Darwin Initiative Main Project 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

Darwin Project Information

Project Reference	20-010
Project Title	Social Assessment of Protected Areas (SAPA)
Host Country/ies	Gabon, Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia, Zambia
Contract Holder Institution	IIED
Partner institutions	**Global:** International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
	Global: United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)
	Global and Gabon: Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)
	Global, Kenya & Uganda: Fauna & Flora International (FFI)
	Gabon: Agence National des Parc Nationaux (ANPN)
	Kenya: Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT)
	Uganda: Uganda Wildlife Authority
	Ethiopia: Population, Health and Environment (PHE) and Ethiopia Wildlife Conservation Authority
	Zambia: Copperbelt University, Global Environment Facility
Darwin Grant Value	£239,393
Funder (DFID/Defra)	DFID
Start/end dates of project	1/4/13-31/3/16
Reporting period (e.g., Apr 2015 – Mar 2016) and number (e.g., Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	1st April 2014 – 31st March 2015 (annual report #2)
Project Leader name	Phil Franks, IIED
Project website/blog/Twitter	http://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-areas
Report author(s) and date	Phil Franks, April 29th 2014

1. Project Rationale

Natural forests, wildlife and fisheries make an important contribution to the well-being of more than a billion people, and a growing proportion of these resources are being protected through designation as a protected area (PA). In recent years the definition of a PA has been extended with the recognition of governance type as a second dimension of the categorisation alongside management objective. This is leading to the official recognition of large numbers of PAs that are under private or community management that were to date unrecognised although many have a long track record of effective conservation. Efforts to expand the coverage of PAs have also been given new momentum by an agreement on ambitious global targets for PA coverage – 17% of the terrestrial area and 10% of coastal and marine areas by 2020 (Aichi target 11).

Interest in the positive contribution of PAs to human well-being, and concerns over negative social impacts is not new, and numerous studies have been conducted by natural and social scientists using wide range of different methodologies. What has changed in recent years in the increase in political commitment to address issues of social equity in PA conservation. Initially agreed at the 2003 World Parks Congress (WPC), this principle has been further elaborated in many different policy instruments at national and international levels, including the CBD Aichi target on expansion of PA systems which calls for the targets to be achieved through *effectively and equitably managed systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures*.

Promoting equity and benefit sharing in the establishment and management of PAs is a goal of the CBD Programme of Work on PAs (goal 2.1), and recent reviews of progress have identified this goal as needing much more attention. The first activity under this goal is: *Assess the economic and socio-cultural costs, benefits and impacts arising from the establishment and maintenance of protected areas, particularly for indigenous and local communities, and adjust policies to avoid and mitigate negative impacts, and where appropriate compensate costs and equitably share benefits in accordance with the national legislation.* Since WPC in 2003 there have been many studies of the costs and benefits of protected areas but mostly using complex and costly methodologies that are not easily replicated, and often with a process that lacks broad stakeholder ownership and thus broad commitment to respond to the findings. The need for simpler, more participatory approaches is the focus of SAPA.

The 2011-2020 Strategic Plan for the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) set an agenda for biodiversity conservation to contribute towards poverty eradication. Protected areas are important for CBD parties to deliver this objective and the 10th Conference of Parties encouraged parties to 'support initiatives on the role of protected areas in poverty alleviation' (Decision X31). SAPA will help managers of all types of protected areas (i.e. covering the full range of objectives and governance type) assess their contribution to poverty alleviation, and identify policies and measures to enhance this contribution.

SAPA as a concept began in 2006, supported by a consortium of IIED, CARE International, UNEP-WCMC and The Nature Conservancy (TNC). During the period 2006-2011 the initiative supported a series of expert meetings through which the goals and approach were clarified (a focus on rapid, low cost methods), a comprehensive review of relevant methods was conducted and published (see http://pubs.iied.org/14589IIED.html?c=biodiv) a first draft of a framework and process was developed, and initial discussions were held with IUCN and others on the linkage between SAPA and PA Management Effectiveness (PAME) assessment. This project builds on this strong foundation.

The World Parks Congress of 2014 has further highlighted the need for social assessment and governance assessment (also addressed by SAPA). This is reflected in the following extracts from the recommendations of the governance stream in the "Sydney Promise":

- enhance governance for the conservation of nature through participatory processes of inquiry, assessment……………… (recommendation #1)
- develop guidance on: assessing the "equitable management" dimension of Aichi Target 11 (recommendation #11)

This project directly addresses both recommendations.

2.   Project Partnerships

- **Gabon:** As planned, we have worked with WCS and the national PA Authority, ANPN, in the use of SAPA at the first field site – now completed – and WCS is in the middle of the process at the second site in Gabon. We are currently in discussion with both partners on a second phase that would extend the work to 4 other PAs in Gabon and both ANPN and WCS seem keen to do this.

- **Kenya:** As planned, work at the first site in Kenya (Ol Pejeta Conservancy) took place in partnership with the management of the Conservancy and FFI and has now been completed. Results were presented to the Board of the Conservancy in November 2014. Building on the success of this initial work we have been able to establish a partnership with the nearby Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT) and work is currently underway at the Sera Conservancy that is supported by NRT. The main challenge with NRT which we frequently encounter is the view that they are "already doing it". However more in depth discussion revealed that the social surveys that they are conducting have a very different objective (supporting the work of NRT) versus SAPA which focuses on addressing the information needs of PA management.

- **Uganda:** Uganda has been brought into the project as a substitute for Liberia because of the Ebola epidemic making Liberia in accessible. Work is focused on Ruwenzori National Park where both the Uganda Wildlife Authority and local government have been very actively engaged in the work alongside FFI. We are currently in discussion with UWA and FFI on a second phase that would extend the work to 4 other PAs in Uganda and both UWA and FFI seem keen to do this.

- **Ethiopia:** In late 2014 Population, Health and Environment (PHE) Ethiopia heard about SAPA and approached us regarding a site in Ethiopia. PHE has an ongoing project supporting three PAs in Ethiopia to introduce shared governance arrangements and supporting local livelihood interventions. We plan to start with one PA (Awash National Park) and then extend to the other sites all being well. The national PA Authority is supportive of the work and interested in a follow on project to extend to other sites. SAPA work in Ethiopia is funded from DFID's Accountable Grant to IIED.

- **Zambia:** Discussions with Brian Child, advisor to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on the social dimension of GEF investments in PAs, have led to interest in testing SAPA at two sites that they support in Zambia in partnership with the Copperbelt University in Zambia. GEF has been looking for something like SAPA so this is a partnership with great potential. SAPA work in Zambia is funded by GEF with the exception of technical input from IIED which is funded from DFID's Accountable Grant to IIED.

At the global level SAPA is being implemented in partnership with UNEP-WCMC. This partnership builds on a history of collaboration on a number of projects. Over the last year WCMC staff have provided substantial technical input, in particular on the development of the SAPA methodology and the relationship between SAPA, PA governance assessment and Protected Area Management Effectiveness Evaluation.

At global level WCS and FFI are also key partners, bringing substantial expertise in the social dimension of conservation and specifically the assessment of social impacts of conservation activities. As members of an ad hoc technical advisory group, staff of both organisations are making a substantial contribution to the development of the SAPA methodology.

IUCN is a key partner both in terms of engagement of the IUCN Secretariat and its regional and country offices, and the IUCN Commissions (WCPA and CEESP). Building on earlier work, strong collaboration has been established with communities of practice on PA Management Effectiveness and PA Governance Assessment, in particular with a view to integration of SAPA with PA governance assessment.

3.   Project Progress

The following sections report on activities under the five outputs that were planned for year 2 as indicated in the implementation timetable in annex 2 (which is an amended version of the original plan that was approved in November 2014)

3.1   Progress in carrying out project activities

Activity 1.3: Development of additional tools

The three core tools of SAPA that we developed in first draft form in early 2014 (focus group discussion, users matrix, household survey template) were further refined in mid 2014. In addition three additional tools have also been developed – stakeholder analysis tool, assessment plan template, and the focus group discussion for results verification. All of these tools continue to be work in progress and will be further refined up to the point where the final output of this project is produced in December 2015.

Activity 1.4: Field testing

The list of PA's identified for SAPA fieldwork is now as follows:

Country	Protected area	Management category	Governance type	Status
Kenya	Ol Pejeta Conservancy	VI	Private	Completed in September 2014
	Sera Conservancy	VI	Community	Starting June 2015
Gabon	Monte de Cristal	II	Government	Completed in March 2015
	Loango	II	Government	Started March 2015
Uganda	Ruwenzori	II	Government	Started January 2015
Ethiopia	Awash	II	Shared	Starting June 2015
Zambia	Kafue	II VI	Government Community	Starting June 2015

Kenya and Gabon were in the project plan from the start and work has proceeded without problem. Uganda has be brought in to replace Liberia where work was prevented by the Ebola outbreak. The other two countries specified in the project proposal were The Gambia and Senegal where in-country work was planned to be undertaken piggy-backing on a climate change adaptation project implemented by WCMC (with costs funded by this WCMC project as part of WCMC's co-financing of this project). However as we developed the SAPA framework and methodology it became clear that piggy-backing on another process was not a viable option - in particular from the perspective of the length of time local communities would have to commit to the process. For this reason we looked for and have found alternative sites in Ethiopia and Zambia where SAPA is not piggy-backing on other community-level activities. In country work in these countries is being funded with IIED co-funding. Following this annual report we will submit a change request that presents our updated co-funding plan for the project. There is no change to our plan for using the Darwin element of the budget.

Activity 1.5: Revision of draft framework and guidance

The first version of SAPA guidance that was attached to the year 1 report was further developed during the period April-September 2014 based on experience emerging from the first two field testing sites and published in November 2014 as chapters 1 and 2 of an IIED discussion paper: http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html.

Activity 1.6: Present and consult on draft guidance at World Parks Congress

At the World Parks Congress there was an event devoted to SAPA where the methodology and results from the first two field sites (Kenya and Gabon) were presented and discussed. The event was well attended (approximately 50). Several participants indicated an interest in trying the SAPA methodology – notably from Philippines, India and South Africa. Several of the points raised in discussion have influenced subsequent development of the methodology – notably the need to integrate more with PA governance assessment, and the importance of ensuring that communities participating in SAPA have a good knowledge of the history of the PA so as to be able to reflect on their current experience in relation to changes that have taken place over time (e.g. with respect to rights of access).

Activity 1.7a Translation into French and Spanish of draft guidance

The core tools (focus group discussion, users' template, household survey template) have been translated into French but not Spanish since we have no Spanish speaking countries participating in SAPA at this stage.

Activity 2.1: Implementation of SAPA framework in one site in each host country

As noted in the year 1 report and the amended implementation plan, a decision was taken during year 1 to have two cycles of field-work in order to allow for more iterative development of the SAPA assessment methodology. The first cycle included one site in Kenya and one in Gabon and work has been concluded as planned by the end of this reporting period.

Activity 2.2: Roll out of approach to other sites where appropriate

A second cycle of fieldwork started in January 2015 and was due to have been completed by the end of June 2015 but has had to be extended to the end of September for a variety of reasons (delayed onset of rains in Kenya, a national election in Ethiopia, and the long process for GEF contracting in Zambia). However all sites are on track to have completed the SAPA assessment process by September 30th 2015.

Activity 2.3: Documentation of lessons learned from implementation in each site/country

Lessons learned from implementation at the first two sites in Kenya and Gabon were documented in chapter 3 of the report published in November 2014: http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html. As planned (activity 2.4) a further publication of lessons learned along with a synthesis of results will be produced by the end of the project.

Activity 5.1: Project web pages designed and uploaded

SAPA web-pages are located within the IIED web-site (see http://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-areas).

Activity 5.2: Project web pages regularly updated and all new outputs uploaded

During this reporting year the publication mentioned in activity 2.3 above has been added to the SAPA web page along with a publication on synergies between PA management effectiveness evaluation and social and governance assessment that is closely related to the theme of this project although developed with other funding: http://pubs.iied.org/14647IIED.html. In addition two blogs have been produced: http://www.iied.org/piloting-social-assessment-protected-areas-some-initial-reflections and http://www.iied.org/ensuring-equitable-management-protected-areas-were-still-defining-issues

3.2   Progress towards project outputs

Output 1: SAPA framework document including tools and guidance material

As per the approved revised activity plan (annex 2), SAPA tools and guidance will be published by the end of December 2015 as one in the series of IUCN Best Practice Protected Areas Guidelines. SAPA tools and guidance will form the second part of this publication while the first part will comprise chapters on key concepts, and experience to date in assessing the social impacts of PAs.   A first draft of the SAPA guidance and tools has already been produced (chapter 2 of the November 2014 publication: http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html) which describes the SAPA methodology in terms of the following four main elements: analytical framework; experimental design; process; and tool-kit. While the analytical framework and experimental design are unlikely to change significantly the process and tool-kit remain very much work in progress and will be further refined based on experience from the second cycle of field testing that will be concluded in September 2015. This is a year behind the original target date reflected in the second indicator for output 1, but for reasons explained earlier and in last year's report we believe this will make for a much stronger output.

Output 2. Report documenting implementation and lessons learned from SAPA process at project sites

Chapter 3 of the November 2014 publication (http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html) describes and discusses lessons learned from the first two sites in Gabon and Kenya where work had been largely concluded by September 2014. Thus the target in the second indicator for this output has been met. However with work at a further 5 sites currently ongoing or about to start we plan to produce and disseminate a second lessons learned publication by the end of the project as per the revised workplan. As noted earlier, we have had to make changes to the list of countries where we are working for a variety of reasons but this has not any way undermined the performance of the project. On the contrary, since the new countries came to us and are keen to extend the work to other PAs in the country, we are probably in a stronger position.

Output 5. Dedicated SAPA web page(s) within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group web portal

As explained in the year 1 report, we have placed the SAPA web-page within the IIED website rather than the PCLG website. Over the course of this second year of the project we have produced two comprehensive publications and two blogs which are all accessible through the SAPA web page. Thus we have met the targets in the indicators for this output. These indicators could be strengthened by including information on the number of downloads of each document from the IIED website. We will make a point of including this information in the final end of project report.

3.3   Progress towards the project Outcome

Although we are slightly behind in terms of meeting specific targets at outcome level (see below), in terms of achieving the main intent of this outcome the project is very much on track. At the two sites where the process has been completed (Gabon, Kenya) the PA management has been very satisfied with the process. Furthermore, and equally important, other key stakeholders – in particular local communities and local government - at local level have been very satisfied. In Gabon it was observed that the closing workshop of the SAPA process was the first time that such a meeting of local stakeholders and PA management had taken place.

Empowerment of local stakeholders is proving to be a key dimension of the impact of SAPA. This relates to a closely related research theme at IIED – advancing equity in conservation and REDD+ (see: http://www.iied.org/equity-justice-ecosystem-services-what-do-we-mean). Under this theme IIED and its partners are developing a framework to better understand and assess equity that has three dimensions – recognition, procedure and distribution. SAPA is focused

primarily on the distribution dimension while PA governance assessment focuses on the other two. Hence this equity framework explains the linkage of social and governance assessment at site level, and provides a clear link between these assessments and Aichi Target 11.

The project outcome statement emphasises benefits for poor and traditionally marginalised groups including women. The SAPA methodology is proving strong in this respect since differentiation of results by gender and poverty status is fundamental to the methodology. In both Kenya and Gabon this has enabled identification of PA benefits and costs that are more significant for women and/or poorer people which should, in turn, enable PA management to deliver more equitable management from both a pro-poor and gender perspective.

In terms of specific outcome indicators progress is as follows:
- By year 3 PA managers in at least 5 protected area sites have under-taken social assessments using the SAPA framework and guidance developed through the project

By the start of year 3 (April 2015) SAPA assessments had been completed or at least started in 4 sites. The fifth site that should have started by then was the second site in Kenya which was delayed due to the drought situation which made it impossible to start fieldwork before the start of the next rain season.

- By year 3 social assessment process in at least 5 PA sites has resulted in improved awareness and willingness of PA managers to address negative effects

Since awareness raising takes place at the beginning of the SAPA process it is fair to say that 4 sites had achieved this element of the indicator by the start of year 3. Willingness to address negative impacts is a different issue and can really only be assessed through actions taken in response to the findings of SAPA. We will obtain this information through a questionnaire which will be sent to every site 6 months after completing the SAPA process, i.e. to be reported in the end of project report.

- By the end of project PA managers in at least 3 sites adapt their conservation management strategies to promote net positive well-being outcomes compared with pre-assessment

We have some anecdotal evidence of this from the first Kenya site where PA managers have made efforts to allocate PA-related benefits (investment in education and health) more evenly across and within local communities to counter bias that was uncovered by SAPA. We will collect evidence on this more systematically through the questionnaire mentioned above.

- At World Parks Congress in 2014 social assessment approach endorsed by CBD and WCPA and wide uptake recommended

Our efforts to influence the outcome of the World Parks Congress (WPC) focused on the "equitable management" element of Aichi target 11 and to this end we made a significant contribution to recommendation #11 of the governance stream: *develop guidance on: assessing the "equitable management" dimension of Aichi Target 11*.

- By end of project, uptake of social assessment extends beyond project sites to national systems of protected areas in pilot countries

This will be achieved in Zambia where the Global Environment Facility (GEF) is supporting the use of SAPA at two sites whereas only one site was planned. This partnership with GEF (initiated by a discussion at the World Parks Congress) is a major opportunity for this project not only in Zambia but also for other countries. GEF has been looking for a simple tool to help PAs that are supported by GEF funding assess their social impacts and believes SAPA may be the right tool for this purpose. The PA authorities of the other four countries have all expressed interest in extending use of SAPA to other PAs but as yet do not have firm plans to do so.

3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

Assumptions at outcome level	
Assumption 1	Assessment procedure developed accepted as scientifically and politically robust while being within the capacity of site managers to implement
Assumption 2	Political will and capacity exists at site level to adapt management plans and procedures according to outcomes of social assessment process
Assumption 3	National governments receptive to learning from project sites and rolling out approach to national PA systems
Assumption 4	CBD and WCPA influence and authority sufficient to encourage wider uptake
Assumptions at output level	
Assumption 1	Project team are able to develop a social assessment framework and guidance that is of sufficient quality to lend itself to field implementation in different contexts
Assumption 2	Country partners are able to understand assessment process and roll out approach to multiple field sites
Assumption 3	Field testing sites remain positive about the project, are willing to test framework and to share lessons learned

At output level the assumptions have already been validated and thus are unlikely to prove problematic. The assumptions at outcome level are more challenging. However at this point in time the signs are positive that these outcome assumptions remain valid providing that we pay close attention to these issues (see section 8). The exception may be the last because there is no obvious opportunity to get CBD and/or WCPA to exert their influence. However, we believe that this is not crucial to the success of the project as there are other strategies to encourage uptake of SAPA which may in any case prove more effective, e.g. via GEF and the international conservation NGOs that are already partnering in the project.

3.5 Impact: achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty alleviation

In terms of biodiversity conservation it is too early to expect to see concrete evidence. However we do have a growing body of evidence of the validity of the theory of change that links the outcomes to impact. Essentially this is that minimising negative social and economic impacts and maximizing positive impacts for local communities – in other words increasing *equity* in conservation - will increase support for conservation within local communities and thus the *effectiveness* of conservation efforts. Conversely, as shown by recent research conducted by IIED in Uganda, a sense of inequity can be one of the main factors motivating illegal resource use. Increasing equity in conservation is a more realistic ambition than expecting conservation to alleviate poverty, and SAPA is tool that is specifically designed to achieve this.

Whether increased equity will translates into poverty alleviation is a separate and more context-dependent issue. At the Kenya site, Ol Pejeta Conservancy, the PA has substantial revenues from tourism and shares part of this with local communities in the form of support for education, health services and agriculture. These benefits clearly contribute to poverty alleviation and information from SAPA is enabling PA management to ensure that these benefits are more widely distributed versus the current situation where there has been some degree of elite capture, i.e. more benefits going to poorer people. On the cost side, SAPA has highlighted the significance of crop damage by baboons and elephants which can be a very significant cause of poverty, and hopefully PA management will take further steps over the next year to reduce the level of crop damage.

In Gabon the Monts de Cristal ~National Park, created 10 years ago, has no revenue that it could share with local communities and, from the community perspective, is almost entirely negative in terms of social impacts. The big issue here is crop damage by elephants which affects most people and causes very substantial losses. When asked in the SAPA household survey if food security had changed in the last 10 years, 76% reported a worsening situation and that crop damage by wildlife (mainly elephants) is the main factor. This problem was already well known but SAPA has provided more credible evidence. Assuming this results in greater efforts by the PA authority to address this problem, and the signs are that it will, then SAPA will be contributing to poverty alleviation but in the sense of reducing negative social impacts of the PA that are currently exacerbating poverty.

Monts de Cristal is by no means exceptional. Many PAs have negative social impacts that are a significant cause of poverty in PA adjacent communities. That said, it is important to make a distinction here between poverty and sustainable development. Whilst some PAs may alleviate poverty for very few local people, and may be a cause of poverty for many, PAs also provide ecosystem services that underpin sustainable development in PA-adjacent communities and also at larger scales. This is the complex reality of poverty and protected areas and SAPA is making an important contribution in helping PA managers to better understand and work with this reality, and better manage the inevitable trade-offs.

4. Project support to the Conventions (CBD, CMS and/or CITES)

SAPA directly supports the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) and specifically activity 2.1.1 of the PoWPA: *assess the economic and socio-cultural costs, benefits and impacts arising from the establishment and maintenance of protected areas, particularly for indigenous and local communities, and adjust policies to avoid and mitigate negative impacts, and where appropriate compensate costs and equitably share benefits in accordance with the national legislation.*

Furthermore, Aichi Target 11 includes a specific commitment to equitable management of PAs. SAPA will help managers of PAs (and associated conservation and development initiatives) to a) understand what is meant by equitable management, b) assess the current allocation of benefits and costs of conservation within and between neighbouring communities, and c) identify policies and measures to increase equity in PA management.

We have not interacted with the host CBD country focal points to date since we are still in the middle of the field testing programme but will do so once this is completed in September 2015.

5. Project support to poverty alleviation

It is too early to be able to detect impact on poverty but we expect that this will be possible to some extent by the end of the project – not through change measured through poverty indicators but at least through mini case studies that look at the social impact of actions that PA management have taken in response to the results from SAPA.

That said, it is important to reiterate the points made in section 3.5 above. The impact of PAs, and changes in PA management on poverty is a complex issue. In some cases PAs currently exacerbate the poverty of some people within PA-adjacent communities and the impact of SAPA will be mostly in terms of reducing these negative social impacts. In other cases where the PA is able to deliver tangible benefits then SAPA should contribute to increasing these benefits or at least ensuring their more equitable distribution within the communities.

In many cases both impact pathways will be relevant. SAPA will also identify key benefits related to ecosystem services that do not contribute to poverty alleviation per se (e.g. clean water) but that underpin the development efforts of other actors within local communities (e.g. water supply projects).

6.   Project support to Gender equity issues

The SAPA methodology is designed to enable results to be disaggregated by gender. This starts with the focus group discussions that identify the significant positive and negative social impacts of the PA where men and women do this impact identification and prioritisation in separate groups. This then enables us to ensure that the household survey explicitly addresses women's priority interests and concerns.

At Ol Pejeta Conservancy in Kenya we found that women attach more importance than men to the school bursaries that are provided by the PA, and that they are more concerned about crop damage by wildlife (while men are relatively more concerned with employment opportunities related to the PA). These patterns are very understandable in the cultural context of that area but more often than not overlooked by "gender blind" conservation and development actors of all sorts. We hope that in responding to SAPA findings Ol Pejeta will be "gender responsive" rather than blind and we will be looking for evidence of this during the final year of the project.

7.   Monitoring and evaluation

The project has a fairly comprehensive set of indicators and arrangements in place to collect output level information. The challenge lies in the collection of information at outcome level especially with the key outcome indicator: *by the end of project PA managers in at least 3 sites adapt their conservation management strategies to promote net positive well-being outcomes compared with pre-assessment.*

The project will need to take proactive steps to collect and analyse information for this indicator. We propose to do this through a small questionnaire that will be sent to each member of the SAPA facilitation team at each site six months after completion of the SAPA assessment.

8.   Lessons learnt

- What worked well?

The multi-stakeholder nature of the SAPA process is proving to be crucial and in particular the fact that the assessment questions that the assessment is designed to address are defined by PA management and other local stakeholders together. This makes it clear from the start that SAPA is designed primarily to serve the information needs of local stakeholders (rather than another extractive study). This builds local ownership, ensure relevance, and hopefully greater commitment to act on the results.

- What didn't work well?

The section of the SAPA household survey that looks at perceptions of equity did not work well. Now that IIED has done a significant amount of work on better understanding the meaning of equity in the context of REDD+ and PAs it is clear that the weakness of the SAPA questionnaire lies in the fact that we ourselves did not have a good enough understanding of equity when we designed the questionnaire. We plan to remedy this is in work at the last two sites that will start in June.

- If you had to do it again, what would you do differently?

Perhaps the biggest challenge with SAPA is reconciling the inherent technical complexity of social impact assessment and demand of conservation scientists for scientific rigour with the limited resources and capacity that in reality exist for doing this kind of work at PA level. We are trying to address this through simplifying the methodology as much as possible and developing more comprehensive step by step guidance. With simplification there is a real tradeoff versus scientific rigour and thus credibility of the results, particularly in the eyes of external stakeholders. In retrospect we started with too much complexity but fortunately the site-level partners had sufficient enthusiasm for the process to have no problem with some complex moments along the way, and we have been able to make significant simplifications for the work at subsequent sites including reducing the process from 10 key steps to 8 steps.

The other key learning has been in relation to assessing the quality of PA governance. Although SAPA was not initially designed to look at governance issues (e.g. local stakeholder participation in decision-making), the user-driven nature of the SAPA process has resulted in governance issues emerging as a priority. This has not presented any problem per se other than the fact that coverage of governance has been patchy because we lacked a framework to guide us. Now that we have recognised this we are starting a new piece of work with separate funding on simple PA governance assessment tools, some of which will be incorporated into the next phase of development and roll-out of SAPA from April 2016.

- What recommendations would you make to others doing similar projects?

Err on the side of local stakeholders need for clarity, simplicity and low cost versus the desire for more complexity of many external stakeholders.

- How are you going to build this learning into the project and future plans?

This point has been addressed within the sections above.

9.   Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)

Comments in the review of the last report needing a response in this report:

- *The budget for Year 1 was reduced significantly as a result of a Change Request submitted to the Darwin Initiative. However, the timetable of activities has not changed. Please update this in the next annual report.* Done.
- *Have local partnerships been established in Gambia and Senegal? Please provide evidence of what efforts are being made to develop/maintain partnerships with local organisations in preparation for the field work in these countries.* As explained in this report we have changed countries to Ethiopia and Zambia and developed partnerships with the NGO Population, Health and Environment (PHE) in Ethiopia and Copperbelt University in Zambia.

10.   Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

11.   Sustainability and legacy

Through our efforts to simplify the SAPA methodology we have been bringing down the cost of the assessment. At present the average cost is around USD 10000 per site excluding the cost of staff time of the facilitating agencies which is assumed to be a contribution in kind. A cost of $10k/site is considerably less than for most other social assessment methodologies but is still a significant amount for many PAs.

In Gabon the project has significant profile within the PA Authority at national level who have actively participated in the process. We have recently floated the idea of a follow-on project to extend SAPA to four new sites and they have expressed strong interest assuming that external funding can be provided. To what extent they might want to roll-out SAPA with just their own resources has not yet been discussed as we have not yet completed work at the second site.

In Kenya the first site was a standalone private conservancy. However the second site is part of a network of community-based conservancies and the programme that supports this network, Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT), is interested in extending SAPA to other conservancies if the work goes well. Kenya Wildlife Service has not participated in the work to date but is aware and interested in participating in the proposed follow-on project which would extend SAPA to four KWS-managed PAs.

In the other three countries (Uganda, Ethiopia and Zambia) fieldwork has only just started. Even so the PA Authorities of the three countries have all expressed interest in the proposed follow-on project.

This project will have an impact at the seven sites where SAPA will have been used. However in terms of longer term impact at scale this project is also about developing the SAPA methodology to the point where it is ready for roll-out to other PAs within the target countries and other countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. It has always been clear that this roll-out process would need some further donor support and IIED is exploring opportunities for this including an application to Darwin later this year for a post project. We aim to secure funding for a three year roll-out phase. After this point our assumption is that further rollout will be funded by PA authorities themselves and/or supporting NGOs as is now the case with PA Management Effectiveness Evaluation.

12. Darwin Identity

All SAPA external communications make explicit reference to funding from the Darwin Initiative. All partners are aware that this project is funded by the Darwin Initiative. Although IIED is providing some additional resources from its DFID Accountable Grant, all activities involve some level of Darwin support and have a Darwin Identity.

We have not enquired as to the level of understanding of the Darwin Initiative at country level.

There is a link to the Darwin Initiative on the SAPA web-page that is within the IIED site.

13. Project Expenditure

Table 1 Project expenditure <u>during the reporting period</u> (1 April 2014 – 31 March 2015)

Project spend since last annual report	2014/15 Grant (£)	2014/15 Total actual Darwin Costs (£)	Variance %		Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)					
Dilys Roe IIED					
Phil Franks IIED					Phil Franks dedicated more time to field visits than was originally envisaged.
Fiona Roberts IIED					
Colleen Corrigan WCMC					Colleen Corrigan moved to Australia to start work on a PhD. Although the PhD is closely related to SAPA her ability to engage with our project has been much reduced and Neil Burgess has stepped in to till the gap
Neil Burgess WCMC					
Helen Schneider FFI					
Rob Small FFI					
Joy Juma FFI					
NRT fieldwork coordinator FFI					
Helen Anthem FFI					Joy Juma left FFI in February and Rob Small took on more fieldwork responsibilities during March as a result.
Uganda fieldwork coordinator FFI					
Uganda fieldwork coordinator FFI					
David Wilkie					

WCS					
Malcolm Starkey WCS					
Gabonese team leader WCS					
Consultancy costs					
Overhead Costs					
Travel and subsistence					
Operating Costs					An IIED organised meeting of the UK-based partners was budgeted in Year 2 but is now scheduled for Q1 of Year 3. In addition FFI spent relatively more on field work travel costs and less on field work operating costs than envisaged.
Capital items (see below)					
Others (see below)					
TOTAL	**113,301**	**111,496**	**-2%**		

This report is against the budget approved after our last change request submitted in November 2015.

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

We will complete this section in the end of project report.

Annex 1:   Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2014-2015

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2014 - March 2015	Actions required/planned for next period
Goal/Impact Protected areas achieve the CBD aspiration of contributing to poverty eradication and sustainable development as PA managers and national policy-makers use tools to improve knowledge of the links between biodiversity conservation actions, sustainable livelihoods and well-being.		Premature to report at this level	███████████████
Purpose/Outcome Protected area managers and policy-makers have access to guidance and tools for assessing the impact of biodiversity conservation actions on local people living in and around protected areas, enabling them, through better engagement, to make informed decisions to minimise negative social and economic effects and maximize positive impacts for local communities. Benefits would be seen at the local level (in particular for the poor and for traditionally marginalised groups, including women) both through empowerment – as they engage with social assessment and articulate their priorities – and through subsequent improved management which takes those priorities into account.	▪ By year 3 PA managers in at least 5 protected area sites have under-taken social assessments using the SAPA framework and guidance developed through the project ▪ By year 3 social assessment process in at least 5 PA sites has resulted in improved awareness and willingness of PA managers to address negative effects ▪ By the end of project PA managers in at least 3 sites adapt their conservation management strategies to promote net positive well-being outcomes compared with pre-assessment ▪ At World Parks Congress in 2014 social assessment approach endorsed by CBD and WCPA and wide uptake recommended ▪ By end of project, uptake of social assessment extends beyond project sites to national systems of protected areas in pilot countries	▪ By the start of year 3 (April 2015) SAPA assessments had been completed or at least started in 4 sites. The fifth site that should have started by then was the second site in Kenya which was delayed due to the drought situation which made it impossible to start fieldwork before the start of the next rain season. ▪ Since awareness raising takes place at the beginning of the SAPA process it is fair to say that 4 sites had achieved this element of the indicator by the start of year 3. Willingness to address negative impacts is a different issue and can really only be assessed through actions taken in response to the findings of SAPA. We will obtain this information through a questionnaire which will be sent to every site 6 months after completing the SAPA process, i.e. to be reported in the end of project report. ▪ We have some anecdotal evidence of this from the first Kenya site where PA managers have made efforts to allocate PA-related benefits (investment in education and health) more evenly across and within local communities to counter bias that was uncovered by SAPA. We will collect evidence on this more systematically through the	The main focus of the final year of the project is completion of field testing by the end of September and then preparation of the two final outputs of the project – IUCN Best Practice Guidelines for social assessment of PAs and a research report that will provide a synthesis of results and experience across the 7 field sites. An additional activity not in the current work-plan is to develop a questionnaire to send to each PA site 6 months after completion of the SAPA assessment to determine what actions have been taken in response to SAPA results. A second additional activity is engaging CBD focal points in the host countries during the last 6 months of the project

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>

■ questionnaire mentioned above.

■ Our efforts to influence the outcome of the World Parks Congress (WPC) focused on the "equitable management" element of Aichi target 11 and to this end we made a significant contribution to recommendation #11 of the governance stream: develop guidance on: assessing the "equitable management" dimension of Aichi Target 11.

■ This will be achieved in Zambia where the Global Environment Facility (GEF) is supporting the use of SAPA at two sites whereas only one site was planned. This partnership with GEF (initiated by a discussion at the World Parks Congress) is a major opportunity for this project not only in Zambia but also for other countries. GEF has been looking for a simple tool to help PAs that are supported by GEF funding assess their social impacts and believes SAPA may be the right tool for this purpose. The PA authorities of the other four countries have all expressed interest in extending SAPA to other PAs but as yet do not have firm plans to do so.

</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1. SAPA framework document including tools and guidance material</td>
<td>

■ By September 2013, revised SAPA framework with tools and guidelines available for field testing

■ By September 2014 final framework incorporates lessons learned from field testing

■ By November 2014 final version translated into French and Spanish and launched at World Parks Congress

</td>
<td colspan="2">As per the approved revised activity plan (annex 2), SAPA tools and guidance will be published by the end of December 2015 as one in the series of IUCN Best Practice Protected Areas Guidelines. SAPA guidance and tools will form the second part of this publication while the first part will comprise chapters on key concepts, and experience to date in assessing the social impacts of PAs. A first draft of the SAPA guidance and tools has already been produced (chapter 2 of the November 2014 publication: http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html) which describes the SAPA methodology as in terms of the following four main elements: analytical framework; experimental design; process; and tool-kit. While the analytical framework and experimental design are unlikely to change significantly, the process and tool-kit remain very much work in progress and will be further refined based on experience from the second cycle of field testing that will be concluded in September 2015. This is a year behind the original target date reflected in the second indicator for output 1, but for reasons given in earlier sections of this report and in last year's report we believe this will make for a much stronger output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">Activity 1.3
Development of additional tools and guidance</td>
<td colspan="2">The three core tools of SAPA that we developed in first draft form in early 2014 (focus group discussion, users matrix, household survey template) were further refined in mid 2014. In addition three additional tools have also been developed – stakeholder analysis</td>
</tr>
</table>

		tool, assessment plan template, and the focus group discussion for verification. All of these tools continue to be work in progress and will be further refined up to the point where the final output of this project is produced in early 2016.
Activity 1.4 Field testing		Kenya and Gabon were in the project plan from the start and work has proceeded without problem. Uganda has be brought in to replace Liberia where work was prevented by the Ebola outbreak. The other two countries specified in the project proposal were The Gambia and Senegal where work was planned to be undertaken piggy-backing on a climate change adaptation project implemented by WCMC (with in country costs funded by this WCMC project as part of WCMC's co-financing of this project). However as we developed the SAPA framework and methodology it became clear that piggy-backing on another process was not a viable option in particular from the perspective of the length of time local communities would have to commit to the process. For this reason we looked for and have found alternative sites in Ethiopia and Zambia
Activity 1.5: Revision of draft framework and guidance		The first version of SAPA guidance that was attached to the year 1 report was further developed during the period April-September 2014 based on experience emerging from the first two field testing sites and published in November 2014 as chapters 1 and 2 of an IIED discussion paper: http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html.
Activity 1.6: Present and consult on draft guidance at World Parks Congress		At the World Parks Congress there was an event devoted to SAPA where the methodology and results from the first two field sites (Kenya and Gabon) were presented and discussed. The event was well attended (approximately 50). Several participants indicated an interest in trying the SAPA methodology – notably from Philippines, India and South Africa. Several of the points raised in discussion have influenced subsequent development of the methodology – notably the need to integrate more with PA governance assessment, and the importance of ensuring that communities participating in SAPA have a good knowledge of the history of the PA so as to be able to reflect on their current experience in relation to changes that have taken place over time (e.g. with respect to rights of access).
Activity 1.7a Translation into French and Spanish of draft guidance		The core tools (focus group discussion, users' template, household survey template) have been translated into French but not Spanish since we have no Spanish speaking countries participating in SAPA at this stage.
Output 2. Report documenting implementation and lessons learned from SAPA process at project sites	▪ By July 2014 fieldwork completed and lessons from each site collated ▪ By September 2014, lessons learned report drafted and posted on project website	Chapter 3 of the November 2014 publication (http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html) describes and discusses lessons learned from the first two sites in Gabon and Kenya where work had been concluded by September 2014. Thus the target in the second indicator for this output has been met. However with work at a further 5 sites currently ongoing or about to start, we plan to produce and disseminate a second lessons learned publication by the end of the project as per the revised workplan. As noted earlier, we have had to make changes to the list of countries where we are working for a variety of reasons but this has not any way undermined the performance of the project. On the contrary, since the new countries came to us and are keen to extend the work to other PAs in the country, we are probably in a stronger position.
Activity 2.1		As noted in the year 1 report and the amended implementation plan, a decision was taken

Implementation of SAPA framework in one site in each host country		during year 1 to have two cycles of field-work in order to allow for more iterative development of the SAPA assessment methodology. The first cycle included one site in Kenya and one in Gabon and work has been concluded as planned by the end of this reporting period
Activity 2.2: Roll out of approach to other sites where appropriate		A second cycle of fieldwork started in January 2015 and was due to have been completed by the end of June 2015 but has had to be extended to the end of September for a variety of reasons (delayed onset of rains in Kenya, a national election in Ethiopia, and the long process for GEF contracting in Zambia). However all sites are on track to have completed the process by September 30th 2015.
Activity 2.3: Documentation of lessons learned from implementation in each site/country		Lessons learned from implementation at the first two sites in Kenya and Gabon were documented in chapter 3 of the report published in November 2014: http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html. As planned (activity 2.4) a further publication of lessons learned from all the sites along with a synthesis of results will be produced by the end of the project.
Output 5. Dedicated SAPA web page(s) within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group web portal	▪ By June 2013 SAPA web site established within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group portal ▪ By September 2014 all project outputs to date uploaded onto website in advance of World Parks Congress ▪ By end of project all outputs available on project website	As explained in the year 1 report, we have placed the SAPA web-page within the IIED website rather than the PCLG website. Over the course of this second year of the project we have produced two comprehensive publications and two blogs which are all accessible through the SAPA web page. Thus we have met the targets in the indicators for this output. These indicators could be strengthened by including information on the number of downloads of each document from the IIED website. We will make a point of including this information in the final end of project report.
Activity 5.1 Project web pages designed and uploaded		SAPA web-pages are located within the IIED web-site (see http://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-areas).
Activity 5.2 Project web pages regularly updated and all new outputs uploaded		During this reporting year the publication mentioned in activity 2.3 above has been added to the SAPA web page along with a publication on synergies between PA management effectiveness evaluation and social and governance assessment: http://pubs.iied.org/14647IIED.html. In addition two blogs have been produced: http://www.iied.org/piloting-social-assessment-protected-areas-some-initial-reflections and http://www.iied.org/ensuring-equitable-management-protected-areas-were-still-defining-issues

Annex 2 Project's full current logframe

Hierarchy of Objectives	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
Goal/Impact Protected areas achieve the CBD aspiration of contributing to poverty eradication and sustainable development as PA managers and national policy-makers use tools to improve knowledge of the links between biodiversity conservation actions, sustainable livelihoods and well-being.			
Purpose/Outcome Protected area managers and policy-makers have access to guidance and tools for assessing the impact of biodiversity conservation actions on local people living in and around protected areas, enabling them, through better engagement, to make informed decisions to minimise negative social and economic effects and maximize positive impacts for local communities. Benefits would be seen at the local level (in particular for the poor and for traditionally marginalised groups, including women) both through empowerment – as they engage with social assessment and articulate their priorities – and through subsequent improved management which takes those priorities into account.	▪ By year 3 PA managers in at least 5 protected area sites have under-taken social assessments using the SAPA framework and guidance developed through the project ▪ By year 3 social assessment process in at least 5 PA sites has resulted in improved awareness and willingness of PA managers to address negative effects ▪ By the end of project PA managers in at least 3 sites adapt their conservation management strategies to promote net positive well-being outcomes compared with pre-assessment ▪ At World Parks Congress in 2014 social assessment approach endorsed by CBD and WCPA and wide uptake recommended ▪ By end of project, uptake of social assessment extends beyond project sites to national systems of protected areas in pilot countries	▪ Reports from each study site on application of SAPA framework and assessment outcomes ▪ Project reports including feedback from protected area managers on outcomes of SAPA process and anticipated changes; field datasheets ▪ Individual PA management plans and/or guidance documents. Feedback from affected communities gathered in project workshops documented in reports ▪ Official text in CBD meetings and within WCPA guidance ▪ Relevant text in CBD national reports and reports to POWPA	▪ Assessment procedure developed accepted as scientifically and politically robust while being within the capacity of site managers to implement ▪ Political will and capacity exists at site level to adapt management plans and procedures according to outcomes of social assessment process ▪ National governments receptive to learning from project sites and rolling out approach to national PA systems ▪ CBD and WCPA influence and authority sufficient to encourage wider uptake
Output 1. SAPA framework document including tools and guidance material	▪ By September 2013, revised SAPA framework with tools and guidelines available for field testing ▪ By September 2014 final framework incorporates lessons learned from field	▪ Publication of agreed outputs (framework and guidance document, policy brief, lessons learned report, journal article)	▪ Project team are able to develop a social assessment framework and guidance that is of sufficient quality to lend itself to field implementation in different contexts

	testing		
	By November 2014 final version translated into French and Spanish and launched at WPC	■ Biannual project progress reports ■ Project website and website content	■ Country partners are able to understand assessment process and roll out approach to multiple field sites
Output 2. Report documenting implementation and lessons learned from SAPA process at project sites	■ By July 2014 fieldwork completed and lessons from each site collated ■ By September 2014, lessons learned report drafted and posted on project website		■ Field testing sites remain positive about the project, are willing to test framework and to share lessons learned
Output 3. Policy brief summarising SAPA process and impacts	■ By March 2015, policy brief drafted based on final SAPA framework and lessons learned from implementation ■ By September 2015 policy brief disseminated via IUCN and CBD channels ■ By September 2015 policy brief disseminated by partner networks		
Output 4. Peer reviewed journal article to promote review of methodology by academic community	■ By March 2015, project partners (including host country partners) produce draft journal article ■ By July 2015 journal article submitted ■ By end of project journal article accepted by, or published in, Oryx or other peer reviewed journal		
Output 5. Dedicated SAPA web page(s) within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group web portal	■ By June 2013 SAPA web site established within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group portal ■ By September 2014 all project outputs to date uploaded onto website in advance of WPC ■ By end of project all outputs available on project website		

Activity	No of	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3

		Months	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Output 1	SAPA framework, toolkit and guidance document													
1.1	Consultation and peer review to refine draft SAPA framework	6	X	X	X									
1.2	Desk research to identify existing tools to support framework	3			X	X								
1.3	Development of additional tools	6			X	X		X						
1.4	Field testing (2 phases)	15				X	X	X	X		X	X		
1.5	Revision of draft framework and development of draft guidance	4						X	X					
1.6	Present and consult on draft guidance at World Parks Congress	1							X					
1.7a	Translation into French and Spanish	2							X				X	
1.7b	Revision and expansion of draft guidance											X	X	
1.8	Dissemination	6											X	X
Output 2	Lessons Learned Report													
2.1	Implementation of SAPA framework in one site in each host country	3				X	X	X						
2.2	Roll out of approach to other sites where appropriate	6								X	X			
2.3	Documentation of lessons learned from implementation in each site/country	9							X	X	X	X		
2.4	Publication and dissemination of lessons learned report	12										X	X	X
2.5	Regional workshop to share implementation findings	1											X	
Output 3	Policy Brief													
3.1	Meeting of project partners to agree policy brief structure	1								X				
3.2	Policy brief produced in collaboration with IIED communications team	3										X		
3.3	Dissemination via IUCN, CBD and partner networks	12											x	X
Output 4	Journal Article													
4.1	Meeting of project partners to agree journal article structure	1								X				
4.2	Journal article drafted and submitted	5								X	X			
Output 5	SAPA web pages													
5.1	Project web pages designed and uploaded	2					X							
5.2	Project web pages regularly updated and all new outputs uploaded	24					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Annex 3 Standard Measures

Code No.	Description	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Year 4 Total	Total to date	Number planned for reporting period	Total planned during the project
1A 1B	Number of people to submit thesis for PhD qualification * Number of people to attain PhD qualification							
2	Number of people to attain Masters qualification (MSc, MPhil etc) *							
3	Number of people to attain other qualifications (ie. Not standard measures 1 or 2 above) *							
4A 4B 4C 4D	Number of undergraduate students to receive training * Number of training weeks to be provided Number of postgraduate students to receive training * Number of training weeks to be provided							
5	Number of people to receive at least one year of training (which does not fall into categories 1-4 above) *							
6A 6B	Number of people to receive other forms of education/training (which does not fall into categories 1-5 above) * Number of training weeks to be provided	7 7	9 9					35 35
7	Number of (i.e.. different types - not volume - of material produced) training materials to be produced for use by host country		1					1
8	Number of weeks to be spent by UK project staff on project work in the host country	2	6					15
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) to be produced for Governments, public authorities, or other implementing agencies in the host country							
10	Number of individual field guides/manuals to be produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording							
11A	Number of papers to be published in peer reviewed journals							1

11B	Number of papers to be submitted to peer reviewed journals						1
12A	Number of computer based databases to be **established** and handed over to the host country						
12B	Number of computer based databases to be **enhanced** and handed over to the host country						
13A	Number of species reference collections to be **established** and handed over to the host country(ies)						
13B	Number of species reference collections to be **enhanced** and handed over to the host country(ies)						
14A	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops to be **organised** to present/disseminate findings	1					1
14B	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops **attended** at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	3					5
15A	Number of national press releases in host country(ies)						4
15B	Number of local press releases in host country(ies)						
15C	Number of national press releases in UK						2
15D	Number of local press releases in UK						
16A	Number of newsletters to be produced						
16B	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(ies)						
16C	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the UK						
17A	Number of dissemination networks to be **established**						
17B	Number of dissemination networks to be **enhanced/ extended**						1
18A	Number of national TV programmes/features in host country(ies)						1
18B	Number of national TV programmes/features in UK						
18C	Number of local TV programmes/features in host country(ies)						
18D	Number of local TV programmes/features in UK						

Ref	Detail							
19A	Number of national radio interviews/features in host county(ies)							3
19B	Number of national radio interviews/features in UK							
19C	Number of local radio interviews/features in host country(ies)							
19D	Number of local radio interviews/features in UK							
	Policy brief							2
	Social assessment reports (1 per site)		2					6
	Lessons learned report (multi-country)		1					1
20	Estimated value (£'s) of physical assets to be handed over to host country(ies)							
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisations to be established and then continued after Darwin funding has ceased							
22	Number of permanent field plots to be established during the project and continued after Darwin funding has ceased							
23	Value of resources raised from other sources (ie. in addition to Darwin funding) for project work							

Table 2   Publications

Type (eg journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (eg contact address, website)	Cost £
SAPA Flier			http://pubs.iied.org/G03764.html	Free
SAPA working paper	P Franks, 2014	IIED	http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html	Free
Blog	P Franks, 2014		http://www.iied.org/piloting-social-assessment-protected-areas-some-initial-reflections	Free
Blog	P Franks, 2014		http://www.iied.org/ensuring-equitable-management-protected-areas-were-still-defining-issues	Free

Checklist for submission

	Check
Is the report less than 10MB? If so, please email to Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk putting the project number in the Subject line.	Yes
Is your report more than 10MB? If so, please discuss with Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	
Have you included means of verification? You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	Links
Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report? If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number.	No
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	Yes in terms of analysis of experience but they have not provided specific content and thus not listed as authors
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	Yes
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	