreements also make reference to the government regulation which demarcated a boundary between the highly manipulated coffee forest (heavily affected by understorey clearance and enhancement planting of wild coffee taken from the “natural” forest) and the “natural” forest.

As the PFM process progresses so specific adjustments / fine tuning will be made, tested and recorded so that by the end of the project an adjusted PFM process suited to supporting in situ conservation will be developed and disseminated.

Extension materials about the different institutional options available for PFM have been developed to help the Got-level PFM groups discuss and decide about appropriate institutional forms at the wereda level.

Land cover mapping of the wereda has been completed showing land use change at intervals between 1973 and 2009. New mapping will be undertaken in 2013 with data up to late 2012. Detailed transects have also been undertaken for vegetation mapping which will feed into the biodiversity monitoring. This mapping has also included woody biomass measurement as the basis for carbon payment scheme development. (See Documentation Annex, Item 2).

## 3. Capacity of Govt Staff & Communities Strengthened

3.1 Training in participatory processes, PFM, CBO management, leadership etc

3.2 Training in joint planning, monitoring and evaluation

3.3 Training & development of extension materials

Training in participatory processes is a continual part of all project work and is the starting point for all work with communities and the government. This builds on specific PRA training which project staff received in 2011.

Training in participatory methods for forest resource assessment was completed in 12 gots this year, while training in forest management planning was completed in 20 gots. Other training relates to Activity 1.1 mentioned above.

Training has not been undertaken on the community institutions – PFM and Enterprise Development CBOs, as these were not formally established with elected committee members during the year. Their formation processes were underway and they will be operating by mid 2013.

As the project was prevented by the regional government from appointing an M&E officer, there has been great pressure on the PC to undertake the M&E work needed for normal reporting. Development of this work, with building community and government capacity to undertake M&E, will be a priority once the project adjustments are agreed with the regional government by mid 2013.

Specific guideline documents to provide extension on PFM, in situ conservation and forest enterprise development will be developed in 2013-2014 based on field experience.

#### 4. Community Based PFM Institutions

##### 4.1 Training & support for PFM CBOs, PLCs and Coops

##### 4.2 Development of byelaws and regulations for CBOs

##### 4.3 Legalisation of CBOs

##### 4.4 Support for operation of CBOs.

While there has been little action specific to these headings due to the delays in institutional establishment and project progress, there has been a lot of effort, consultation, planning and workshops at the community and wereda level to establish the got level forest management groups and the wereda level PFM Association. This included a major wereda level workshop which formed a general assembly for selecting the Association form at the wereda level for PFM. This will be formally registered by mid 2013 and through this all got level PFM groups will become legal branches of the Association.

#### 5. Viable Forest Products Based Enterprises Operating

##### 5.1 Support production of NTFPs focusing on quality and supply

##### 5.2 Assess market opportunities & develop strategies and links for CBOs

##### 5.3 Explore incentive payments for environmental services, e.g. carbon

##### 5.4 Facilitate links with funding mechanisms for PES & implement pilot

During the year assessments have been made of the range of potential NTFPs which could be marketed from these forests. These have been discussed with communities with respect to the supply and quality, and with outlets / buyers in Addis Ababa in terms of demand and quality. (see Documentation Annex, Item 3).

The quality of the coffee from the “coffee forest” and that from the wild plants in the “natural” forest has been assessed by a number of UK based coffee buying organisations. They have identified that the coffee from the wild plants in the natural forest is particularly attractive. Potential ways of adding value to the natural forest are being considered. However, at the same time it is necessary to assess the implication for in situ conservation of improved marketing opportunities for the wild coffee and other products from the natural forest and the coffee from the coffee forest. Great care is being taken to review all potential results of project support to the marketing of coffee and other forest products.

The carbon assessment which has been completed, provides the basis for preparing PIN and PDD for carbon trading. These will be prepared in 2013 and submitted to Plan Vivo in Edinburgh.

## 6. Dissemination to Govt & Civil Society Agencies

6.1 Dissemination of project findings.

6.2 Contribution to policy debates

6.3 Advocacy on specific issues, esp. forest policy, PFM for biodiversity conservation and PES

6.4 Liaison with biosphere projects

The Project Coordinator has been involved in the discussions at the regional level with respect to the revision of the forest legislation. The new regional forest proclamation was passed by the regional government in 2012. Discussions now focus on the development of regulations which will be the basis of applying the legislation.

Advocacy documents and project dissemination materials will be developed once field experience is obtained, monitored and assessed. An initial DVD on the project area has been filmed and will be available by mid 2013.

Contacts have been established with the three biosphere projects in the SW of Ethiopia and an assessment of this experience is to be undertaken in April 2013. This is critical as the Zonal Administration has decided that a biosphere reserve should be established in Bench Maji Zone within which Sheko wereda, and the work of this project, is located. A top down approach to BR, as has been applied elsewhere in Ethiopia, could undermine the grassroots approach to biodiversity conservation, through PFM, of this project.

## 4.2 Progress towards project outputs

*1. The forest and coffee biodiversity maintained* (by the application of fine-tuned Participatory Forest Management (PFM) approach applied by the local communities and officially recognised by regional and local governments.)

[*Indicators:* Forest and coffee biodiversity maintained in Amora Gedal and Kontir Berhan forests against baseline assessment. Coverage of intervention forests under PFM. Communities applying PFM for forest conservation. Recognition of PFM for biodiversity conservation in legislation /policy and by agreements with local government offices.]

Monitoring of the forest cover has a baseline going back to 1973 and is being updated this year to provide the required data.

The key step to forest maintenance is to halt open access and obtain community rights. This is being progressed through the PFM process on the ground and the policy work at the regional level.

Progress along the 7 PFM steps has reached step 5 in the 20 first priority gots and step 3 in the other 18 gotes. Approximately 60% of the forested area of Sheko wereda (district) has been mapped as the basis for PFM being applied.

The woody biomass/ carbon assessment has been completed and along with surveys of ground flora they provide the major elements of the biodiversity baseline assessment

All communities approached with respect to PFM have applied to the government for support to apply PFM. 100% of the communities with forest have applied for PFM

This is an on-going process which is beginning to see government recognition.

2. Participatory forest management (PFM) methods developed in the region, are adapted, fine-tuned and applied specifically for in situ conservation of forests and coffee biodiversity

[*Indicators:* PFM Methods fine tuned and applied for in situ conservation of forest and coffee biodiversity, with feedback from field experience incorporated in revision of methods.]

PFM methods are being applied as developed by the project partners in another project and are being tested and adjusted for PFM which supports in situ conservation of wild coffee.

Fine tuning for in situ conservation is seen in the forest management plan development process so far, but other adjustments will occur over time.

3. The capacity of community organisations (PFM Associations) and government agencies for the effective conservation of coffee biodiversity using PFM is significantly strengthened.

[Indicators: 60 communities (gots) in 14 kebeles (lowest administrative units) implementing PFM for forest and coffee biodiversity conservation through their local PFM Associations over their recognised forest areas and reporting effective support from government extension staff and districts experts.]

Through the PFM work and the institutional development at the got and wereda level the potential of PFM to help communities maintain and manage their forests is being developed. The wereda PFM association will be legalised by mid 2013 and from then community based forest management, with use, protection and development, will be applied.

The grass roots approach of the project which is the basis of PFM is highly appreciated by the communities and is building positive support for forest maintenance. Communities are keen to have clear rights over the forest to stop open access and to reduce the chances of land allocations to investors. (This positive view of this project and the PFM approach contrasts with recent burning of parts of the core zone in a Biosphere Reserve in another district in SW Ethiopia by disgruntled local communities.)

4. Community based PFM institutions for biodiversity conservation, sustainable forest management, and marketing of forest products and services established and operating sustainably.

[Indicators: Twelve community institutions (PLCs and Cooperatives) have legal establishment documents signed by government officials. Community institutions are operating and effective in terms of forest management, biodiversity conservation and marketing of forest products and carbon.]

Institutional development for PFM is well under way in the 13 kebeles where the project has been operating. PFM got level groups will be legalised once the wereda level PFM Association has been chosen and will soon be legalised.

[Assessment of institutional options for forest enterprise development, including assessment of local experience with cooperatives, is underway. An informed participatory process will be followed so that the community makes the final decision based on discussions amongst themselves and with the government and project staff. Care in choice is essential for commercial success and hence sustainability.](#)

5. Viable forest product based enterprises operating with improved market linkages and services established and providing livelihood benefits without conflict with conservation goals. Carbon payments generating income for government and communities.

[Indicators: At least two forest product based enterprises operating. Carbon payment agreements made and implemented. No negative impacts on conservation goals for forests and coffee biodiversity.]

A variety of forest products are being explored for enterprise development, focusing on local, national and international markets. Coffee and honey appear to be the front runners at present as trade links are already established. Analysis of their value chains and assessment of how benefits can be increased to communities are to be undertaken, as well as exploring how value added to the forest in a way which will maintain the “natural” forest as a suitable environment for *in situ* conservation of the wild coffee.

Carbon payments are being explored with the PIN and PDD documents to be prepared in mid 2013 using the completed carbon baseline assessment.

6. Dissemination to other government and civil society agencies in Ethiopia and elsewhere of fine-tuned PFM methods for development of policy and practice of in situ biodiversity conservation.

[*Indicators:* Practice and policy development. Dissemination documents prepared and despatched. Conferences and meetings attended to undertake dissemination.]

The new regional forest proclamation is in place. This is relevant across the region and provides guidance for government and NGO agencies working in this region and has more general impacts for those working in other parts of Ethiopia.

Dissemination of material from this project will develop as lessons are learned.

#### **4.3 Standard Measures**

##### **Table 1 Project Standard Output Measures – to follow**

The above table and concepts are new for this project and was not required in the application. They will be considered and completed in the next quarter after a management meeting consider these measures.

##### **Table 2 Publications**

To date no formal publications from work funded through this project have yet been produced

#### **4.4 Progress towards the project purpose and outcomes**

**Purpose:** Key areas of Amora Gedel and Kontir Berhan ‘wild coffee’ forests are conserved and providing sustainable livelihood benefits through Participatory Forest Management (PFM) by the local communities with full government support

Progress is being made as planned with the implementation of PFM and the indicators remain adequate.

More than half of the forest in the project’s kebeles has been mapped and assessed with boundaries demarcated for the implementation of PFM.

Institutional arrangements have been developed and agreed by the communities to formally establish PFM and the legalisation process is underway.

Once the PFM arrangements are operating the “open access” nature of the forest will come to an end and sustainable livelihood development linked to maintaining the natural forest can be developed.

The wereda, zonal and regional government now strongly support the application of PFM. The communities have all requested PFM and are anxious for it to be applied to secure their forests from investors and other external threats.

#### **4.5 Progress towards impact on biodiversity, sustainable use or equitable sharing of biodiversity benefits**

There are few indicators of these changes as yet. Biodiversity impacts will be measured against the baseline but will be limited in a three year period. More important is attitudes and behaviour towards the forests and the arrangement to manage the forest. These will be seen in the forest management plans of the communities and the monitoring of them. This will include benefit sharing arrangement with the government and amongst the communities.

### **5. Monitoring, evaluation and lessons**

Baseline land cover data has been collected, focusing on forest cover mapping. This goes back to 1973. Along with this biomass data has been collected as required for carbon funding. Much data collection of shrub and ground cover species has also been completed. A biodiversity baseline is being completed.



M&E of project operations and activities is undertaken on a monthly basis.

Output monitoring will be in place with the appointment of the Participatory Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation officer once this is approved by the regional government.

Lessons from the project experience so far are that the project needs the original staffing for M&E and this has now been accepted in principle by the Regional Government.

## **6. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)**

A Mid Term Review of the overall project was undertaken by the Regional Government and by consultants for the EU Delegation. The main recommendations beyond speeding up operations on the ground through full staffing, were to expand the area of PFM work to cover all of the wereda completely and to extend PFM into neighbouring weredas to prevent spill over deforestation, or displaced deforestation. One of these weredas with considerable forest areas (100k ha) also has wild coffee.

## **7. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere**

A major challenge to the project is the political decision to create a biosphere reserve in the zone where the project is working. The BR approach in Ethiopia is very top down and heavily commandist. This is in complete contrast to the participatory, bottom up, and empowering approach of PFM. A dialogue has been started with the zonal administration and potential actors in the BR initiative and a visit organised to explore the experience to date with BRs in SW Ethiopia. (After the reporting period, the project led this visit and a highly informative and critical report of BR experience to date has been produced. It is now agreed at the zonal level that PFM should be the basis of biodiversity conservation. How this is implemented remains a major challenge.)

There has been a major enhancement of understanding of biodiversity conservation issues for PFM through the input of the DI funded adviser, Robert Wild. He has also encouraged the exploration of a biocultural approach for which a senior Ethiopian has been recruited as a consultant – Dr Mengistu. Contents of their reports are included in the documentation Annex items 4 and 5

Development of close links with the zonal administration over the biosphere reserve ideas has been led by the senior PFM adviser – Dr Mulugeta. His recent report – from April 2013 is included as it is critical for the project. Item 6.

## **8. Sustainability**

The whole PFM approach to *in situ* conservation of biodiversity is based on ownership of the PFM process by the local community and their engagement throughout. It is a grassroots or bottom up process, which is essential for ownership which in turn is responsible for sustainability beyond the period of project support or external funding from carbon or other sources.

Community based institutions, chosen by the communities are a key element of this and are central to the work of this project.

Economically viable enterprises and marketing / processing institutions which can support sustainable enterprises and livelihoods which make the forest valuable are also central to long term sustainability of maintenance of the forest. Generating value from diverse sources must be the basis of making PFM sustainable, and thereby the maintenance of the natural forest in which the wild coffee grows and can be conserved *in situ*.

## **9. Dissemination**

To date dissemination has not been a major concern. Documenting experience as the basis for lessons learning and subsequent dissemination is the major focus to date.

## 10. Project Expenditure

**Table 3 project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2012 – 31 March 2013)**

Item	Budget (please indicate which document you refer to if other than your project application or annual grant offer letter)	Expenditure	Variance/ Comments
Staff costs specified by individual	XXX	XXX	
Dr Mulugeta	XXX	XXX	
Dr Mengistu	XXX	XXX	
Overhead costs			
Travel and subsistence			Vehicle hire paid with EU funds
Operating costs			
Capital items/equipment			
Others: Consultancy			
Dr Dena Freeman			
Rob Wild			
Others (please specify)			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>54,823.00</b>	<b>43,658.15</b>	

## 11. **OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements of your project during the reporting period (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes**

I agree for LTS and the Darwin Secretariat to publish the content of this section (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here)

## Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2012-2013

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2012 - March 2013	Actions required/planned for next period
<p><b>Goal:</b> <i>To draw on expertise relevant to biodiversity from within the United Kingdom to work with local partners in countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources to achieve</i></p> <p>⇒ The conservation of biological diversity,            ⇒ The sustainable use of its components, and            ⇒ The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</p>			
<p><b>Purpose</b>            Key areas of Amora Gedel and Kontir Berhan 'wild coffee' forests are conserved and providing sustainable livelihood benefits through Participatory Forest Management (PFM) by the local communities with full government support</p>	<p>Area of forest under PFM management with specific conservation aims / agreements with government.</p> <p>Sustainable livelihood benefits being generated from PFM forests.</p> <p>Number of communities / population engaged in PFM for conservation and benefitting from sustainable forest based livelihood benefits.</p>	<p>Action planning for PFM managed forest has been completed in 20 priority Gots, some 5,000 ha of "natural" forest. Second priority gots remain to reach this stage. Signing of PFM agreements between community and government for the first priority gots is expected in June 2013.</p> <p>Research in products, markets and value chains for forest items which can contribute to sustainable livelihoods is underway and options for community discussions and decision have been identified. This process requires PFM and marketing institutions to be established.</p>	<p>The focus in Year 2 of the DI supported activities will be on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Completing the PFM process within Sheko wereda and considering extending coverage to adjoining areas</li> <li>b) Developing the capacity and skills of the PFM institutions at wereda and got level to ensure effective implementation.</li> <li>c) Developing enterprises and institutions for marketing and value chain development to ensure sustainable livelihoods from the forest.</li> <li>d) Building M&amp;E capacity in the project and in the communities to monitor activities, forest state and biodiversity related to wild coffee.</li> <li>e) Analysing findings and identifying lessons for disseminating.</li> <li>f) Ensuring new forest legislation is properly understood and applied.</li> <li>g) Progressing biosphere reserve work with PFM as the key building block in the approach.</li> </ol>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2012 - March 2013	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Output 1. 1. The forest and coffee biodiversity maintained by the application of fine-tuned Participatory Forest Management (PFM) approach applied by the local communities and officially recognised by regional and local governments.</p>	<p>Forest and coffee biodiversity maintained in Amora Gedal and Kontir Berhan forests against baseline assessment.</p> <p>Coverage of intervention forests under PFM.</p> <p>Communities applying PFM for forest conservation.</p> <p>Recognition of PFM for biodiversity conservation in legislation /policy and by agreements with local government offices.</p>	<p>Woody biomass assessment completed and further surveys of ground flora made as contributions for the baseline biodiversity assessment</p> <p>Approximately 5,110ha of “natural” forest, 7,459ha of “coffee” forest and 1,843ha of agricultural and settlement land in Sheko wereda (district) has been mapped as the basis for PFM being applied. This is approximately 60 % of the natural forest area of the wereda.</p> <p>All communities approached with respect to PFM have applied to the government for support to apply PFM. 100% of the communities with forest have applied for PFM</p> <p>This is an on-going process which is beginning to see government recognition.</p>	
<p>Activity 1.1 PFM training applied</p>		<p>Awareness raising of PFM has been undertaken through 49 awareness meetings / training in the gots where the project works and one awareness meeting at the wereda (district) level.</p>	
<p>Activity 1.2 Forest demarcation for PFM groups</p>		<p>Forest demarcation has been complete in in all 38 Gotts including 3 Gotts of Shayita with 5,110ha of “natural” forest, 7,459ha of “coffee” forest and 1,843ha of agricultural and settlement land identified and mapped on the GIS system</p>	
<p>Activity 1.3 PFM Agreements signed</p>		<p>PFM agreements are to be signed between the wereda (district) government and the first 20 got level PFM Groups.</p>	
<p><b>Output 2.</b> Participatory forest management (PFM) methods developed in the region, are adapted, fine-tuned and applied specifically for in situ conservation of forests and coffee biodiversity</p>	<p>PFM Methods fine tuned and applied for in situ conservation of forest and coffee biodiversity, with feedback from field experience incorporated in revision of methods.</p>	<p>This is an on-going process. PFM step with responsibility for forest management now recognises the different forest types and the need for separate plans.</p>	
<p>Activity 2.1. PFM fine tuned with respect to community-based biodiversity conservation</p>		<p>The process of applying PFM in this project involves continual trial and testing and adjustment. To date the main areas of adjustment from the simplified PFM method established by the partners in this project in their former work has been with respect to PFM Management Planning which has developed specific planning processes for different forest areas, coffee forest and natural forest.</p>	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2012 - March 2013	Actions required/planned for next period
Activity 2.2. Appropriate extension materials developed, distributed and applied		Extension materials have been developed to help the Got-level PFM groups discuss and decide about appropriate institutional arrangements for PFM. Materials to support the use of PRA tools have been developed and these tools employed to help community and government partners select appropriate institutional arrangements for PFM at the wereda level in very participatory way.	
Activity 2.3 Baseline mapping for the application of PFM		Land cover mapping of the wereda has been complete showing land use change at intervals since 1971. Detailed transects have also been undertaken for vegetation mapping which will feed into the biodiversity monitoring. This mapping has also included woody biomass measurement as the basis for carbon payment scheme development.	
<b>Output 3.</b> The capacity of community organisations (PFM Associations) and government agencies for the effective conservation of coffee biodiversity using PFM is significantly strengthened.	60 communities (gots) in 14 kebeles (lowest administrative units) implementing PFM for forest and coffee biodiversity conservation through their local PFM Associations over their recognised forest areas and reporting effective support from government extension staff and districts experts.	Legal basis for PFM application is still being completed, but close to completion.	
Activity 3.1 Training in participatory processes, PFM, CBO management, leadership etc		Training in forest resource assessment was complete in 12 gots, while training in forest management planning was completed in 20 gots. (These are steps in the PFM process.)	
Activity 3.2 Training in joint planning, monitoring and evaluation		(This has not been undertaken as the community institutions were not formally established with elected committee members to date.)	
Activity 3.3 Training & development of extension materials		Training has been provided to government and community groups in PFM, participatory processes, biodiversity issues. PRA tools. GIS and GPS handling, and CBNRM	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2012 - March 2013	Actions required/planned for next period
<p><b>Output 4.</b> Community based PFM institutions for biodiversity conservation, sustainable forest management, and marketing of forest products and services established and operating sustainably.</p>	<p>Twelve community institutions (PLCs and Cooperatives) have legal establishment documents signed by government officials.</p> <p>Community institutions are operating and effective in terms of forest management, biodiversity conservation and marketing of forest products and carbon.</p>	<p>Institutional development for marketing is under consideration with various models being reviewed. Care in choice is essential for commercial success.</p> <p>PFM got level groups will be legalised once the wereda level PFM Association has been chosen and will soon be legalised.</p>	
<p>Activity 4.1. Training &amp; support for PFM CBOs, PLCs and Coops</p>		<p>(This has not been undertaken as the community and marketing institutions were not established in this period.)</p>	
<p>Activity 4.2. Development of byelaws and regulations for CBOs</p>		<p>Regulations for the woreda FMA have been prepared and endorsed by a General Assembly; internal byelaws for Got level FMAs have been drafted and will be endorsed by each Got immediately after signing of PFM agreement with the government.</p>	
<p>Activity 4.3 Legalisation of CBOs</p>		<p>This is being progressed and legalisation from the woreda FMA to the got level FMAs will be completed in June</p>	
<p>Activity 4.4 Support for operation of CBOs</p>		<p>(This has not been undertaken as the marketing institutions were not established in this period.)</p>	
<p><b>Output 5.</b> Viable forest product based enterprises operating with improved market linkages and services established and providing livelihood benefits without conflict with conservation goals. Carbon payments generating income for government and communities.</p>	<p>At least two forest product based enterprises operating.</p> <p>Carbon payment agreements made and implemented.</p> <p>No negative impacts on conservation goals for forests and coffee biodiversity.</p>	<p>Coffee and honey are being explored as the bases of such enterprises.</p> <p>Carbon payments will be explored once the P{IN and PDD are completed</p> <p>The grass roots approach of the project which is the basis of PFM is highly appreciated by the communities and building positive support for forest maintenance. (This contrasts with recent burning of parts of the core zone in a Biosphere Reserve in another district in SW Ethiopia by disgruntled local communities.)</p>	
<p>Activity 5.1 Support production of NTFPs, focusing on quality &amp; supply</p>		<p>Assessment has been made of the range of potential NTFPs which could be marketed from these forests.</p>	
<p>Activity 5.2 Assess market opportunities &amp; develop strategies and links for CBOs</p>		<p>Marketing of wild forest coffee is being explored</p>	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2012 - March 2013	Actions required/planned for next period
Activity 5.3 Explore incentive payments for environmental services, e.g. carbon		Carbon assessment is completed and provides the basis for preparing PIN and PDD as needed for submission to Plan Vivo	
Activity 5.4 Facilitate links with funding mechanisms for PES & implement pilot		To be applied after 5.3 completed	
<b>Output 6.</b> Dissemination to other government and civil society agencies in Ethiopia and elsewhere of fine-tuned PFM methods for development of policy and practice of in situ biodiversity conservation.	Practice and policy development.  Dissemination documents prepared and despatched.  Conferences and meetings attended to undertake dissemination.	Major progress with new legislation has been made with new forest proclamation allowing PFM. Regulations remain an issue.  Lessons not yet clear to allow dissemination  Only minor activities. Dissemination awaits clarification of the lessons from the field activities.	
Activity 6.1. Dissemination of project findings		Presentations for local stakeholders and regular reporting take place. There is plan to communicate project findings in the future to the regional government. Recently the Project Coordinator made a one and a half minute air time on Southern television on the occasion of establishing woreda FMA.	
Activity 6.2. Contribution to policy debates		The Project Coordinator has been involved in the discussions at the regional level with respect to the revision of the forest legislation. This is continuing with development of regulations which will be the basis of applying the legislation	
Activity 6.3 Advocacy on specific issues, especially forest policy, PFM for biodiversity conservation and PES		These materials will be developed once field experience is obtained, monitored and assessed.	
Activity 6.4 Liaison with biosphere projects		Contacts have been established with the three biosphere projects in the SW of Ethiopia and an assessment of this experience is to be undertaken in April 2013.	

## Annex 2 Project's full current logframe

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Goal:</p> <p>Effective contribution in support of the implementation of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (CMS), as well as related targets set by countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources.</p>			
<p>Sub-Goal:</p> <p>Afromontane forests of south-west Ethiopia and associated <i>Coffea arabica</i> biodiversity are effectively conserved and providing ongoing community wellbeing and livelihood benefits</p>	<p>Decrease in forest degradation.</p> <p>Maintenance of <i>Coffea arabica</i> biodiversity.</p> <p>Forest based livelihood benefits generated sustainably.</p>	<p>Time series remote sensing.</p> <p>Biodiversity assessment in project areas.</p> <p>Livelihood surveys.</p>	
<p>Purpose</p> <p>Key areas of Amora Gedel and Kontir Berhan 'wild coffee' forests are conserved and providing sustainable livelihood benefits through Participatory Forest Management (PFM) by the local communities with full government support</p>	<p>Area of forest under PFM management with specific conservation aims / agreements with government.</p> <p>Sustainable livelihood benefits being generated from PFM forests.</p> <p>Number of communities / population engaged in PFM for conservation and benefitting from sustainable forest based livelihood benefits.</p>	<p>Mapping of project PFM areas and communities with PFM agreements. Listing of agreements registered.</p> <p>Survey of livelihoods in communities in project area.</p>	<p>Government policy remains supportive of PFM, community involvement in biodiversity conservation and of biodiversity conservation in south-west Ethiopia.</p>



Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Outputs</p> <p>1. The forest and coffee biodiversity maintained by the application of fine-tuned Participatory Forest Management (PFM) approach applied by the local communities and officially recognised by regional and local governments.</p>	<p>Forest and coffee biodiversity maintained in Amora Gedal and Kontir Berhan forests against baseline assessment.</p> <p>Coverage of intervention forests under PFM.</p> <p>Communities applying PFM for forest conservation.</p> <p>Recognition of PFM for biodiversity conservation in legislation /policy and by agreements with local government offices.</p>	<p>Biodiversity assessments.</p> <p>PFM agreements and records of their operations for biodiversity conservation and areas of forest covered.</p> <p>Government legislation, policies and policy practice, including PFM agreements signed with local government offices.</p>	<p>Political will continues to involve communities in biodiversity conservation in forest areas.</p>
<p>2. Participatory forest management (PFM) methods developed in the region, are adapted, fine-tuned and applied specifically for in situ conservation of forests and coffee biodiversity</p>	<p>PFM Methods fine tuned and applied for in situ conservation of forest and coffee biodiversity, with feedback from field experience incorporated in revision of methods.</p>	<p>PFM for Biodiversity Manual and revisions.</p> <p>Reports of application of PFM for biodiversity conservation from community institutions (PFM Associations) and government.</p>	<p>PFM remains an approved and legally supported method in the region.</p>
<p>3. The capacity of community organisations (PFM Associations) and government agencies for the effective conservation of coffee biodiversity using PFM is significantly strengthened.</p>	<p>60 communities (gots) in 14 kebeles (lowest administrative units) implementing PFM for forest and coffee biodiversity conservation through their local PFM Associations over their recognised forest areas and reporting effective support from government extension staff and districts experts.</p>	<p>Training of communities, PFM Associations and government staff.</p> <p>Reports of the activities of PFM Associations.</p> <p>Survey of performance and capacity of PFM Associations.</p> <p>Record of government support to PFM Associations and assessment of performance.</p>	<p>Stability of staff in government agencies and stability in leadership and representation in community organisations.</p>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
4. Community based PFM institutions for biodiversity conservation, sustainable forest management, and marketing of forest products and services established and operating sustainably.	<p>Twelve community institutions (PLCs and Cooperatives) have legal establishment documents signed by government officials.</p> <p>Community institutions are operating and effective in terms of forest management, biodiversity conservation and marketing of forest products and carbon.</p>	<p>Legal documents of PFMAs</p> <p>Record of PFMAs operations from their meeting minutes.</p> <p>Records of marketing of forest products.</p>	Supportive government and policy environment for community-based institutions.
5. Viable forest product based enterprises operating with improved market linkages and services established and providing livelihood benefits without conflict with conservation goals. Carbon payments generating income for government and communities.	<p>At least two forest product based enterprises operating.</p> <p>Carbon payment agreements made and implemented.</p> <p>No negative impacts on conservation goals for forests and coffee biodiversity.</p>	<p>Survey of forest product based enterprises.</p> <p>Assessment of their sustainability and impacts, both socio-economically and environmentally.</p> <p>Carbon payment agreements in place and assessed.</p>	<p>Favourable market opportunities for coffee, forest products and carbon.</p> <p>Support from regional and national governments for carbon payment with benefits reaching the communities.</p>
6. Dissemination to other government and civil society agencies in Ethiopia and elsewhere of fine-tuned PFM methods for development of policy and practice of in situ biodiversity conservation.	<p>Practice and policy development.</p> <p>Dissemination documents prepared and despatched.</p> <p>Conferences and meetings attended to undertake dissemination.</p>	Records of developments in policy and practice of in situ conservation practice, dissemination meetings and communication process.	Political will for civil society and community participation in biodiversity conservation and related policy development.

**Activities** (details in workplan)

1. Forest & Biodiversity Maintained as PFM Applied

PFM training applied

Forest demarcation for PFM groups

PFM Agreements signed

2. PFM Fine Tuned for *in situ* conservation

PFM fine tuned with respect to community-based biodiversity conservation

Appropriate extension materials developed, distributed and applied

Baseline mapping for the application of PFM

3. Capacity of Govt Staff & Communities strengthened, etc.

Training in participatory processes, PFM, CBO management, leadership etc

Training in joint planning, monitoring and evaluation

Training & development of extension materials

4. Community-based PFM institutions, etc

Training & support for PFM CBOs, PLCs and Coops

Development of byelaws and regulations for CBOs

Legalisation of CBOs

Support for operation of CBOs

5. Viable forest product based enterprises operating etc

Support production of NTFPs, focusing on quality & supply

Assess market opportunities & develop strategies and links for CBOs

Explore incentive payments for environmental services, e.g. carbon

Facilitate links with funding mechanisms for PES & implement pilot

6. Dissemination to other government etc

Dissemination of project findings

Contribution to policy debates

Advocacy on specific issues, especially forest policy, PFM for biodiversity conservation and PES

Liaison with biosphere projects

18. Provide a project implementation timetable that shows the key milestones in project activities. Complete the following table as appropriate to describe the intended workplan for your project.

Activity	No of Months	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
1.1 PFM training applied	2	x	x			x			x			x	
1.2 Forest demarcation for PFM groups	8		x	x	x								
1.3 PFM Agreements signed	3			x	x	x							
2.1 PFM fine tuned with respect to community-based biodiversity conservation	2	x	x				x						
2.2 Appropriate extension materials developed, distributed and applied	2		x					x					
2.3 Baseline mapping for the application of PFM	2	x											
3.1 Training in participatory processes, PFM, CBO management, leadership etc	2	x		x		x			x				
3.2 Training in joint planning, monitoring and evaluation	2			x			x	x				x	
3.3 Training & development of extension materials	2		x			x				x			
4.1 Training & support for PFM CBOs, PLCs and Coops	3			x	x		x	x		x			
4.2 Development of byelaws and regulations for CBOs	1			x	x			x					
4.3 Legalisation of CBOs	1				x	x							
4.4 Support for operation of CBOs.	2					x		x		x			
5.1 Support production of NTFPs, focusing on quality & supply	3					x	x	x	x	x			
5.2 Assess market opportunities & develop strategies and links for CBOs	2			x			x		x				
5.3 Explore incentive payments for environmental services, e.g. carbon	2				x		x		x				
5.4 Facilitate links with funding mechanisms for PES & implement pilot	3								x	x	x	x	x
6.1 Dissemination of project findings.	2				x				x			x	x
6.2 Contribution to policy debates	2				x		x		x			x	
6.3 Advocacy on specific issues, esp. forest policy, PFM for biodiversity conservation and PES	2				x		x		x			x	
6.4 Liaison with biosphere projects	3				x		x		x		x		x

### Annex 3 Onwards – supplementary material (optional but encouraged as evidence of project achievement)

This may include outputs of the project, but need not necessarily include all project documentation. For example, the abstract of a conference would be adequate, as would be a summary of a thesis rather than the full document. If we feel that reviewing the full document would be useful, we will contact you again to ask for it to be submitted.

It is important, however, that you include enough evidence of project achievement to allow reassurance that the project is continuing to work towards its objectives. Evidence can be provided in many formats (photos, copies of presentations/press releases/press cuttings, publications, minutes of meetings, reports, questionnaires, reports etc) and you should ensure you include some of these materials to support the annual report text.

SEE SEPARATE FILES

#### Checklist for submission

	Check
<b>Is the report less than 5MB?</b> If so, please email to <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> putting the project number in the Subject line.	yes
<b>Is your report more than 5MB?</b> If so, please discuss with <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	no
<b>Have you included means of verification?</b> You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	Yes – 3 separate files
<b>Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report?</b> If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number.	Not unless requested
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	Compiled from joint material
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	yes
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	