

## Darwin Initiative Main and Post Project Annual Report

To be completed with reference to the “Writing a Darwin Report” guidance: (<http://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/resources-for-projects/reporting-forms>). It is expected that this report will be a **maximum** of 20 pages in length, excluding annexes)

**Submission Deadline: 30<sup>th</sup> April 2020**

### Darwin Project Information

Project reference	25_006
Project title	Enhancing Equity and Effectiveness of Protected Area Conservation (EEEPAC)
Country/ies	Kenya, Uganda
Lead organisation	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)
Partner institution(s)	Fauna & Flora International, Uganda Wildlife Authority, Kenya Wildlife Services, Africa Parks Malawi, Centre for Environmental Policy and Advocacy (CEPA), Liberia Forestry Development Authority
Darwin grant value	£339,747.00
Start/end dates of project	Start Date: 2018-07-01 End Date: 2021-03-31
Reporting period (e.g. Apr 2019 – Mar 2020) and number (e.g. Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	April 2019 – Mar 2020, Annual Report 2
Project Leader name	Phil Franks
Project website/blog/social media	<a href="https://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-conserved-areas-sapa">https://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-conserved-areas-sapa</a>
Report author(s) and date	Phil Franks, Francesca Booker, Rob Small, Josephine Nzilani, Rogers Niwamanya

**Note to reader: In this report, we use ‘social equity assessment’ and ‘SAPA’ (social assessment of protected area) as synonymous.**

## 2. Project summary

Global efforts to reduce biodiversity loss are heavily focused on expanding the network of protected areas. But the reality of our target countries (and many others) is that protected areas are struggling to achieve and maintain conservation effectiveness in the face of powerful drivers of biodiversity loss – notably poaching and expansion of agriculture. Poverty is often cited as the primary underlying driver but there is growing evidence that resentment related to perceived injustices of conservation actions is also a key driver of illegal poaching

and encroachment just as it is a driver of crime in more developed countries. Resentment relates both to perceived inequity in the *distribution* of costs and benefits and reluctance of some authorities to *recognise* concerns of local communities and strengthen PA governance *procedures*.

This project is supporting Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) and Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) to institutionalise an approach (designed by IIED and FFI) to social equity assessments at protected areas, and to undertake action planning to strengthen governance and management. We anticipate the actions taken will contribute to poverty reduction and improved wellbeing through actions to, for example:

- increase community consultation in decision-making,
- more effectively mitigate crop/livestock damage by wildlife,
- improve fairness in the allocation of development projects around protected areas
- increase employment opportunities (including for women) associated with tourism related business.

The project is working at four protected sites in Kenya and Uganda (eight in total), and these sites are illustrated in figures 1 and 2. We will also be establishing a peer to peer learning process to allow partners in Kenya and Uganda to transfer and share their experiences with partners in Liberia and Malawi interested in social equity assessments.

At the international level this project will be at the forefront of work to support protected area managers and relevant authorities and other key stakeholders to understand the meaning of equitable protected area management and governance, to promote actions to improve equity at site and system levels, and assess progress for national reporting to the CBD. This work will be supported by developing relevant policy briefs and best practice guidelines on assessing equity in protected area management and governance.



Figure 1. Map of Uganda showing the location of the 4 protected area sites: Mgahinga Gorilla National Park, Kibale National Park, Murchison Falls National Park and Bwindi impenetrable National Park.



Figure 2. Map of Kenya showing the location of the 4 sites: Ruma National Park, Kisite Marine Park, Marsabit National Park and Amboseli National Park.

### 3. Project partnerships

The project builds on an existing partnership between FFI and IIED to assess the social impacts of protected areas and extends this partnership to government institutions in Kenya and Uganda.

In Uganda, this project was assigned to a UWA contact person Adonia Bintora – Senior Manager Community Benefits. Adonia is kept informed by FFI of upcoming field activities by FFI and has participated in a range of these at the Uganda sites, including site-level inception meetings, training of enumerators and stakeholder meetings. FFI prepares periodic progress reports that are shared with Adonia and his senior management colleagues at

UWA for purposes of information (see Annex 4 for an example – Progress Report on SAPA to UWA March 2020). At site level, Community Conservation Wardens are the focal points for the project and are part of the facilitation teams. These Wardens report on social equity assessments activities in their regular monthly and quarterly reports produced for UWA.

FFI staff are working closely with senior UWA management to discuss the institutionalisation of social equity assessment (ie the SAPA methodology - <https://pubs.iied.org/14659IIED/>) at UWA including: the Deputy Director, Field Operations (Charles Tumwesigye), Deputy Director Community Conservation (Owoyesigire George), M&E Manager (Susan Namuli) and Partnerships Manager (Sam Besigye). In a meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2020, at UWA Headquarters, FFI and UWA staff discussed the tailoring and uptake of the SAPA methodology at an organisational level through its use as a component of the UWA Protected Area General Management Planning process (see Annex 4 – FFI-UWA communication on SAPA next steps Feb 2020).

This February 2020 meeting followed recommendations from the UWA Senior Management Team's annual meeting in December 2019 where FFI together with the Chief Warden of Kibale Conservation Area presented the SAPA results for Kibale National Park (NP), Mgahinga Gorilla NP and lessons learnt from implementation of the project so far. At this meeting, the Senior Management Team agreed that SAPA should be conducted at each UWA supported protected area on a 5-year cycle and prior to the formal review of park management plans. At the site level, it was agreed that respective wardens for community conservation, law enforcement and tourism, incorporate the action ideas with in the specific annual operations plans. (Unfortunately, we cannot access the meeting minutes from the December 2019 meeting to share with the reviewer as evidence of these agreements as UWA staff are currently working from home without access during Covid-19. We have attached the presentations given to the meeting in Annex 4 - Lessons learnt from SAPA experience sharing - UWA Mgt team Dec 2019 and SAPA overview and results - UWA Mgt team Dec 2019).

In Kenya, the point of contact at the KWS HQ is the Head of Ecological Monitoring, Winston Ouna. At site level, research scientists have been the point of contact, coordinating activities in consultation with park wardens and community wardens.

FFI and IIED staff work closely with the Head of Ecological Monitoring - Winston Ouna - to plan field activities and the involvement of national and park level staff. Ouna coordinates the engagement of HQ staff in the project including nominating and organising for key HQ staff to engage in project field activities. This includes organising for the engagement of four HQ staff (2 men and 2 women) in action planning workshops in both Ruma Park and Kisite marine Park (activity 1.2), and four HQ staff (1 man and 3 women) in a learning exchange workshop in Nairobi (activities 1.6, 2.4, 3.1 and 3.2)

KWS staff at the headquarters have been keen to participate in site level activities, especially for activities related to action planning following the park level social equity assessments. For example, Karen Ndiema (community warden), Paul Mungai (researcher), Margaret Mosse (assistant Director Licensing) and Witson Ouna participated in action planning workshops at Ruma National Park, and Karen Ndiema participated in action planning and the resulting community information workshops around Marsabit National Park (- the participants lists of the action planning workshops are available in the site folders attached to Annex 4). IIED and FFI have observed that site level KWS staff have appreciated building relationships and asking for inputs from national level headquarters staff during action planning - especially to gain ideas and insights from headquarters staff on ideas for action, but to also clearly articulate the challenges site level staff face and the gaps in national guidance currently.



## 4. Project progress

### 4.1 Progress in carrying out project Activities

#### Output 1. Social equity assessment and action planning have been conducted at 8 PA sites in Uganda and Kenya

1.1. Capacity building workshop for assessment facilitation teams and monitoring staff of PA agencies in Kenya and Uganda

*Completed:*

- On the 28<sup>th</sup> of August 2019, 7 facilitators received training and field mentoring on social equity assessment (SAPA) at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda. This included 4 UWA staff (3 site level and 1 from national headquarters; 3 men and 1 woman) and 3 local government representatives (Community Development Officers; 2 men and 1 woman).
- On the 14<sup>th</sup> of October 2019, 6 facilitators received training and field mentoring on how to undertake social equity assessments (SAPA) at Marsabit National Park, Kenya. This included 3 site level KWS staff (2 men and 1 woman), one representative (male) from Kenya Forest Service and two representatives from civil society organisations (1 man and 1 woman).
- On the 7<sup>th</sup> of June 2019, 12 facilitators received training and field mentoring on how to undertake social equity assessment (SAPA) at Murchison Falls National Park. This included 2 site level UWA staff (2 men), 1 representative of civil society (1 man) and 8 local government representatives (5 men and 3 women) from the districts that surround the protected area).
- On the 24<sup>th</sup> of February 2020, 11 facilitators received training and field mentoring on how to undertake social equity assessment (SAPA) at Amboseli National Park. This included 7 KWS staff (all site staff; 3 men and 4 women), one person from the World Wildlife Fund (WWF; male) and 3 representatives of civil society organisations (2 men and one woman).



Participation lists for training at each site are included in Annex 4 in each site's evidence folder (eg Amboseli SAPA, Bwindi INP SAPA etc).

Photo: Training workshop on SAPA at Amboseli National Park – February 2019.

1.2. Conduct assessments in 4 sites per country with targeted hands-on technical support for site 1 and remote technical support for all other sites

*On track but could be significantly affected by COVID 19:* So far, the social equity assessment (SAPA) process has been introduced and assessment activities are completed at six out of eight sites. KWS and UWA staff are now supporting action planning at Kisite Marine Park (Kenya), Ruma National Park (Kenya), Marsabit National Park (Kenya) Mgahinga Gorilla National Park (Uganda), Kibale National Park (Uganda), Murchison Falls National Park (Uganda).

In Uganda, at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (BINP) we have reached the assessment stage following the recent completion of household surveys and data analysis. Planned field-based activities in March for reaching the action planning phase had to be postponed due to restrictions in place in response to the Covid19 pandemic.

The assessment process at Amboseli National Park (Kenya) began on 24th February 2020. We had hoped to be further along the assessment process by the end of the financial year, but activities related to information gathering and assessing the results have been affected by 1) unseasonable rains in the area (impacting on the logistics of fieldwork and in particular the team's ability to reach remote communities), and 2) subsequently the anticipation of, and ultimately enforcement of the Covid19 lock down in Kenya.

Completion at these two sites (BINP and Amboseli) will be rescheduled for Y3 of the project but will be subject to delays depending on the emerging situation with Covid 19 (see discussion in section 12 of this annual report).

<b>PA</b>	<b>Phase of Assessment</b>	<b>Date undertaken/planned</b>
Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (Uganda)	Scoping	August 2019
	Information gathering (survey)	December 2019- January 2020
	Assessing the results (with all site level stakeholders)	<i>Delayed to Y3, planning will be affected by Covid 19</i>
	Data analysis (with UWA, IGCP staff)	February - March 2020
	Action Planning	<i>Delayed to Y3, planning will be affected by Covid 19</i>
Murchison Falls National Park (Uganda)	Scoping	August 2019
	Information gathering (survey)	December 2019
	Assessing the results	February 2020
	Data analysis (with UWA staff)	January 2020
	Action Planning	February 2020
Marsabit National Park (Kenya)	Scoping	October 2019
	Information gathering (survey)	December 2019
	Assessing the results	January 2020
	Data analysis (with KWS staff)	January-February 2020
	Action Planning	March 2020

	Scoping	February 2020
Amboseli National Park (Kenya)	Information gathering (survey)	<i>Delayed to Y3, planning will be affected by Covid 19</i>
	Assessing the results	<i>Delayed to Y3, planning will be affected by Covid 19</i>
	Data analysis (with KWS staff)	<i>Delayed to Y3, planning will be affected by Covid 19</i>
	Action Planning	<i>Delayed to Y3, planning will be affected by Covid 19</i>



Photos of community meetings during the SAPA process at Murchison Falls and Ruma National Parks.

Evidence of the various activities detailed in the table above are attached in Annex 4 as folders with the relevant documentation for each site (eg Amboseli SAPA, Bwindi INP SAPA etc). We have included a folder for all 8 sites, though note that we reported on 4 of the sites in our first annual report.

1.3. Communicate key results of assessments to site-level and national stakeholders through brief reports for each site with substantial use of maps and graphics.

*On track:* To date, we have supported community meetings and a stakeholder workshop to share assessment results at all sites apart from Amboseli National Park (Kenya) and Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (Uganda). Evidence of these activities are submitted in Annex Annex 4 in each site's evidence folder (eg Amboseli SAPA, Bwindi INP SAPA etc).

Typically, our social equity assessment (SAPA) process proposes that site level community meetings should take place before a stakeholder workshop – this allows community members to discuss the results and propose ideas for action. At one site, we piloted a different approach – at Marsabit National Park we opted not to undertake a stakeholder workshop as there are fewer external stakeholders at this site. Instead, we held an action planning meeting with 3 KWS staff (2 from site level and 1 from HQ), followed by a three community meetings at locations included in the scoping phase and an additional community meeting at a site that through the household survey, had been shown to have received very little information about the national park. This alternative phasing of activities meant that we could use the community meetings to

- share the results of the assessment
- capture community ideas for action
- communicate the actions that KWS will take up as a result of the assessment, and



- begin to implement the actions with an information sharing campaign on KWS's policy and process for human wildlife conflict compensation (eg animals that are eligible, process for applying etc).

Alongside our KWS and UWA colleagues we have produced a case study report that summarise and visualises the results of the social equity assessments. Reports are available for all sites (see each site's evidence folder in Annex 4 eg Amboseli SAPA, Bwindi INP SAPA etc) apart from Amboseli and Bwindi where activities are ongoing

#### 1.4. Facilitate a follow-up meeting at each site to prioritise actions and assign responsibilities

*On track:* An action planning workshop has been held at all sites apart from Amboseli National Park and Bwindi impenetrable National park. Action plans have been developed for each sites and are available in Annex 4 (see each site's evidence folder in Annex 4 eg Amboseli SAPA, Bwindi INP SAPA etc).

At many sites there are common ideas for action for KWS and UWA staff across sites. In Kenya this includes: sharing contact numbers for the Park Warden and the KWS Office with communities to report HWC issues, mapping hotspots for problem animals; developing accessible materials for communities to access information on KWS policies, community funding and the 2013 Wildlife Act; a reinstatement of Conservation Education Wardens (or similar) who in previous years played an important role in information sharing with communities. In Uganda, this also includes the improvement and accessibility of information concerning UWA policies, management plans. UWA, unlike KWS, has a commitment to a 20% share of park entry fee income - regulations for the benefit sharing process were under review in early 2020 and getting updated information on this to communities will also be key across all the sites.

#### 1.5. Support facilitation teams to engage in action planning processes of key stakeholders at each site to encourage and plan responses to key assessment findings

*On track:* FFI staff in Uganda and Kenya are following up regularly with the facilitation team at each site to ensure they are well supported to monitor and encourage the implementation of action plans. This contact is via email and telephone.

In Kenya, FFI staff have engaged with KWS park staff and KWS HQ staff through telephone calls and emails to monitor the implementation of actions and discuss any challenges they encounter that delay progress. This has enabled the implementation of responses to key findings in sites including, for example, measures to eradicate tsetse flies in Ruma PA, actions to ensure safe storage of confiscated fishing vessels in Kisite and creating awareness on KWS CSR policy in both sites. Facilitation teams have also been supported in introducing new park Wardens (in both Ruma and Kisite) to SAPA findings and the actions that were agreed.

In Uganda, FFI staff deal directly with the facilitation teams through calls and or direct physical contact to ascertain the progress of the actions at site level. WhatsApp groups for Facilitation team members have been kept active and progress and advice can be shared there to keep everyone to speed.

### **Output 2. Staff of KWS and UWA HQ have understanding, skills and tools to plan, coordinate and analyse PA social equity assessments and action planning, and there is broad awareness and support for PA equity assessment within civil society**

2.2. Capacity building and technical support for planning, research and monitoring units of PA agencies in Kenya and Uganda to manage a social equity assessment database, conduct analysis, produce summary reports of results and apply results through annual plans and PA management plans.

*Delayed:* Last year we reported this activity as on track, but with more critical reflection and understanding of our partners limited existing knowledge and skills to support data analysis, we update this status to delayed.

One of the key challenges we have been facing is that there are few people at the site level that are able to conduct the minimum cross-tabular analysis we recommend for the data collected during the social equity assessment. At UWA and KWS sites, we have experienced only one exception to this, with a KWS colleague at Marsabit National Park who was able to follow our manual guidance on how to undertake the data analysis and run the analysis independently. This colleague still, however, required guidance from FFI Kenya to visualise the analysis into graphs and interpret the key findings. Outside of the national conservation authorities, staff of both the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) and Ol Pejeta Conservancy (OPC) have been able to conduct a full SAPA analysis in 2020 with minimal technical support from the project indicating that with motivation, interest and enough initial capacity the required analysis can be conducted independently.

To move analysis forwards we initially, tried to tackle this challenge by providing hands on training to UWA staff to undertake the analysis of the assessment independently. This is what we reported in our year one annual report. Unfortunately, we found that staff still experienced challenges with their data analysis skills and when they left the workshop they were unable to independently conduct the analysis and interpretation of the assessment data.

Of course, we could request for more hands-on support from headquarters staff at KWS and UWA, but we feel that this remove the ownership of the process away from site level staff. It also makes the tool less viable if site level staff have to rely on headquarters level staff, who do not often get to travel to the sites.

Instead, to respond to this challenge we have been working with the EU Joint Research Centre (JRC) in Italy to design a semi-automated tool that can be used for data analysis and interpretation of social equity assessment data. This activity is being supported by funds outside of the Darwin project and was sought by IIED and FFI in direct response to the challenges experienced in this project. We expect to have a beta-version of the automated tool designed in year three of this project. Field-testing will be conducted by IGCP on their on-going roll out of SAPA in Rwanda and DRC and we are currently fundraising to support the piloting of this automated tool with our KWS and UWA colleagues. The benefits of the tool will be that site level staff can add the data to the tool and follow an automated process of analysis that highlights interesting patterns and differences in the data for site level staff to explore. We also expect that the first version of the tool will support basic visualisations of the results for site level staff to use to understand the results and communicate their findings to others. We hope to be able to deliver the automated tool in year three of this Darwin project, though we expect delays with the current COVID19 crises affecting staff availability to design the automated tool.

## 2.5 Facilitate effective linkages with related processes in focal countries (IUCN Green list certification, PA system-level governance assessment)

We have been working closely with IUCN on the Green List process. At present none of the sites where we have conducted SAPA are being proposed for Green List Certification, but this may change over the coming year. There has been no system level governance assessment in either country and none is currently planned.

## 3.3. Develop and publish IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidelines for assessing equity in PA management and governance (similar to WCPA BPG #14 on effectiveness)

We plan to develop a virtual guidance package in place of these guidelines since after further consultation with WCPA it is clear that even a shorter document could easily take 12 months because of the complex review process of WCPA (normally it takes c 2 years). We will develop this in partnership with IUCN and complete it by the end of September. It will

provide an introduction to SAPA and also to our other two tools for equity assessment – GAPA and SAGE. It will be used in conjunction with the existing SAPA manual.

3.4 Conduct synthesis of results from 10 PA sites and basic PA management effectiveness and ranger-based monitoring data from same sites and produce a report for launch at World Conservation Congress

In Uganda, working with the Law Enforcement Manager at head office and the project's UWA contact person, FFI requested in person for information on poaching incidence which was received positively and was due to be shared. However, it latterly transpired that for the period 2017-2019, there were no site-specific datasets externally available with only summarised graphs for all National Parks and Game Reserves. Through UWA presentations made at site-level stakeholder meetings, there is some site specific information that was made available on poaching and or crime incidence for Murchison Falls NP, Bwindi NP and Kibale NP and these have been compiled in Annex (Data available in PPT in BINP, Kibale and Murchison Falls).

In Kenya, data was formally requested from KWS HQ through the project point of contact, Winston Ouna. He promised to share the data but it has not been shared yet. There were concerns that data shared previously with other organisations has been used to malign KWS and data protection measures may be more stringent and limiting. Evidence of formal data request is attached in Annex (see KWS Request for data).

As an alternative to data from ranger-based monitoring we now plan to use data from an outcome harvesting process which will take place between July and September 2020.

3.6 Facilitate inclusion of sessions on social equity assessment in relevant regional and sub-regional events organised by CBD Secretariat and IUCN

In October 2019, Phil Franks (IIED) presented the SAPA methodology and results at a regional BIOPAMA (Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management Programme) meeting for government representatives from Eastern and Southern Africa.

IIED and FFI submitted a successful proposal for a session at the World Conservation Congress. This session is a Speaker Pitch and will take the format of a 15-minute talk and a 15-minute Q&A and/or activity session. This session was planned for June 2020 in Marseille, France. However, this event has now been postponed till January 2021 in light of the Covid19 epidemic. We also anticipate that this year's CBD events will be postponed to 2021, and continue to monitor international and sub-regional events for opportunities to showcase SAPA results with our partners from UWA and KWS.

### ***Combined activities***

1.6. Learning event for 2 facilitation teams from Kenya and 2 from Uganda to share experience and results (2 days combined with activity 3.2), and learning report

2.4 Second national workshop with staff of PA agencies, relevant conservation and development NGOs and other key stakeholders to present and review social equity assessment results from the first 2 sites (1 day)

3.1 Organise cross visits for peer to peer learning between learning group countries (Kenya, Uganda, Liberia, Malawi).

3.2 Organise a capacity building event for the PA social equity assessment learning group (2 days in Nairobi)

In September 2019, IIED and FFI hosted a 4-day learning event in Nairobi attended by 34 participants from six sub-Saharan African countries who were either currently implementing social equity assessments or were planning to do so within the next 18 months. Participants were from PA agencies – KWS (13), UWA (6), the Liberian Forest Development Authority (1) and Administração Nacional das Áreas de Conservação, Mozambique (1); NGOs – IGCP,

Rwanda and Uganda (2), Wilderness Foundation, South Africa (1) FFI, Liberia (1), WWF, Kenya (1), Zoological Society of London (1) and Ol Pejeta Conservancy (1); other key stakeholders - Rhino Impact Bond/Conservation Alpha (1), Fundo Nacional de Desenvolvimento Sustentável, Mozambique (2).

The objectives of the workshop included:

- Share and synthesise results from use of the SAPA methodology at sites in Kenya, Uganda and Mozambique
- Learning for SAPA users, through exchanging experiences of applying the methodology
- Understand the opportunities and needs for mainstreaming of the SAPA methodology across PA/CA authority sites.

The 13 KWS staff that attended the event – 4 from HQ and 9 from sites: 2 from Ruma, 2 from Kisite, 1 from Marsabit and 1 from Amboseli, 2 from Western Conservation Region and one from Coast Conservation Region (5 women, 8 men). Park Wardens from Ruma National Park and Kisite Marine Park presented SAPA results for each park respectively to workshop participants. Research Scientists from each of the two PAs presented SAPA Action Plans entailing the issues identified and the planned actions. Ruma park research scientist presented group work on the SAPA methodology challenges and solutions.

The 6 staff from UWA that attended the event included – 1 from HQ and 5 from Murchison Falls NP, Kibale NP, Mgahinga Gorilla NP and Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (3 women, 3 men). 2 staff from IGCP both males from Rwanda and Uganda attended the event - the country coordinator who was on the facilitation team for Mgahinga NP, presented the SAPA results for Mgahinga and the Community Conservation Warden for Mgahinga presented that site's Action Plan. The Kibale NP Community Conservation Warden presented the results for Kibale NP and its Chief Warden presented the Action Plan for Kibale. In addition, the Chief Warden for Kibale Conservation Area presented group work on methodological challenges and solutions.

The report from the 4 day learning event is available in Annex 4 (SAPA Learning Event Workshop Report). It includes a summary of the key learnings captured from KWS and UWA staff about their experiences in using social equity assessment. This includes:

- SAPA enables facilitators to directly understand community perspectives - previously much of the issues and concerns were received via hearsay
- SAPA's multi-stakeholder process brought together partners (government and NGOs) that often work in silos, and identified areas where there are opportunities to work together in action planning implementation
- 'Eye-opener', learning a lot and gaining experience on how to shape management actions
- Positive and negative impacts may be related to the PA or other related conservation areas such as hunting blocks, reserves etc located nearby to the PA
- Translation of the questionnaires to different local languages can be difficult – may have to change the language from survey to survey depending on the area. It's hard to translate concepts like wellbeing, protected areas etc – it's hard to translate without losing the meaning of these concepts. Doing trial runs of survey translations can be very useful – ie testing the translations in the field.



A photo of workshop participants:



Workshop participants sharing learning in a 'speed dating' exercise.

The proposed Malawi site – Majete National Park – did not participate in these activities because they experienced a management crisis and could not travel out of the country at the time of the workshop. We remain in touch with the site and hope to work together in year three of the project.

## 4.2 Progress towards project Outputs

### **Outputs 1: Social equity assessment and action planning have been conducted at 8 PA sites in Uganda and Kenya**

*On track:*

- Uganda Wildlife Authority - with hands on guidance from FFI Uganda – have undertaken social equity assessments (SAPA) at four sites, Mgahinga Gorilla National Park, Kibale National Park, Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Murchison Falls National Park.
- Kenya Wildlife Service - with hands on guidance from FFI Kenya– have undertaken social equity assessments at three sites, Ruma National Park, Kisite Marine Park and Marsabit National Park. Work on the social equity assessment is ongoing at Amboseli National Park having been slightly delayed by unseasonable rainfall. Although, with the current Covid 19 lock down we are unsure when we will be able to restart the information gathering activities of the social equity assessment.

Evidence of the assessments are in Annex 4 as folders with the relevant documentation for each site (eg Amboseli SAPA, Bwindi INP SAPA etc).

### **Output 2: Staff of KWS and UWA HQ have understanding, skills and tools to plan, coordinate and analyse PA social equity assessments and action planning, and there is broad awareness and support for PA equity assessment within civil society**

*On track:*

Altogether we have trained 49 (19 UWA [5F, 14M] and 30 KWS [21M, 9F] staff) and 1 KFS staff member at Marsabit National Park (35 men and 14 women) to plan, undertake and coordinate social equity assessments.

At the nine protected area sites so far, we have included 44 representatives of civil society organisations or tourism operators in the social equity assessments (indicator 2.2). This includes:

- Seven representatives at Mgahinga National Park; the International Gorilla Conservation Programme, Haba Concepts, Bwindi and Mgahinga Conservation Trust, United Organisation for Batwa Development in Uganda (UOBDU), the Gorilla organisation, Uganda Wildlife clubs, Gitenderi Protect the environment (CBO).
- Seven representatives at Kibale National Park; Kibale Association for Rural and Environmental Development, U.N.I.T.E. for the Environment, Toro Botanical gardens, Sebitoli Chimp project, Kibale Forest Schools Project, Kabarole New Community Based Organisations, Tea commodities Ltd.)
- Two representatives at Murchison falls National Park ; Buliisa Initiative for Rural Development Organization (*BIRUDO*), Village enterprise
- Eleven representatives at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park; Conservation through public health (CTPH), Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation trust (BMCT), institute of tropical forest conservation (ITFC), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Gorilla Doctors MGVP, Buhoma Mukono Community development Association (BMCDA), Gorilla organisation, Nkuringo Community Conservation Development Association (NCCDF), Batwa Development Program(BDP), Mgahinga Community Conservation development Association (MCCDA) and Raising the Village
- Three representatives at Ruma National Park; Suba Environmental Education of Kenya (SEEK), Ruma Park Honey CBO and Friends of Ruma.
- Three representatives at Kisite National Park; Kisite Community Boat Operators, REEFolution and Shimoni Reef Hotel.
- Three representatives at Marsabit National Park: Pastoralist Community Initiative and Development Assistance (PACIDA), SAKU Community Forest Association and Jaldesa Community Conservancy.

- Eight in Amboseli: Amboseli Trust for Elephant, International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), Amboseli School of Field Studies, Kuku Group Ranch, Eselenken Conservancy, Kitenden Conservancy, and World Wildlife Fund (WWF).

Participants on our learning event on social equity assessment held in Nairobi benefited from interacting with people from other sites who have done the assessment, and stated that this made a huge difference for their work, seeing what other sites have done. Those from parks/conservation areas where SAPA had not started stated they learnt a lot and look forward to application of the SAPA methodology in their sites. See Annex 4 – ‘Emails: Nairobi workshop feedback’.

**Output 3: Capacity, guidance and tools necessary for wider scaling up of social equity assessment and action planning, and evidence to support advocacy for more supportive international and national policy**

All elements of this output will be delivered in year 3 including a virtual guidance package in place of the proposed IUCN WCPA guidelines as described under activity 3.1.

### 4.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

**Outcome:** PA equity assessment institutionalised in Kenya and Uganda, initiated in Liberia and Malawi, actions taken in response to strengthen management and governance, and equity provisions strengthened in international conservation policy

**Actions taken in response to strengthen management and governance:**

In terms of action planning we have an update for each site below. All the evidence referred to below for progress on action planning and taking at each is available in Annex 4 in a folder named ‘Site Action Planning Progress’.

Kibale NP

- Since February 2020, the community conservation department has been conducting awareness raising meetings on mitigation measures for crop raiding. This has been supplemented by a radio talk show during March 2020 as it was encouraged to avoid gatherings due to the COVID 19 pandemic.
- Community mobile clinics have been restarted since the social equity assessment and are occurring on a regular basis (once or twice a week) with support from the health department of the local government. This was a key issue raised in the SAPA especially around sleeping sickness.
- Trench construction, out of the 229km park boundary, so far 80km have been excavated. With approximately 75km unsuitable for trenches (rocky, boggy or railway line), approximately 79km of trenches remain to be excavated.
- The Community Conservation Warden have been in talks with the departments of Veterinary and Health on how best they can conduct mobile clinics at community level to minimise pests and diseases with in the communities surrounding the park.

Details on progress are in Annex 4 (Kibale Progress on SAPA action plan implementation), as shared by Kibale NP Community Conservation Office.

Kistie Marine Park

At Kistie Marine Park, the facilitation team has engaged with the NGO, the Colobus Trust, in fundraising efforts to raise resources towards primate management in response to the social impact raised by communities of HWC conflict due to nuisance monkey raiding crops and damaging property. KWS has also installed eight mooring systems for safety anchoring of canons and two moorings for bigger vessels to ensure that confiscated vessels (from fishers trespassing and illegally fishing from the Park) are safely stored to minimise damage. An

email (Kisite Action Plan Update Message) and spreadsheet (Kisite PA Action Implementation Progress) detailing site progress is included in Annex 4.

Action at this site has been negatively affected by changes in staffing (see section 11 for further discussion of the impact of this issue). For example, the park warden was transferred at the end of 2019. A new park Warden was deployed in March 2020 and has been briefed on the SAPA process in Kisite PA.

### Marsabit NP

In Marsabit NP, KWS park staff and KWS HQ staff engaged in an information sharing campaign to create awareness on Kenya Wildlife Act 2013, focusing on provisions on HWC compensation. This involved informing community on the wildlife species that are eligible for compensation and the ones that are no longer covered. The campaign also included sharing a hotline with communities to enable reporting of HWC incidents and sharing other park related information with KWS. HWC featured as a negative social impact of high importance with 90% of respondents in Marsabit reporting that they had an issue with crops being damaged by animals in the last year. See Annex 4 (Marsabit PA Action Plan Implementation).

### Mgahinga NP

- At Mgahinga, an assessment of the stone wall was undertaken and a report was produced which will help the park's stakeholders identify where they need to reinforce the stone wall (see Mgahinga NP Stone wall assessment Report). A CBO – Gitenderi Protect the Environment - have been reinforcing the Park's boundary wall with *erithrina abithinicca* and filling the gaps with stones with support from IGCP. This is an ongoing activity on the stretch of Gitenderi Parish
- Water for Virunga (WV) was supposed to provide 12 tanks, they latter managed to provide 14 to the communities in Gitenderi, Gisozi and Rukongi where SAPA identified a need for these tanks. Bwindi Mgahinga conservation trust provided 22 water harvesting Tanks at house hold level. In total, there are 36 water tanks provided by different stake holders with in the three parishes.
- A radio talk show was organised by UWA on resource harvesting and the general park resource utilisation rules
- Water for Virunga has trained 20 primary teachers on the content of the new wildlife Act.

60% of the short-term actions (those that could be implemented within 6months) have been implemented at Mgahinga. A challenge remains for the translation of the Wildlife Act and or regulations into local languages which requires engagement at National level. See Annex 4 (Mgahinga Site Progress review March 2020).

### Murchison Falls NP

The facilitation team at Murchison Falls NP are working closely with the Community Conservation Warden to inform the process for implementing an electric fence (30km) in the northern section of the NP to ensure the inclusion of community perspectives. This is important as it was clear in the SAPA results that some communities have concerns that as much as the fence has the potential to reduce direct crop raiding, it also could limit community members from accessing resources permitted under resource access agreements. Other activities they have undertaken include:

- Training of Rangers (50 rangers) on human rights in February 2019 with the help of the British Embassy.
- Training on wildlife crop raiding mitigation is ongoing and one radio talk show in Masindi took place in late February 2020.



See Annex 4 (Murchison Falls Action Plan Progress).

### Ruma NP

- In response to the social impact of inadequate permanent employment by KWS, action has been taken by sharing information with communities on KWS recruitment process through 3 community barazas in villages including Nyadenda, God Jope and Kibwer.
- KWS in partnership with KENTTEC have installed pesticide treated Tsetse fly eradication in and around Ruma Park to reduce Tsetse population and negative impacts for communities.
- Electric fence maintenance is being conducted on a regular basis and baboon proof wires have been installed in some of the fence sections reporting problems with baboons. Tight locks have also been purchased to strengthen fence and deter wildlife that break fence and escape into community areas.
- To improve response to HWC, KWS Office contacts have been shared with communities and a GPS receiver given to Problem Animal Control team for geo-referencing and mapping of HWC sites.
- As part of information sharing with communities, community members were recently involved in a Roan Antelope Action Strategy launch at Ruma Park. Poaching that has played a role in decline of Roan population and community members were encouraged to share information and participate community-based monitoring outside protected area by reporting sighting.
- KWS have supported Nyadenda community water project, installing a 10,000 Litres tank.

See Annex 4 (Ruma SAPA Actions Update Message and Ruma PA Action Plan Implementation progress).

### **Equity provisions strengthened in international conservation policy:**

[CBD COP15 has been delayed till early 2021 and only then will we know whether specific reference to the equity framework is included in the new strategy.](#)

#### **4.4 Monitoring of assumptions**

**Assumption:** At least one NGO actively participates in each assessment and offers to provide political and/or financial support to implement some of the suggested actions.

A staff member of IGCP was one of the facilitation team members of the assessment conducted in Y1 at Mghainga Gorilla National Park. In Y2 they took up the lead facilitation role, with some with technical backstopping from FFI, at BINP. In partnership with WWF, one of the IGCP coalition members, they have supported the Bwindi assessment financially and have spearheaded the assessment process (including data analysis). They are now at assessment of the results and they are looking at continuing the process after the COVID-19 pandemic. While doing assessment at Mghainga, IGCP pledged to support Gitenderi Protect the environment group to strengthen the stone wall which they did and have been able to reinforce and maintain a stretch of 5km of the stone wall

WWF in Kenya, USD 2,000 to support some of the SAPA activities in Amboseli NP after the COVID-19 pandemic. WWF's CBNRM expert, Peter Muigai, participated in the first community meetings in Amboseli NP.

**Assumption:** Funding is secured by FFI and FDA in Liberia to implement social equity assessment for at least at 1 PA site

Although the Protected Area Manager for the FDA, who attended the September 2019 learning event, remains highly supportive of conducted social equity assessments impacts of

COVID-19 make it unclear if assessments in Liberia will be feasible in Y3 of the project. Funding for a repeat of SAPA at Sapo National Park is being actively sought by FFI.

**Assumption:** At least 4 other social equity assessment conducted in other countries that already expressed interest in SAPA following launch of version 1 of the SAPA manual.

FFI have supported the Mozambican National Sustainable Development Fund (FNDS) in the implementation of social equity assessment at three Protected Areas in Mozambique that are within the World Bank's MozBio2 programme (Chimanimani National Park, Maputo Special Reserve and Marromeu National Park). Following their involvement with this project at Mgahinga National Park the International Gorilla Programme (IGCP) is supporting assessments in Virunga (DRC) and Volcanoes National Park (Rwanda). In addition the Rhino Impact Bond has selected SAPA as a compulsory element of funding for two sites in South Africa (Great Fish River Nature Reserve and Addo Elephant National Park). Furthermore, IIED have worked with GIZ to support three social equity assessments under their BSB Yamoussa programme comprising Benoue and Bouba Njida National Parks in Cameroon and Sena Oura National Park in Chad. from May - August 2019.. The total is therefore 8 assessments in other countries

**Assumption:** Funding is secured to implement social equity assessment for at least 1 PA site in Malawi in partnership with CEPA and KFW or African Parks

After initially expressing interest, Africa Parks advised that they could not take on SAPA at the PA they support in Malawi - Majete Wildlife Reserve – due to a crisis that necessitated a change of management. However, we may now be able to reschedule for the end of this year, and the EU BIOPAMA programme has indicated willingness to fund the assessment if it can be conducted alongside their IMET management effectiveness assessment.

**Assumption:** Close collaboration with the IUCN Green List Certification process

Although none of the project sites are yet involved in the Green List process IIED continue to collaborate closely with IUCN on the Green List process at the global level and in new Green List programmes in Zambia and five countries in Latin America.

**Assumption:** Sufficient interest and political will in each participating country to support implementation of some measures to advance equity at site level in response to the social equity assessment findings.

There is interest particularly at sites and regional level in Kenya (Western Conservation Region and Coast Conservation region) to support implementation of measures to advance equity. As reported above and as shown in Annex 4 (see the folder on Site Action Planning Progress), sites have started implementing actions that they are able to do without additional funding. KWS has provided support on some of the actions including in improving the fence to deter wildlife at Ruma and in supporting water infrastructure. Frequent staff changes at KWS HQ have impacted negatively on our institutionalisation efforts (discussed further in section 11). However, there is interest to do SAPA in one additional KWS Park (Watamu Marine Park) and the park warden has been involved in SAPA activities to gain knowledge on the tool and its implementation.

In Uganda, UWA's senior management team have taken steps to incorporate SAPA in their planning process. For example, it was resolved in the senior management team for UWA in December 2019 that before every review of the management plan for a protected area, SAPA site specific SAPA process should be conducted. Some action plans have been incorporated with in the current annual operations plans for specific sites where SAPA was conducted. Among those actions included in the annual operations plan are; 30Km stretch of electric fence along Nwoya stretch, sending the full list of Community Wildlife Committees to UWA headquarters by June 2020, awareness raising on new revenue sharing guidelines, mapping of tourism sites around the park at, and human rights to be included in the rangers basic training.

**Assumption:** At least two major international conservation organisations (in addition to IIED and FFI) lobby CBD and IUCN to encourage country parties/IUCN members to conduct social equity assessment.

There has been a high level of interest in social equity assessment and the methodologies used in our project by WWF. This was initiated through collaborative work between WWF and FFI on the International Gorilla Conservation Programme. WWF have gone on to include a feature on the SAPA methodology in a recent internal Massive Online Course (MOC) as a means to monitor the implementation of Environmental and Social Safeguards. Staff from both WWF UK offices and the WWF Governance practice have directly engaged with project partners for potential application at site level and WWF Kenya staff are on the facilitation team for the assessment at Amboseli National Park in Kenya. Through the Conservation Initiative on Human Rights, of which FFI and WWF are both members, the project will be developing a lobbying position for CBD on these issues in Y3.

#### **4.5 Impact: achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty alleviation**

The anticipated impact of this project five years after the start (ie by April 2023) is 'Improved conservation and poverty alleviation of at least 6000 households across 10 PAs in Uganda, Kenya, Liberia and Malawi, and indications of similar impacts with at least 10 other PAs'.

The project M&E plan in the project proposal indicates that progress towards this target during the project lifetime is to be assessed using outcome indicators 0.4 and 0.5.

The means of verification for 0.4 was specified as reports from ranger-based monitoring. To date we have been unable to get access to the necessary data from KWS and UWA, but even if we succeed during year 3 of the project the data for some PAs is simply raw data that cleaning and analysis before we can use it without which is unusable. As an alternative we propose to address this indicator using the means of verification proposed for indicator 0.2 – outcome harvesting based on key informant interviews. See:

[http://betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/outcome\\_harvesting](http://betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/outcome_harvesting). We plan to work on this in the period October – December 2020 and since it is done by phone interviews it should not be affected if fieldwork is still impossible due to COVID.

The means of verification for indicator 0.5 is specified in the project proposal as participatory impact assessment with focus groups at community level. Since we are not sure if this is going to be possible before the end of the year (due to Covid-19) we will extend outcome harvesting to this indicator as well, ie interview community leaders to get their impression of the proportion of community members who have benefited in various ways from the project.

#### **5. Contribution to the Global Goals for Sustainable Development (SDGs)**

This project is directly contributing to gender equality (SDG 5) within protected areas adjacent communities by identifying and addressing social equity issues that are of concern to women and men (women's concerns are often overlooked in conservation).

The social equity assessments (SAPA) are revealing important issues of inequity related to distribution, procedure and recognition, and efforts to undertake and implement action plans at the protected area sites will contribute to reducing inequality in the context of conservation (SDG 10).

#### **6. Project support to the Conventions, Treaties or Agreements**

Under goals 2.1 and 2.2, the CBD's Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) calls for parties to:

- Assess the economic and socio-cultural costs, benefits and impacts arising from the establishment and maintenance of protected areas,

- Carry out participatory national reviews of the status, needs and context-specific mechanisms for involving stakeholders, ensuring gender and social equity, in PA policy and management.

Additionally, Aichi Target 11 within the current CBD Strategic Plan calls for “equitable management” of PAs by 2020.

This project responds to these issues by building the capacity of government staff to 1) undertake participatory social equity assessments involving a diversity of stakeholders (including local communities) and 2) respond to key issues of social equity through targeted action planning and implementation.

## **7. Project support to poverty alleviation**

Most of the sites have now conducted action planning and in the process of implemented some of the measures that have been planned. As per the project design these are community instigated and led activities which are not directly supported by the project. This is good from the perspective of sustainability and community empowerment but since we are not directly involved in these community activities we can provide examples as in the last annual report but cannot provide a comprehensive overview until the last year of the project when we will be conducting a survey for this purpose related to indicator 0.4. As noted elsewhere in this report, this will now be done using the outcome harvesting method.

## **8. Consideration of gender equality issues**

Community meetings at the four protected area sites have included separate focus group discussions for women and men to understand the key equity issues at the protected area site. This ensures that women’s concerns are taken forwards into the household survey. Interestingly during our learning event in Nairobi in September 2019 one of the key learnings raised by KWS staff was that the social equity assessment enables them to understand ‘women’s and men’s perspectives and this allows us to understand new issues, particularly from women’ (see Annex X for full report).

Our approach to sex disaggregated data analysis enables comparison of the perspectives of women and men for all social impacts and related governance constraints. This allows for us to identify actions to address social impacts that a specific to women and/or men.

In Ruma NP in Kenya, for example, SAPA findings indicated that women perceived that they are not considered for casual jobs at KWS - ie casual jobs are only offered to men. They also perceived that they are not invited to meetings about the park. In response to these, ideas for action were suggested: gender equality be adhered to (both men and women to have equal opportunities for employment regardless of the task). KWS also intends to build interest amongst women to engage in issues about the park including attending meetings when invited (and of course holding meetings at times appropriate for women).

## **9. Monitoring and evaluation**

M&E information is being collected as per the plan in the proposal with some adjustments in response the review of last year (see section 11).

A key M&E activity for this final year of the project will be the outcome harvesting exercise which, as described in section 11, will be extended in scope to cover indicators 0.4 and 0.5 as well as 0.3. A detailed design for this exercise will be prepared by the end of June based on the design used by Phil Franks for work on REDD+ safeguards. See : [https://www.redd-standards.org/images/outcomes/Executive\\_summary\\_REDD\\_safeguards\\_outcome\\_evaluation\\_ENG.pdf](https://www.redd-standards.org/images/outcomes/Executive_summary_REDD_safeguards_outcome_evaluation_ENG.pdf)



As well as contributing to M&E of this project, this outcome harvesting exercise will make a substantial contribution to IIEDs plan to make more use of this method and to adapting this method for use as part of the SAPA methodology itself

## **10. Lessons learnt**

Following frequent staffing changes at KWS HQ level, a lesson learnt is that as well as trying to engage at the HQ level, it is valuable to engage Regional Directors throughout the process to enhance SAPA institutionalisation process in Kenya. Regional Directors head several parks in one region and they can support SAPA implementation in their region. For example, Arthur Tuda who headed the Coast Conservation Region (coastal parks) was keen to implement SAPA in coastal parks and engaged Watamu Marine Park Warden on the SAPA process to learn and implement SAPA in the park. Conversations are ongoing for Watamu to secure financial support to implement SAPA.

All the four parks where SAPA is being implemented in Kenya are different (include marine, some electric fenced, varying management arrangements etc) and we have learned to adapt SAPA activities according to the context. In Marsabit, for example, we did not have a second stakeholder workshop as we realised there were few institutions that would be interested and have capacity to support KWS in implementing responses to findings. Instead we held a focused action planning workshop with KWS and began implementing actions through community barazas. A key learning for us is to adapt the SAPA process and activities to the context – sometimes this might mean changing the order of how meetings happen, or the people who are invited to participate in the meetings. For example, in Marsabit there is clear conflict between KWS and Kenya Forestry Service – normally SAPA (being a multi-stakeholder process) would recommend the inclusion of KFS but this was not possible in Marsabit in the context of a lack of trust between the institutions and competing mandates.

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

**Comment: AR1 does not report specifically on how the partnerships are managed and maintained, how day-to-day communication is effected, nor does it mention any particular challenges. A change in the point of contact at KWS head office does not appear to have caused any difficulties.**

Over the project period there have been several changes in point of contact at the KWS HQ. At the inception of the project, the point of contact was Dr Samuel Kasiki who participated in the development of the project proposal. However, he was redeployed to a duty station outside Nairobi before implementation began. Dr Arthur Tuda who worked closely with Kasiki the became to the point of contact. He was supportive of the project and dedicated to lead KWS in institutionalising SAPA and implementing it in other KWS parks. However, again Tuda was redeployed from the HQ to Kenya's coast to head marine parks and has since left KWS. Winston Ouna who participated in the project's inception workshop and worked in the same department with Tuda was became the main point of contact in January 2019. He has been supportive of the process and has been involved in most of the project's field activities. At site level, there have also been staff changes: at Ruma Park and Kisite Marine Park, Park Wardens were transferred at the end of 2019 and new staff deployed. The new Park Wardens have been briefed on the project and progress made and are supporting implementation of actions. These changes at the HQ and sites have impacted on our efforts to institutionalise SAPA.

**Comment AR 1: It would be interesting to learn if - and in what ways - this project has benefited from the legacy of 20-010 in Kenya. It would be of interest to know what (relevant) lessons were learned from the previous SAPA project in Kenya (20-010), especially in terms of legacy. Has the current project been able to capitalise on this?**

OI Pejeta Conservancy (OPC) has become a champion for the application of SAPA in Kenya, particularly with the staff of its Community Development Programme. SAPA results from the Darwin project 20-010 directly involved the development of the Darwin project 24-002 which is currently entering its 4<sup>th</sup> year. OPC undertook its second SAPA assessment during Y3 of this project and will be completing the process following the lifting of Covid-19 restrictions. Findings from this assessment will be informing the development and approach of the OPC 2030 strategic plan which is currently under development. Staff from OPC have given technical support to the project at site-level in Ruma and made significant contributions to the international learning event held in September 2019 (activities 1.6, 2.4, 3.1 and 3.2 of this project). In addition, Loisaba and Borana conservancies have applied SAPA assessments in Y2 of this project through the support of OPC staff who provided training and data analysis of results.

**Comment: It is difficult to assess progress towards achievement of the project's outputs, as their indicators are not time-bound**

**Response:**

For outputs 1 and 2, since most of the output targets have already been reached it would not be very useful to invest time and money in SMARTening these output indicators at this stage.

For output 3:

*3.1 IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidelines for advancing equity in PA management and governance is revised to: 3.1 IIED-IUCN guidance (web-based) for advancing equity in PA management and governance by end of September 2020*

*3.2 3 staff of PA Authorities and NGOs in Liberia and Malawi participate in training and peer to peer learning is revised to: 3.2 3 staff of PA Authorities and NGOs in Liberia and Mozambique participate in training and peer to peer learning by March 2020.* This target has been achieved.

*3.3 Report of a meta-analysis of social equity assessments from 10 sites is revised to: 3.3 Report of a meta-analysis of social equity assessments from 10 sites by end of December 2020.* This is the product of a year three activity and so the timeframe was by end of project. However since we can use it at a SAPA event at the World Conservation Congress the timeframe should be end of December

*3.4 Policy briefs targeting CBD policy and strategic planning processes is revised to: 3.4 Policy briefs targeting CBD policy and strategic planning processes by end of September 2020.*

We now have a clearer view of where to target this brief within the CBD strategy development process. This should be the third Open-Ended Working Group in October or November.

We will be submitting a change request to this effect.

**Comment: It would be useful if the Outcome-level indicators could be revisited and 'SMARTened'.**

**Response:** The normal convention for outcome indicators is that the specified targets relate to end of project and this is noted in our logframe. While we have not specified annual targets/benchmarks our proposal notes that progress towards the end of project targets will be assessed annually except for indicators where the means of verification – outcome harvesting - is by nature a one-off activity. As noted in the proposal, outcome harvesting in the means of verification for indicator 0.3, and we now propose extending this to 0.4 given

the difficulty in accessing ranger-based monitoring data in a usable form, and also to 0.5 given the risk that we may not be able to conduct community focus groups before the end of December. Indicators 0.2 and 0.6 are end of project as there is no activity before year three.

## 12. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

We are concerned about the impact of Covid19 on the field activities of the project in year 3. We are as yet uncertain about what it means for continuing the SAPA process at Amboseli National Park – as we do not yet know when – or if – it will be safe to host community meetings and multi-stakeholder meetings during year 3 of the project.

It is very unclear how Covid19 will affect Uganda and Kenya in the short-medium term. Though it is becoming increasingly obvious that KWS and UWA will be severely impaired by loss of funding – in Uganda for example, we have been told by a project contact that the loss of tourism funding means UWA have serious financial constraints and challenges to ensure continued funding of their PA's core PA functions. Of course, this will impact on action planning and implementation at each of the sites. For example, we anticipate that in the next year some staff will not receive wages and so not turn up to work at the PAs, others might be diverted to tasks such as law enforcement. What this means for the project is that we are likely to see a reduction in the implementation of activities – as attentions are diverted elsewhere to support crises management within Uganda and Kenya's PAs as well as to respond to difficult personal circumstances people find themselves in and their families.

One thing we can do is work with our colleagues in UWA and KWs to ensure that key actions are taken up into annual work plans at each site – so while actions might not be implemented during the lifetime of this project, they will be implemented as people return to normal working life. In addition, we can also work on desk-based activities to provide guidance to UWA and KWS on key cross cutting social equity issues

Finally, it is worth noting that the actual budget for field activities related to the follow up of action planning is minimal.

Covid19 will also affect the national and international policy work we expect to undertake in year three of this project. We already know that the World Conservation Congress and subsequently our speaker event has been delayed from June 2019 to January 2020. We also anticipate delays and changes to international processes around the post 2020 framework and the CBD. We are monitoring rescheduling of events closely to ensure that we adjust our timetables accordingly.

In May 2019, our project team will be holding a full debrief of year 2 achievements, challenges and learnings. We did not manage to host this meeting prior to our annual reporting due to busy professional and personal schedules as we all adapt to new ways of working during Covid 19. At our May 2019 meeting, all team members will meet on zoom to discuss three different scenarios of Covid 19 and the impact it will have on our project and how we will adjust and adapt using the following template (see table). We will use the results of our planning exercise to revise our logframe and submit a change request to the Darwin Initiative as appropriate.

Duration of lockdown:	Scenario 1 – lock down for 3 months (April to end June 2020)	Scenario 2: lock down for 6 months (April to end Sept 2020)	Scenario 3: lock down for 12 months (April 2020 to end March 2021)
Key implications			
Alternative options			



### **13. Sustainability and legacy**

Capacity of KWS staff particularly at site level has been increased to a level that staff have been able to support project activities in other sites. For example, the research scientist in Ruma Park led information gathering process in Kisite Marine Park, supporting training of facilitators, training enumerators and coordinating household surveys. We are confident facilitation teams in Kisite and Marsabit too have adequate capacity to implement SAPA with limited support. Research Scientist in Marsabit led the analysis of household survey data and communication of SAPA results to communities.

In Uganda, staff who have gone through the SAPA process have given guidance to those where it's being implemented. The community conservation Warden Mgahinga NP gave guidance to her colleagues at Bwindi INP when they initiated the process, on what needs to be done in form of partnerships, and the kind of planning required and whom you need to talk to. This made it easier for UWA staff at Bwindi and such kind of sharing would help any institutional staff understand what SAPA process is and what is needed to it to help them achieve their conservation objectives.

As detailed in the Project Partnerships section our project has developed significant interest and buy-in to a broader adoption of a tailored social assessment approach for UWA's portfolio of protected areas. In Y3, to move this intent to action, FFI will be engaging with UWA regarding the recently announced World Bank project "Uganda Investing in Forests and Protected Areas for Climate-Smart Development Project" as a means to enable implementation of Action Plans and system wide adoption of methodologies.

### **14. Darwin identity**

We have publicised the Darwin Initiative as the funder of this project in all communications and in all outputs to date, as well as on social media.

### **15. Safeguarding**

IIED has the following relevant safeguarding policies, which have been included in annex 4:

- Anti-Fraud and Bribery Policy
- Anti-Harassment and Anti-Bullying Policy
- Complaints Policy
- IIED Disciplinary Procedure
- Safeguarding Policy
- Staff Code of Conduct 2020
- Whistleblowing Policy.

These policies guide our approaches to zero tolerance for bullying, harassment, sexual exploitation and abuse, protection for whistleblowing, safeguarding and the code of conduct staff are obliged to uphold to ensure high quality work and partnerships. The policies also detail the process of how to register, investigate and respond appropriately and sensibly to issues raised that are related to safeguarding, disciplinary procedures, and whistleblowing.

FFI's Safeguarding Children and Adults at Risk Policy & Procedure was developed in December 2014 and last updated in March 2018. The policy applies to Members of Council and its sub-committees, FFI employees, temporary staff provided through agencies, volunteers and interns, contractors, consultants, service providers and any third parties who carry out work on behalf of FFI, in partnership with FFI or in conjunction with FFI. The policy expressly states that FFI does not tolerate sexual exploitation and abuse of any kind.

FFI's Anti-bullying and Anti-harassment Policy was developed in March 2018. The policy applies to Members of Council and its sub-committees, FFI employees, temporary staff provided

through agencies, volunteers and interns, contractors, consultants and any other third parties who carry out work on FFI's behalf. The policy expressly states that bullying or harassment of any kind against a person or group of people, whether persistent or an isolated incident, will not be tolerated under any circumstances.

FFI's Whistleblowing Policy was developed in June 2013 and last updated in December 2019. The policy applies to FFI employees.

FFI's partner due diligence procedures include checking whether any safeguarding concerns have arisen with the partner concerned and the Safeguarding Children and Adults at Risk Policy & Procedure forms part of contracts and agreements with third party contractors and sub-grantees. We are also currently researching LMS platforms (Learning Management Systems) which would enable online training in policies & procedures.

We monitor updates in Government and Charity Commission guidance and review our policies and procedures accordingly. No safeguarding issues have been reported during the reporting year.

In terms of social safeguards, FFI has publically available position papers on our approach to Free, Prior and Informed Consent Position, Gender in Conservation, Displacement and Restrictions on Access to Resources and Conservation, Livelihoods and Governance (links below). Our specialist Conservation, Leadership and Governance team support regional FFI staff and partners to take a holistic, people-centred approach to biodiversity conservation, and to ensure all project activity is strongly aligned with these principles.

All FFI and IIED relevant policies are attached to Annex 4.

## 16. Project expenditure

**Table 1: Project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2019 – 31 March 2020)**

Project spend since last report	2019/20 Darwin Grant (£)	2019/21 Darwin Costs (£)	Variance £	Variance %	Comments
Staff costs (see below)					
Phil Franks - Project Leader					
Francesca Booker - Researcher					
Fiona Roberts - Programme Manager					
Rob Small, FFI coordination and researcher, Uganda					
Helen Anthem, Technical adviser					
Andy Cameron, GIS expertise					
Josephine Nzaleni, Country lead, Kenya					
Rogers Niwamanya, Country lead, Uganda					
Patrick Lelei, Kenya project support					
Stella Ajilong, Uganda project support					
Consultancy costs					
Overhead Costs					
Travel and subsistence					
Operating Costs					
Capital items (see below)					
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)					
Others (see below)					
Uganda and Kenya office costs FFI					
Publication production, printing etc FFI					
TOTAL					

## Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2019-2020

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2018 - March 2019	Actions required/planned for next period
<p><b>Impact</b></p> <p>(by 30<sup>th</sup> June 2023): Improved conservation and poverty alleviation of at least 6000 households across 10 PAs in Uganda, Kenya, Liberia and Malawi, and indications of similar impacts with at least 10 other PAs</p>		<p>Too early to assess contribution to impact at this stage.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome:</b> (by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021): PA equity assessment institutionalised in Kenya and Uganda, initiated in Liberia and Malawi, actions taken in response to strengthen management and governance, and equity provisions strengthened in international conservation policy</p>	<p>0.1 KWS and UWA and other key stakeholders conduct social equity assessments at a total of 8 PA sites with active engagement of their central planning, research &amp; monitoring units.</p> <p>0.2 FDA in Liberia and Africa Parks in Malawi conduct social equity assessments at 2 PA sites and start an institutionalisation process.</p> <p>0.3 Changes in PA management and governance at site and system levels that will plausibly deliver better conservation and social outcomes.</p> <p>0.4 At least 2400 households (average 400 at each of first 6 sites) report poverty reduction and improved equity attributable to changes in PA management and governance</p> <p>0.5 Decreased threat to biodiversity in 8 PAs in Kenya and Uganda as a result of 15% reduction in poaching</p>	<p>0.1 Site assessment report available for all sites but Amboseli NP and Bwindi Impenetrable NP</p> <p>0.2 FDA attended a learning event on SAPA in Sept 2019</p> <p>0.3 – 0.6 Too early to report progress.</p>	<p>0.1 Complete reports for Amboseli NP and Bwindi Impenetrable NP</p> <p>0.2 Work with FDA Liberia to conduct a SAPA</p> <p>0.3 and 0.5 Plan M&amp;E of Action Plans at each site using outcome harvesting</p> <p>0.6 Continued engagement with the CBD in the lead up to</p>



	0.6 CBD strategic plan 2020-30 refers explicitly to the 3 dimensional equity framework as the basis for advancing equity in PA management/governance		
<b>Output 1</b> Social equity assessment and action planning have been conducted at 8 PA sites in Uganda and Kenya	<p>1.1 KWS and UWA conduct social equity assessments at a total of 8 sites</p> <p>1.2 Key stakeholders at 8 PAs have responded to social equity assessment findings through their own annual planning processes</p> <p>1.3 At least 4 men and 4 women assessment facilitators in each country trained in understanding equity, social equity assessment and action planning</p>	<p>1.1 Assessment reports are available for 6/8 sites.</p> <p>1.2 Some actions are being implemented at 6 sites so far (see folder Site Action Planning Progress)</p> <p>1.3 In total, 14 women and 35 men in Uganda and Kenya have received in-depth training on understanding equity and social equity assessment (see folder for each site, Amboseli, Bwindi etc)</p>	
Activity 1.1. Capacity building workshop for assessment facilitation teams and monitoring staff of PA agencies in Kenya and Uganda		Activities are focused on action planning in 6/8 sites (see folders for each site which hosts all documents relevant to the SAPA activities including the case study report).	Complete action planning at Bwindi Impenetrable NP, and continue SAPA at Amboseli NP (where Covid 19 situation allows).
Activity 1.2. Conduct assessments in 4 sites per country with targeted hands-on technical support for site 1 and remote technical support for all other sites			
Activity 1.3. Communicate key results of assessments to site-level and national stakeholders through brief reports for each site with substantial use of maps and graphics.		Assessment reports available at 6/8 sites (see folders for each site which hosts all documents relevant to the SAPA activities including the case study report).	Site assessment report completed for Bwindi Impenetrable NP and Amboseli NP.
Activity 1.4. Facilitate a follow-up meeting at each site to prioritise actions and assign responsibilities		Completed action planning at 6/8 sites and sites are now implementing action at these sites	

<p>Activity 1.5. Support facilitation teams to engage in action planning processes of key stakeholders at each site to encourage and plan responses to key assessment findings</p>	<p>(see folder on Site Action Planning Progress in Annex 4).</p>	<p>Support action planning at at Bwindi Impenetrable NP and Amboseli NP (where Covid 19 situation allows).</p>
<p>Activity 1.6. Learning event for 2 facilitation teams from Kenya and 2 from Uganda to share experience and results (2 days combined with activity 3.2), and learning report</p>	<p>Completed in Sept 2019 (workshop report attached in Annex 4 'SAPA Learning Event Workshop Report').</p>	<p>.</p>
<p>2. Staff of KWS and UWA HQ have understanding, skills and tools to plan, coordinate and analyse PA social equity assessments and action planning, and there is broad awareness and support for PA equity assessment within civil society</p>	<p>2.1 A total of 10 senior managers KWS and UWA gain a good understand of social equity in relation to PAs</p> <p>2.2 A total of 20 staff of civil society organisations and tourism operators gain a good understand of social equity in relation to PAs</p> <p>2.3 A total of 10 staff of KWS and UWA planning, research and monitoring units gain understanding, skills and tools for social equity assessment</p>	<p>2.1 Completed Y1.</p> <p>2.2 At the nine protected area sites so far, we have included 44 representatives of civil society organisations or tourism operators in the social equity assessments.</p> <p>2.3 Delayed, as we create an automated tool with EU JRC to help support sites undertake data analysis of SAPA information.</p>
<p>Activity 2.1. First national workshop (inception) with staff of PA agencies, relevant conservation and development NGOs and other key stakeholders for project introduction, including "understanding equity" (1 day)</p>	<p>Completed Y1</p>	
<p>Activity 2.2. Capacity building and technical support for planning, research and monitoring units of PA agencies in Kenya and Uganda to manage a social equity assessment database, conduct analysis, produce summary reports of results and apply results through annual plans and PA management plans.</p>	<p>Delayed, as we create an automated tool with EU JRC to help support sites undertake data analysis of SAPA information.</p>	<p>Work with EU JRC to create a tool, and trial the tool with site level research staff.</p>

<p>Activity 2.3. Produce a policy brief for each country aiming to support policy development to enable more equitable PA management and increase political support</p>		<p>Too early in the project to report progress.</p>	<p>Y3 we will create a policy brief drawing learnings from the 4 sites in each country</p>
<p>Activity 2.4. Second national workshop with staff of PA agencies, relevant conservation and development NGOs and other key stakeholders to present and review social equity assessment results from the first 2 sites (1 day)</p>		<p>Completed in Sept 2019 (workshop report attached in Annex 4 'SAPA Learning Event Workshop Report').</p>	
<p>Activity 2.5. Facilitate effective linkages with related processes in focal countries (IUCN Green list certification, PA system-level governance assessment)</p>		<p>Although none of the project sites are yet involved in the Green List process IIED continue to collaborate closely with IUCN on the Green List process at the global level and in new Green List programmes in Zambia and five countries in Latin America.</p>	
<p>3. Capacity, guidance and tools necessary for wider scaling up of social equity assessment and action planning, and evidence to support advocacy for more supportive international and national policy</p>	<p>3.1 IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidelines for advancing equity in PA management and governance</p> <p>3.2 3 staff of PA Authorities and NGOs in Liberia and Malawi participate in training and peer to peer learning</p> <p>3.2 Report of a meta-analysis of social equity assessments from 10 sites</p> <p>3.4 Policy briefs targeting CBD policy and strategic planning processes</p>	<p>3.1. 3.3 3.4 - Too early to in the project to report progress</p> <p>3.2 Colleagues from FDA participated in Sept 2019 SAPA Learning Event (workshop report attached in Annex 4 'SAPA Learning Event Workshop Report').</p>	

<p>Activity 3.1 Organise a cross visit for peer to peer learning between learning group countries (Kenya, Uganda, Liberia, Malawi)</p>	<p>Completed in Sept 2019 (workshop report attached in Annex 4 'SAPA Learning Event Workshop Report').</p>	
<p>3.2. Organise a capacity building event for the PA social equity assessment learning group (2 days in Nairobi)</p>		
<p>3.3. Develop and publish IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidelines for assessing equity in PA management and governance (similar to WCPA BPG #14 on effectiveness)</p>	<p>Too early in the project to report progress.</p>	<p>We plan to develop a virtual guidance package in place of these guidelines</p>
<p>3.4. Conduct synthesis of results from 10 PA sites and basic PA management effectiveness and ranger-based monitoring data from same sites and produce a report for launch at World Conservation Congress or CBD COP15</p>	<p>Too early in the project to report progress.</p>	<p>3.4 Submit a change request to Darwin to reflect our updated M&amp;E plan.</p>
<p>3.5. Develop policy brief to inform international policy development including for use at CBD COP15</p>		<p>3.5 Once we know the revised plans for COP 15 we will reflect on the plans for a policy brief.</p>
<p>3.6. Facilitate inclusion of sessions on social equity assessment in relevant regional and sub-regional events organised by CBD Secretariat and IUCN</p>		<p>3.6 WCC Speakers Event organised for January 2021.</p>
<p>3.7. Organise capacity building events/side events at World Conservation Congress (Sept 2020) and CBD COP15 (Dec 2020)</p>		<p>3.7 WCC Side event with IUCN colleagues on social equity assessment methods and how to use them</p>

## Annex 2: Project's full current logframe as presented in the application form (unless changes have been agreed)

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p><b>Impact:</b> (by 30<sup>th</sup> June 2023): Improved conservation and poverty alleviation of at least 6000 households across 10 PAs in Uganda, Kenya, Liberia and Malawi, and indications of similar impacts with at least 10 other PAs</p>			
<p><b>Outcome:</b> (by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021): PA equity assessment institutionalised in Kenya and Uganda, initiated in Liberia and Malawi, actions taken in response to strengthen management and governance, and equity provisions strengthened in international conservation policy</p>	<p>0.1 KWS and UWA and other key stakeholders conduct social equity assessments at a total of 8 PA sites with active engagement of their central planning, research &amp; monitoring units.</p> <p>0.2 FDA in Liberia and Africa Parks in Malawi conduct social equity assessments at 2 PA sites and start an institutionalisation process.</p> <p>0.3 Changes in PA management and governance at site and system levels that will plausibly deliver better conservation and social outcomes.</p> <p>0.4 At least 2400 households (average 400 at each of first 6 sites) report poverty reduction and improved equity attributable to changes in PA management and governance</p> <p>0.5 Decreased threat to biodiversity in 8 PAs in Kenya and Uganda as a result of 15% reduction in poaching</p> <p>0.6 CBD strategic plan 2020-30 refers explicitly to the 3 dimensional equity framework as the basis for advancing equity in PA management/governance</p>	<p>0.1 Review of site assessment reports for all 8 sites</p> <p>0.2 Review of site assessment reports for 2 sites</p> <p>0.3 Key informant interviews with representatives of key stakeholder groups (as 0.2) using an outcome harvesting method, plus focused case studies to further investigate outcome quality and causality</p> <p>0.4 Participatory impact assessment methods with community-level focus groups (men and women separately)</p> <p>0.5 Reports of ranger-based monitoring conducted by UWA and KWS and discussions with community focus groups</p> <p>0.6 Review of CBD documents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At least two major international conservation agencies adopt PA social equity assessment and action planning as recommended procedures for PAs that they support</li> <li>▪ Evidence of results from using social equity assessment demonstrates that it is a good investment from a conservation perspective</li> <li>▪ Resources are secured from PA authorities and/or donors supporting them for extending the learning group from 4 to 8 countries in Africa. This will deliver the additional 10 PA sites in the impact statement (and potentially many more) although beyond the scope of the project</li> </ul>

<p><b>Output 1</b></p> <p>Social equity assessment and action planning have been conducted at 8 PA sites in Uganda and Kenya</p>	<p>1.1 KWS and UWA conduct social equity assessments at a total of 8 sites</p> <p>1.2 Key stakeholders at 8 PAs have responded to social equity assessment findings through their own annual planning processes</p> <p>1.3 At least (?) 4 men and 4 women assessment facilitators in each country trained in understanding equity, social equity assessment and action planning</p>	<p>1.1 Assessment reports for the 8 sites</p> <p>1.2 Survey conducted by the project</p> <p>1.3 Project reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At least one NGO actively participates in each assessment and offers to provide political and/or financial support to implement some of the suggested actions.</li> <li>▪ At least two major international conservation organisations (in addition to IIED and FFI) lobby CBD and IUCN to encourage country parties/IUCN members to conduct social equity assessment.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Staff of KWS and UWA HQ have understanding, skills and tools to plan, coordinate and analyse PA social equity assessments and action planning, and there is broad awareness and support for PA equity assessment within civil society</p>	<p>2.1 A total of 10 senior managers KWS and UWA gain a good understand of social equity in relation to PAs</p> <p>2.2 A total of 20 staff of civil society organisations and tourism operators gain a good understand of social equity in relation to PAs</p> <p>2.3 A total of 10 staff of KWS and UWA planning, research and monitoring units gain understanding, skills and tools for social equity assessment</p>	<p>2.1 Workshop reports and evaluations by workshop participants</p> <p>2.2 Workshop reports and evaluations by workshop participants</p> <p>2.3 Interviews at the end of the project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Funding is secured by FFI and FDA in Liberia to implement social equity assessment for at least at 1 PA site</li> <li>▪ Funding is secured to implement social equity assessment for at least 1 PA site in Malawi in partnership with CEPA and KFW or African Parks</li> <li>▪ At least 4 other social equity assessment conducted in other countries that already expressed interest in SAPA following launch of version 1 of the SAPA manual.</li> </ul>
<p>3. Capacity, guidance and tools necessary for wider scaling up of social equity assessment and action planning, and evidence to support advocacy for more supportive international and national policy</p>	<p>3.1 IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidelines for advancing equity in PA management and governance</p> <p>3.2 3 staff of PA Authorities and NGOs in Liberia and Malawi participate in training and peer to peer learning</p>	<p>3.1 Quality of the document and level of interest from IUCN and other key actors</p> <p>3.2 Project reports</p> <p>3.3 Quality of research report</p> <p>3.4 Quantity and quality of policy briefs and response of CBD Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Close collaboration with the IUCN Green List Certification process</li> <li>▪ Sufficient interest and political will in each participating country to support implementation of some measures to advance equity at site level in response to</li> </ul>



	<p>3.2 Report of a meta-analysis of social equity assessments from 10 sites</p> <p>3.4 Policy briefs targeting CBD policy and strategic planning processes</p>		<p>the social equity assessment findings.</p>
<p><b>Activities</b> (each activity is numbered according to the output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1)</p> <p>1.1. Capacity building workshop for assessment facilitation teams and monitoring staff of PA agencies in Kenya and Uganda</p> <p>1.2. Conduct assessments in 4 sites per country with targeted hands-on technical support for site 1 and remote technical support for all other sites</p> <p>1.3. Communicate key results of assessments to site-level and national stakeholders through brief reports for each site with substantial use of maps and graphics.</p> <p>1.4. Facilitate a follow-up meeting at each site to prioritise actions and assign responsibilities</p> <p>1.5. Support facilitation teams to engage in action planning processes of key stakeholders at each site to encourage and plan responses to key assessment findings</p> <p>1.6. Learning event for 2 facilitation teams from Kenya and 2 from Uganda to share experience and results (2 days combined with activity 3.2), and learning report</p> <p>2.1. First national workshop (inception) with staff of PA agencies, relevant conservation and development NGOs and other key stakeholders for project introduction, including "understanding equity" (1 day)</p> <p>2.2. Capacity building and technical support for planning, research and monitoring units of PA agencies in Kenya and Uganda to manage a social equity assessment database, conduct analysis, produce summary reports of results and apply results through annual plans and PA management plans.</p> <p>2.3. Produce a policy brief for each country aiming to support policy development to enable more equitable PA management and increase political support</p> <p>2.4. Second national workshop with staff of PA agencies, relevant conservation and development NGOs and other key stakeholders to present and review social equity assessment results from the first 2 sites (1 day)</p> <p>2.5. Facilitate effective linkages with related processes in focal countries (IUCN Green list certification, PA system-level governance assessment)</p> <p>3.1. Organise a cross visit for peer to peer learning between learning group countries (Kenya, Uganda, Liberia, Malawi)</p> <p>3.2. Organise a capacity building event for the PA social equity assessment learning group (2 days in Nairobi)</p>			

- 3.3. Develop and publish IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidelines for assessing equity in PA management and governance (similar to WCPA BPG #14 on effectiveness)
- 3.4. Conduct synthesis of results from 10 PA sites and basic PA management effectiveness and ranger-based monitoring data from same sites and produce a report for launch at World Conservation Congress or CBD COP15
- 3.5. Develop policy brief to inform international policy development including for use at CBD COP15
- 3.6. Facilitate inclusion of sessions on social equity assessment in relevant regional and sub-regional events organised by CBD Secretariat and IUCN
- 3.7. Organise capacity building events/side events at World Conservation Congress (Sept 2020) and CBD COP15 (Dec 2020)

## Annex 3: Standard Measures

Code No.	Description	Gender of people (if relevant)	Nationality of people (if relevant)	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
6A - Number of people to receive other forms of education/ training	Hands on training provided on undertaking the five phases of social equity assessment	Women and men	Ugandan and Kenyan	32	61		93	>60
7 Number of (i.e., different types - not volume - of material produced) training materials to be produced for use by host country	Social Equity Assessment Manual and associated detailed guidance on tools	NA	NA	3	6		10	>10
12A - Number of computer based databases to be <b>established</b> and handed over to the host country	Social equity assessment databases including data from all 8 protected area PA sites	NA	NA	0	0	2	0	2
14B Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops <b>attended</b> at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	Presenting findings at international workshops to share insights from social equity assessment	NA	NA	2	3		2	>6

**Table 2 Publications**

Title	Type (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (authors, year)	Gender of Lead Author	Nationality of Lead Author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. weblink or publisher if not available online)

## Annex 4 Onwards – supplementary material (optional but encouraged as evidence of project achievement)

### Checklist for submission

	Check
<b>Is the report less than 10MB?</b> If so, please email to <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@itsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@itsi.co.uk</a> putting the project number in the Subject line.	x
<b>Is your report more than 10MB?</b> If so, please discuss with <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@itsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@itsi.co.uk</a> about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	
<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.	x
<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. However, we would expect that most material will now be electronic.	
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	x
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	x
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	