



Darwin Initiative: Final Report

To be completed with reference to the “Writing a Darwin/IWT Report” Information Note:
(<https://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/resources-for-projects/reporting-forms-change-request-forms-and-terms-and-conditions/>).

It is expected that this report will be a **maximum** of 20 pages in length, excluding annexes)

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 (FFI), Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), Kenya Wildlife Services (KWS)
Darwin grant value	£339,747
Start/end dates of project	Start Date: 2018-07-01 End Date: 2021-03-31
Project leader’s name	Phil Franks
Project website/blog/social media	https://www.iied.org/enhancing-equity-effectiveness-protected-area-conservation
Report author(s) and date	Phil Franks, Rob Small, Josephine Nzilani and Rogers Niwamanya

1 Project Summary

Global efforts to reduce biodiversity loss are heavily focused on expanding the network of protected areas (PAs). But the reality of our target countries (and many others) is that PAs 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 supported KWS and UWA to institutionalise an approach (designed by IIED and FFI) to social equity assessments at PAs, and to undertake action planning to strengthen governance and management. Long-term, 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 PAs
- increase employment or income-generation opportunities (including for women)

Early signs of these impacts have already been recorded at 4 of the 8 project sites in Kenya and Uganda, illustrated in Figures 1 and 2 (see Annex 7.1).

At the international level, this project is at the forefront of work to support PA managers and relevant authorities and other key stakeholders to understand the meaning of equitable PA management and governance, to promote actions to improve equity at site and system levels, and assess progress for national reporting to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). This work is supported by the development of relevant briefing papers (Annex 7.2 and 7.3) and a research report (Annex 7.1) on equity in PA management and governance.



Figure 1. Map of Uganda showing the location of the 4 PA 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, Amboseli National Park and Marsabit National Reserve.

2 Project Partnerships

The project built on an existing partnership between FFI and IIED to assess the social impacts of PAs and extended this partnership to government institutions in Kenya and Uganda. This report has been drafted by IIED and FFI, including FFI staff in Kenya and Uganda.

IIED was a founder member of the Social Assessment of Protected Areas (SAPA) initiative on which this project builds. With support from Darwin Initiative, SAPA has become a global leader in developing relatively simple low-cost methods for assessing the social impacts of PAs. IIED coordinated the project and led the provision of technical support.

FFI has worked in Kenya and Uganda for 15 and 11 years respectively, supporting a wide range of both terrestrial and marine projects. FFI was the lead international and national partner in the project that developed the SAPA methodology. In this project FFI staff in Uganda and Kenya were responsible for facilitating the assessments, supporting subsequent action planning by key stakeholders, and organising national level stakeholder workshops, working in partnership with KWS and UWA.

In Uganda, this project was assigned to the UWA Senior Manager, Community Benefits. FFI kept UWA up-to-date on project activities, with UWA staff participating in a range of these activities at the Uganda sites, including site-level inception meetings, training of enumerators and stakeholder meetings. FFI prepared and shared periodic progress reports with senior management at UWA for purposes of information (see Annex 7.4 for an example). At site level, Community Conservation Wardens were the focal points for the project and were part of the facilitation teams. These Wardens reported on social equity assessments activities in their regular monthly and quarterly reports produced for UWA. UWA staff also participated in site-level activities, especially for activities related to action planning following the park level social equity assessments. FFI staff also worked closely with senior UWA management to discuss the institutionalisation of the social equity assessment at UWA.

In Kenya, the point of contact at the KWS HQ was the Head of Ecological Monitoring. At site level, KWS research scientists were the point of contact, coordinating activities in consultation with park and community wardens. FFI and IIED work closely with the KWS Head of Ecological Monitoring to plan project activities with the involvement of national and park staff. This includes organising for the engagement of HQ staff in action planning workshops and in a learning exchange workshop in Nairobi. KWS HQ staff also participated in site-level activities, especially for activities related to action planning following the park level social equity assessments. IIED and FFI observed that site-level KWS staff have appreciated building relationships and asking for input from national-level HQ staff during action planning - especially to gain ideas and insights from HQ staff on ideas for action, but also to clearly articulate the challenges site-level staff face and highlight existing gaps in national guidance.

3 Project Achievements

3.1 Outputs

1. Social equity assessment and action planning have been conducted at 7 PA sites in Uganda and Kenya

Social equity assessments and action planning was conducted at 6 of the initial 8 project sites, namely Ruma National Park, Kisite Marine Park, Marsabit National Reserve, Mgahinga Gorilla National Park, Kibale National Park and Murchison Falls National Park. Challenges related to the Covid-19 pandemic such as restrictions on travel and social gatherings as well as the need to adapt to new working conditions affected plans for the assessment at Amboseli National Park and Bwindi Impenetrable National Park. While we had noted these changes and the halting of SAPA at Amboseli National Park, we had hoped that the assessment at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park would be completed. However due to the worsening of Covid-19 in Uganda and the introduction of further lockdowns, it has not been possible to hold community meetings at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park over the last year, with the SAPA being completed half-way (up to Phase 3 of 5, for more see <https://pubs.iied.org/14659iied>). Despite the ending of the project, the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) will still commit resources to completing the assessment at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park

In both Uganda and Kenya, a total of 46 men and 21 women were trained in understanding equity, social equity assessments and related action planning (Participation lists for training at each site are included in Annex 7 in each site's evidence folder, eg Ruma SAPA, Kibale SAPA etc). Reports were produced for each of the 6 sites where assessments were completed and actions planned and subsequently implemented (see Annex 7 under each site's evidence folder). These reports were shared with KWS and UWA staff at the national

and site level which enabled them to review the findings and plan follow-up actions through their own annual planning processes. Across all 6 sites, many of the actions planned were successfully implemented (List and description of actions implemented at each site are under Annex 7 in each site folder). An outcome harvesting survey was also conducted by the project with key stakeholders at 4 of the 6 sites commenting on the assessment findings and related actions planned and implemented (see Annex 7.1).

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

Altogether we have trained 49 staff (19 UWA and 30 KWS) - a total of 35 men and 14 women - to plan, undertake and coordinate social equity assessments. Of these, 11 senior managers at UWA and 14 senior managers from KWS reported a good understand of social equity in relation to PAs (see Annex 7.5 and 7.6).

A total of 44 staff of civil society organisations or tourism operators were also included in the social equity assessments across all 8 initial sites. This included:

- Seven representatives at Mgahinga Gorilla 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 Reserve: Pastoralist Community Initiative and Development Assistance (PACIDA), SAKU Community Forest Association and Jaldesa Community Conservancy.
- Eight in Amboseli National Park: 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).

With respect to the institutionalisation of SAPA, for all National Parks where SAPA has been conducted, KWS and UWA staff have been trained and actively involved in facilitation of the methodology, including survey design, data analysis and action planning components. 6 UWA staff and 9 KWS staff from Community, M&E and Tourism sections of PAs received training in social equity assessments (see Annex 7 under each of the site folders). Capacity of KWS and UWA staff 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 National Park led the information gathering process in Kisite Marine Park, supporting training of facilitators, training enumerators and coordinating household surveys. Currently, OI Pejeta Conservancy staff are actively supporting and providing training on SAPA in private and community conservancies in at least 2 additional sites in 2021. The Research Scientist in Marsabit National Reserve also led the analysis of household survey data and communication of

SAPA results to communities. This high level of competency, especially with Community Wardens, Monitoring and Research Wardens and Park Research Scientists can be drawn on for the future application of SAPA across further KWS and UWA managed protected areas. Towards this, SAPA has now been recognised as key methodology within the UWA M&E technical unit for application within its General Management Plan (GMP) planning cycle.

IIED and FFI, along with EU JRC, are also developing a semi-automated tool to assist SAPA users with data collection, analysis and reporting. As described in the Y3 change request and sections 5 and 8 of this report, this tool is still under-development and will be launched later this year.

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

21 Staff from PA agencies in Kenya, Uganda, Liberia and Mozambique participated in a learning event in Nairobi in September 2019 (see participant list in the 'learning event' folder submitted under Annex 7). Participants said they benefited from interacting with people from other sites who have done the assessment, and stated that it made a huge difference for their work to see what other sites have done. Those from parks or conservation areas where SAPA had not started stated they learnt a lot and look forward to applying SAPA at their sites (for example, see Annex 7.7).

A research report of a meta-analysis of social equity assessments at 6 of the project sites was published in 2021 (Annex 7.1). The report contained results of the outcome harvesting exercise and demonstrated the impact SAPA can have on a site. The report went through the IIED peer-review quality assurance process prior to publication.

In addition to the report, supplementary material (to be incorporated as an annex in the next version of the SAPA manual) which describes action planning guidance to address negative impacts related to law enforcement was published on the IIED website (Annex 7.8). The guidance has since been downloaded 31 times. For feedback from a SAPA facilitator on the quality of the guidance, see Annex 7.9.

The scaling up of SAPA will continue beyond the project timeframe. For example, 10 additional sites have since completed assessments with 7 more planned assessments for 2021 (see section 3.4) and we will be promoting SAPA at side events at the World Conservation Congress and CBD SBSTTA.

3.2 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

The project achieved its intended outcome with the exception of completing an assessment at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park due to Covid-19 restrictions that caused delays to key assessment activities such as stakeholder/community meetings. KWS and UWA and other key stakeholders therefore conducted social equity assessments at a total of 6 PA sites with active engagement of their central planning, research & monitoring units (outcome indicator 1.1, see Annex 7 where individual reports of each of the assessments including action planning are included in the respective site folders).

At the end of the project, the project team conducted phone interviews with representatives of key stakeholder groups from 4 sites using an outcome harvesting method, which was used to produce case studies that investigated outcome quality and causality (Annex 7.1). This identified changes in behaviour as well as actions that strengthened management and governance that have taken place since the equity assessment that may be at least partially

attributable to the assessment. In fact, of the 50 outcomes harvested, a majority were management and governance outcomes as reported by stakeholders. Through this outcome harvesting exercise, demonstrated changes in PA management and governance at site and system levels that should deliver better conservation and social outcomes (outcome indicator 1.3). It also highlighted changes in household poverty/wellbeing attributable to changes in PA management and governance (outcome indicator 1.4). For example, new KWS employment opportunities at Kisite Marine Park and Ruma National Park, new revenue-sharing arrangements at Mgahinga Gorilla National Park and Kibale National Park that have enabled setting up of new livelihood activities. Since the assessments, both UWA and KWS have also implemented projects to improve access to water (eg impacting 280 households around Ruma National Park) and provide better access to healthcare and forest resources to meet subsistence needs (for a list and discussion of outcomes, see Annex 7.1).

The outcome harvesting exercise also revealed decreases in threats to biodiversity at the 4 PA sites through reduction in poaching (outcome indicator 1.5), largely achieved through increased cooperation between PA agencies and local communities. For example, at Ruma National Park, communities are sharing more information with KWS on poaching. Similarly, at Mgahinga Gorilla National Park, community members helped UWA staff to locate and arrest a poacher. These activities were attributed to an increase in respect between stakeholders built due to the multi-stakeholder process of the assessments (see Annex 7.1).

Outcome indicator 1.6 has also been achieved with the CBD COP14 formally deciding to include the 3-dimensional equity framework as the basis for advancing equity in PA management and governance (see <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-08-en.pdf>).

FDA in Liberia attended a learning event on SAPA in 2019 (outcome indicator 1.2, see Annex 7, in the 'learning event' folder). However, as described in the approved change request, FDA in Liberia and Africa Parks in Malawi did not conduct social equity assessments nor start an institutionalisation process. The inclusion of Liberia in this indicator was dependent on co-funding which was secure at the start of the project. However, site level work in Liberia was delayed because of a change in management, and most recently because of Covid-19. Therefore, as communicated in the change request, work in Liberia will be completed outside of the timeframe of the project. The inclusion of Malawi was dependent on co-funding which was not secure at the start of the project and was not secured during the project. This reflects the fact that one of our key project assumptions was not fulfilled.

3.3 Monitoring of assumptions

The validity and robustness of all the important assumptions were reviewed on an annual basis, as evidenced in previous annual reports. Most of the assumptions proved robust, however some of the assumptions were challenged by Covid-19. For example, the 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' was valid with WWF in Kenya and IGCP in Uganda providing political and financial support for the assessments at Amboseli National Park and Bwindi Impenetrable National Park respectively. Their support stemmed from their experience of involvement in other social equity assessments under this project. However, Covid-19 has delayed the completion of the assessments at these two PAs. Similarly, while the assumption 'Funding is secured by FFI and FDA in Liberia to implement social equity assessment for at least at 1 PA site', delays caused partly by Covid-19 mean this assessment will take place outside the timeframe of the project.

A project assumption that was not fulfilled was the securing of funding to implement a 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. Resources were also not secured from PA authorities and/or donors supporting them for extending the learning group from 4 to 8 countries in Africa.

Some of the project assumptions, such as lobbying CBD and IUCN to encourage country parties or IUCN members to conduct social equity assessments has been only partially fulfilled due to the delay of the CBD COP15. IUCN has since offered small grants through its BIOPAMA programme to conduct social equity assessments, including the use of SAPA, at sites in Cameroon, Benin, Kenya and Nigeria. IIED has also continued to closely collaborate with the IUCN Green List Certification process, including on a project in Kenya. The project also assumed that evidence of results from using social equity assessment would demonstrate that it is a good investment from a conservation perspective. This has partially been fulfilled as showcased in the published project research report (Annex 7.1). However, further evidence is needed to substantiate this from a conservation perspective.

The assumption that at least 4 other social equity assessments will be conducted in other countries has been fulfilled, with 10 assessments being conducted to date (see section 3.4) and additional funding has been secured for the implementation of 7 more SAPAs in 2021, 4 of which will be through the BIOPAMA programme.

In both Kenya and Uganda, the project assumed sufficient interest and political will to support implementation of some measures to advance equity at site level in response to the social equity assessment findings. In both countries, measures planned in response to the assessment findings were successfully implemented despite Covid-19 related setbacks such as cuts to funding. Additionally, senior management teams at UWA 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, a site-specific SAPA process should be conducted.

An assumption that was not clearly articulated in the project logframe was with respect to the willingness of PA agencies to share sensitive ranger-based monitoring data. This is further reflected on in section 6 of this report.

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

Impact on original application form:

By 30th 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

In Uganda and Kenya, we conducted outcome harvesting at 4 PAs to understand the conservation and social impacts of the project on nearby households. In total, 50 different outcomes were harvested. Our theory of change assumes that the assessment and associated planning workshop gives rise to three levels of outcome in a hierarchy of objectives. The highest level is a social impact — an outcome that directly contributes to a change in the wellbeing of local people (eg employment). This is followed by management and governance outcomes, i.e., changes in management and governance of the PA and/or other associated conservation and development activities. Most of the 50 outcomes harvested relate to management and governance. These, in turn, should lead to changes in wellbeing, but they are not yet reported in these terms. For example, common outcomes were “improved community-PA relations and trust” and “improved efforts to mitigate human-wildlife conflict”. These are management and governance outcomes that should contribute to less crop damage (social impact). In time, they should improve the wellbeing of local people. However, these outcomes do not imply fewer social impacts of the project as some households may take for granted that improving a wall that keeps buffaloes out of people’s farms will help reduce crop damage. For more detailed description of the outcomes, see Annex 7.1 (i.e., project research report ‘Assessing and improving the social impacts of protected areas: Case studies from Kenya and Uganda’: <https://pubs.iied.org/20151iied>). We anticipate similar impacts at the other project sites.

KWS and UWA integrated actions planned post the assessments into their wider management plans. Some of these activities have contributed to improving conservation as well as poverty alleviation at 6 PAs. For example, in Kenya, at Ruma National Park, human-wildlife conflict zones were mapped and targeted interventions such as fence reinforcements were introduced. KWS also disseminated information to communities on application procedures for compensation and shared their contact information to facilitate quicker response times to reports of human-wildlife conflict. Approximately 280 households have benefitted from piped water supply provided by KWS as a result of the assessment. Through community meetings, KWS shared its CSR policy and information on its community development fund to help enable communities apply for funding for their priority projects. Further details and evidence on these actions and actions taken at the other project sites that we anticipate contributing to improving conservation and poverty alleviation by 30th June 2023 are presented in Annex 7 under each of the site folders.

As mentioned in the Y3 approved change request, the inclusion of Liberia in this impact statement was dependent on co-funding which was secure at the start of the project. However, site level work in Liberia was delayed because of a change in management, and most recently because of Covid-19. As a result, work in Liberia will be completed outside of the timeframe of the project. This reflects the fact that one of our key project assumptions was not fulfilled. Similarly, the inclusion of Malawi was dependent on co-funding which was not secure at the start of the project and has since not been secured. This too reflects the fact that one of our key project assumptions was not fulfilled.

The impact statement mentions PAs in other countries. To-date, since the start of this project, a total of 10 social equity assessments took place in PAs in Mozambique (3 – Chimanimani National Park, Maputo Special Reserve and Marromeu National Park), Kenya (3 – Loisaba Conservancy, Ol Pejeta Conservancy and Borana Conservancy), Chad (1 – Sena Oura National Park), Cameroon (2 – Benoue National Park and Bouba Njida National Park) and Congo Basin (1 - Sangha Trinational, which lies across Central African Republic, Cameroon and Congo-Brazzaville). The impacts of these assessments are currently unknown, but we anticipate similar impacts as observed by our outcome harvesting exercise at 4 of the PA sites (Annex 7.1). At least 7 more assessments are planned for 2021, including 4 funded by the BIOPAMA programme and 1 in Liberia funded by the Arcus Foundation.

4 Contribution to Darwin Initiative Programme Objectives

4.1 Contribution to Global Goals for Sustainable Development (SDGs)

The project directly contributed to gender equality (SDG5) within PA adjacent communities by revealing differences in men and women’s concerns about social impacts of PAs and planning actions to address gendered inequalities (see section 4.4 for more details). More broadly, the ability of social equity assessment to reveal and support efforts to counteract inequity in distribution, procedure and recognition contributes to reducing inequality in the context of conservation (SDG10).

The contribution of the project to SDG14 (life below water) and SDG15 (life on land) is premised on the theory that conservation that is more equitable in terms of recognition, procedures and distribution of benefits and costs tends to be more effective in achieving conservation goals (see <http://pubs.iied.org/14671IIED>). The study of outcomes at 4 sites documented in the IIED research report produced by this project provides evidence of improvement in conservation as well as social outcomes (Annex 7.1).

4.2 Project support to the Conventions or Treaties (e.g. CBD, Nagoya Protocol, ITPGRFA, CITES, Ramsar, CMS, UNFCCC)

The project supports aspects of goals 2.1 and 2.2 of the CBD’s Programme of Work on Protected Areas which calls for parties to:

- Assess the economic and socio-cultural costs, benefits and impacts arising from the establishment and maintenance of protected areas, particularly for indigenous and local communities, and adjust policies to avoid and mitigate negative impacts, and where appropriate compensate costs and equitably share benefits in accordance with the national legislation.
- Carry out participatory national reviews of the status, needs and context-specific mechanisms for involving stakeholders, ensuring gender and social equity, in protected areas policy and management, at the level of national policy, protected area systems and individual sites.
- Support participatory assessment exercises among stakeholders to identify and harness the wealth of knowledge, skills, resources and institutions of importance for conservation that are available in society.
- Make available to Parties case-studies, advice on best practices and other sources of information on stakeholder participation in protected areas

Aichi Target 11 within the CBD Strategic Plan calls for “equitable management” of PAs. However, little progress has been made in assessing benefits, costs and impacts of PAs or ensuring social equity in mechanisms to involve stakeholders in PA policy and management – thereby, enabling more equitable management. This project addressed these gaps with a relatively simple, low-cost approach to social equity assessment that is feasible under typical constraints of human and financial resources in Africa. This project also 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. Additionally, the project has published briefing papers and a research report with case studies that provides information and advice on improving stakeholder participation in protected areas (Annex 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3).

CBD decision COP/DEC/14/8 on protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures “encourages Parties and invites other Governments, relevant organizations, in collaboration with indigenous peoples and local communities, to apply the voluntary guidance contained in annexes I and II, on integration and mainstreaming, and governance and equity of protected areas” (see <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-08-en.pdf>). This project makes a substantial contribution as one of very few initiatives that aims to integrate and mainstream equity in all three of its dimensions.

Few CBD parties and conservation organisations have much capacity on gender, in part because the need is not very evident - problems of male-bias in the allocation of benefits at a particular site, and in decision-making more generally, tend to be invisible to decision-makers. As we have already seen from IIED’s work on PA social equity and governance assessments, including this project, a participatory assessment approach that disaggregates the responses of men and women can be very powerful in revealing gender bias and empowering women to challenge this. By making gender equity/equality an integral part of work on equitable PA management (as opposed to a stand-alone agenda), this project makes an important contribution to advancing gender equity/equality with the CBD.

4.3 Project support to poverty alleviation

This project enhanced the contribution of PAs in Uganda and Kenya to poverty reduction and food security by:

- revealing negative social impacts of PAs that often fall disproportionately on the poorest by disaggregating assessment responses based on wellbeing indicators, planning for the effective mitigation of these impacts, and implementing appropriate actions (see Annex 7.1 for an overview of disaggregated assessment findings at the 6 sites) and

- revealing bias in the allocation of benefits such as development projects, employment and access to resources within PAs, and planning for and implementing corrective actions (see Annex 7.1 for an overview of the 6 sites).

In this way the project helped enable existing resource flows to deliver greater poverty reduction impact. For example, in Uganda, due to the results of the social equity assessment at Murchison Falls National Park, a 30km electric fence around park boundaries was erected to reduce human-wildlife conflict and meetings were held to help resolve issues of human-wildlife conflict and food insecurity. Skill-development trainings were also conducted for communities. At Mgahinga Gorilla National Park, UWA extended water services for communities living around the park, including the signing of MoUs, formation of water and sanitation committees, drafting of byelaws, training on water governance, operation and maintenance, and installing of water meters. UWA also secured funding to run community mobile clinics to improve health conditions of communities living around Kibale National Park. These and many other actions were also reported by interviewed community members during the outcome harvesting process (see Annex 7.1).

4.4 Gender equality

The SAPA methodology includes gender disaggregation by design in having separate focus groups for women and men in the scoping phase. This ensured that women's concerns were taken forward into all of the in-depth assessment. Our approach to gender disaggregation enables comparison of the perspectives of men and women for all social impacts and related governance constraints (for an overview of assessment results at the 6 sites, see Annex 7.1). In many cases women invited to focus groups said it was the first meeting on PA issues that they had ever been invited to, and the discussions proved very successful in giving voice to women's concerns. 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 the 'SAPA success and challenges report' in the learning event folder under Annex 7).

The project also developed specific measures to reduce the risk of situations where men might suppress women's opinions. This included changing the ratio of male to female community representatives in stakeholder workshops to favour women (given that non-community participants were mainly male) and enabling women community representatives to meet and discuss their priorities prior to these workshops. With this approach we have seen impressive results in terms of outcomes. For example, we saw progress in terms of gender balanced community participation in decision-making as well as actions planned and implemented in support of women's groups (see Annex 7.1).

The project also ensured that both women and men received training on social equity assessments and were involved in facilitation of the assessments at all project sites (see participant list under each site folder in Annex 7).

4.5 Programme indicators

- **Did the project lead to greater representation of local poor people in management structures of biodiversity?**

The project used a multi-stakeholder assessment process that enabled local poor people to provide feedback on PA management and governance, including opportunities for equitable participation in decision-making. The results of the assessment were disaggregated to highlight differences between the opinions of assessment participants from households with higher and lower wellbeing. These results were subsequently used to inform action planned, including to improve the equity of how decisions are being made. For example, at Mgahinga Gorilla National Park, community members have begun actively participating in finding solutions to PA-related problems (see Annex 7.1).

- **Were any management plans for biodiversity developed and were these formally accepted?**

Development of action plans followed all the social equity assessments. These actions were included in formal PA management plans and many of the actions implemented during the project timeframe (see individual site folders under Annex 7).

- **Were they participatory in nature or were they ‘top-down’? How well represented are the local poor including women, in any proposed management structures?**

The management plans were developed based on the results of participatory multi-stakeholder assessments. Responses to this participatory process were disaggregated on the basis of gender and wellbeing status, revealing differences in how people felt about decision-making practices. Since the assessment, the chairwoman of the Beach Management Unit at Kisite Marine Park reported feeling greatly empowered in being able to speak directly to government authorities, attributing this to the SAPA process (see Annex 7.1).

- **How did the project positively influence household (HH) income and how many HHs saw an increase?**

Across the 6 project sites, the assessment results highlighted negative social impacts on communities such as a perceived lack of employment opportunities from PA agencies and fair PA revenue sharing as well as a lack of sufficient access to water and other resources. Actions planned and implemented post the assessment addressed these concerns and very likely contributed to an increase in household income. For example, KWS hired 30 community rangers at Kisite Marine Park and improved community access to water around Ruma National Park. At Kibale National Park, UWA provided 90 goats to women’s groups using revenue-sharing funds. Community savings-and-loans groups were also established at Mgahinga Gorilla National Park. See Annex 7.1 for further details of actions that would likely have had an impact on household income at 4 of the PA sites.

- **How much did their HH income increase (e.g. x% above baseline, x% above national average)? How was this measured?**

As described in our approved change request, we revised the outcome indicator and means of verification related to this programme indicator due to Covid-19 related challenges (see details in section 8 of this report). We were therefore unable to measure household income increase. However, as described in response to the previous programme indicator, actions implemented as a result of the project have very likely contributed to an increase in household income.

4.6 Transfer of knowledge

The project has published a research report aimed at conservation practitioners and policymakers on the value of social equity assessments to PA management and governance (Annex 7.1). Country-specific briefing papers for Uganda and Kenya have also been published (Annex 7.2 and 7.3). Additionally, side events including SAPA are scheduled to take place at WCC and CBD SBSTTA, but due to the postponement of these international events, this activity now falls outside of the project timeframe.

4.7 Capacity building

Output 1 focused on building capacity of members of the assessment facilitation team at each site. Across the project sites in Kenya and Uganda, the social equity assessments were led by facilitation teams comprising of at least one KWS/UWA staff member and at least one staff member of a civil society organisation. Overall, 46 men and 21 women received training to facilitate these assessments (see participant lists in site folders under Annex 7). This capacity building took two forms: a) a 3-day training workshop including staff from the research and monitoring units at KWS and UWA HQ, b) targeted hands-on technical support for the first sites in each country and thereafter remote support from IIED and FFI by email and skype. Additionally, facilitators from the first two sites in each country shared experiences at a learning event (see learning event folder in Annex 7).

Under output 2, a data analysis workshop was held with staff from UWA in February 2018 (participant list in Annex 7.10). After this workshop, we concluded that such a training was not

an effective means of institutionalising SAPA and therefore decided against a similar workshop for KWS staff. Instead, as described in the Y3 change request and section 5 of this report, we began developing a semi-automated analysis and reporting tool with EU JRC to assist KWS and UWA planning, research and monitoring units in undertaking data analysis, produce summary reports of results and apply results through annual plans and PA management plans. Later this year, this tool will be trialled with staff from KWS and UWA and subsequently launched for use in Kenya, Uganda as well as elsewhere in Africa. As of the end of the project, capacity of KWS and UWA staff particularly at site level has been increased to a level that staff have been able to support project activities in other sites in Kenya and Uganda respectively.

Under output 3 (wider impact), the project organised a capacity building and peer-to-peer learning event attended by 21 staff from PA agencies in Kenya, Uganda, Liberia and Mozambique who collectively reflected on the assessment results and learnings from use of the SAPA methodology.

5 Sustainability and Legacy

In Kenya, following its successful development and application at several sites, SAPA has now been selected for application at two further protected areas managed by KWS (Watamu and Shimba Hills). For all National Parks where SAPA has been conducted, KWS staff have been trained and actively involved in facilitation of the methodology, including survey design, data analysis and action planning components. 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 National Park led the information gathering process in Kisite Marine Park, supporting training of facilitators, training enumerators and coordinating household surveys. The Research Scientist in Marsabit National Reserve also led the analysis of household survey data and communication of SAPA results to communities. This high level of competency, especially with Community Wardens and Park Research Scientists can be drawn on for the future application of SAPA across further KWS-managed protected areas. Currently, Ol Pejeta Conservancy staff are actively supporting and providing training on SAPA in private and community conservancies in at least 2 additional sites in 2021.

Similarly in Uganda, SAPA has now been recognised as key methodology within the UWA M&E technical unit for application within its General Management Plan (GMP) planning cycle. For all National Parks where SAPA has been conducted, UWA staff have been trained and actively involved in facilitation of the methodology, including survey design, data analysis and action planning components. UWA staff who have gone through the SAPA process have also provided guidance to other sites. The Community Conservation Warden at Mgahinga Gorilla National Park gave guidance to her colleagues at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park on what needs to be done in the form of partnerships, the kind of planning required and with whom. This made it easier for UWA staff at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park. Such kind of sharing would help any institutional staff understand the SAPA process and what is needed for it to help them achieve their conservation objectives. This high level of competency, especially with Community Conservation Wardens and Monitoring & Research Wardens, can be drawn on for the future application of SAPA across further UWA-managed protected areas. In addition, IGCP have adopted SAPA as a measure within their current strategic plan.

To further ensure long-term sustainability of the project, IIED and FFI, along with EU JRC, are also developing a semi-automated tool to assist SAPA users with data collection, analysis and reporting. The tool is currently in development and will be tested by SAPA users at KWS and UWA before being launched later this year.

6 Lessons learned

Understanding social impacts of conservation as well as equity in a systematic way is relatively novel for many conservation organisations. This applies to FFI as well as KWS and UWA. The core applied research capacity of both UWA and KWS centred around ecological monitoring

with staff in community conservation sections focusing on the distribution of benefits. Although the methodologies used by the project don't require social scientists per se, the structure and hierarchy of KWS and UWA meant that it wasn't immediately clear where the most effective place to seed SAPA within these organisations was. For example, linking the project to M&E staff within UWA in addition to the Community Conservation department was very important for a broader uptake and understanding of approaches. Similarly, following frequent staffing changes at KWS headquarters, we learned that as well as trying to engage at the headquarters level, it is valuable to engage Regional Directors throughout the process to enhance SAPA's institutionalisation process. In KWS, Regional Directors head several parks in one region, so involving them enables support for SAPA implementation throughout their region.

Another key lesson learned is that at site level, using a peer learning approach in which KWS or UWA staff supported assessments at additional sites also improved the rate of institutional uptake and understanding. This approach also enabled learning how best to adapt SAPA to different contexts. For example, in Marsabit National Reserve, 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.

Finally, the project had assumed access to ranger-based monitoring data and the willingness of PA agencies to share this data. In Y3 of the project we recognised the sensitive nature of this data and accordingly proposed changes to outcome indicator 1.5, which were subsequently approved. Relatedly, in response to the challenges we faced with getting the information needed for M&E we used "outcome harvesting" based on phone interviews with participants in the SAPA process (5-6 at each site representing different stakeholder groups). This proved remarkably successful especially in identifying equity outcomes that might have been missed by conventional M&E, for example, improved access to information, improving trust and respect between communities and park managers, and empowerment of women (see Annex 7.1).

6.1 Monitoring and evaluation

In Y3, a review of the M&E information informed the project workplan. Accordingly, a change request was submitted and approved. This included amendments to the logframe linked to Covid-19 and assumptions about co-funding. Time-bound changes to indicators under output 3 were also approved (see Annex 1).

Linked to Covid-19:

1. Halting of the social equity assessment at Amboseli National Park, Kenya. Instead, funds were used for extended follow-up activities at the other three Kenyan sites. For this reason, the initial 8 sites became 7 sites. Not noted in the change request was the halting of the assessment at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park. We had hoped to complete this assessment by the end of the project, but due to further Covid-19 restrictions, it was deemed unsafe for in-person gatherings such as community meetings. IGCP is committed to supporting completion of the assessment later in 2021.
2. Extension in our timeline to produce country-level briefing papers for Uganda and Kenya by Q4 instead of Q2 in the final year of the project.
3. The World Conservation Congress and CBD COP15 were postponed to after the project ended in March 2021. We will still be promoting social equity assessments at these events, but these activities will no longer happen during the project's reporting period.
4. Instead of producing an international policy brief aimed at CBD COP15, we produced action planning guidance to address negative impacts related to law enforcement. This guidance is aimed at social equity assessment users and was published as a standalone document on the IIED website (Annex 7.8).

Linked to co-funding and Covid-19:

5. The site level assessments planned in Malawi and Liberia were dependent on co-funding. The co-funding at the Liberia site was secure but work there was delayed, first as a result of a change in management at the site, and later because of Covid-19. The co-funding for work at the Malawi site was not secure. Co-funding being forthcoming for work in these countries was a key assumption, so we have not removed references to Liberia and Malawi from the logframe.
6. Cancellation of the publication of IUCN Best Practice Guidelines for assessing equity in protected area management and governance.
7. During the course of the project, we flagged our plans to extend our work under 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) by collaborating with the EU Joint Research Council to develop a semi-automated tool for improving social equity assessment data analysis and reporting. Delays to signing this contract meant this work continues as a complementary follow-up post the project.

Changes to two of the outcome indicators were also approved:

1.4 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

Became

1.4 At least a quarter of households (at each of 4 sites) experience poverty reduction and improved equity attributable to changes in PA management and governance

The challenge here was with the means of verification: participatory impact assessment methods with community-level focus groups (men and women separately). We were unable to do these focus groups due to Covid-19. We therefore changed the means of verification to outcome harvesting based on phone interviews with a sample of key stakeholders (i.e., the same as indicator 1.3). Using this method, we were able to cover 2 sites in Kenya and 2 in Uganda. While the outcome harvesting method can suggest whether a significant number of households have benefited in a way that reduces poverty and/or improves equity it cannot generate numbers, hence the change in the means of verification.

1.5 Decreased threat to biodiversity in 8 PAs in Kenya and Uganda as a result of 15% reduction in poaching

Became

1.5 Decreased threat to biodiversity in 4 PAs in Kenya and Uganda as a result of significant reduction in poaching

Neither KWS nor UWA were able to release data on levels of poaching as they consider this politically sensitive information. Outcome harvesting was used to assess the extent (if at all) to which stakeholders were aware of a reduction in illegal activities, their estimates of the extent of any reduction and whether and how the project has contributed to this reduction. However, as with the change to indicator 1.4, this method cannot determine the exact % reduction. Using this method, we were able to cover 2 sites in Kenya and 2 in Uganda.

All M&E information was, wherever possible, disaggregated by key social variables, notably to explore differences by gender, by wellbeing status of households, and by ethnicity and other potential dimensions of social marginalisation. This is also reflected in the social equity assessments and all project publications. A key M&E activity of the project was the outcome harvesting exercise which proved highly effective (see Annex 7.1).

Having clearly defined indicators for the output and outcome level of the logframe and regular reporting against these indicators made for more effective and efficient M&E system.

The learning event in September 2019 (see Annex 7 for shared experiences and learnings in the learning event folder) served as a form of internal evaluation in terms of reviewing assessment results and sharing learnings on use of the SAPA methodology.

6.2 Actions taken in response to annual report reviews

The following comments were provided in the annual report reviews - these are accompanied by actions taken in response.

1. *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?*

This comment was responded to in AR2:

OI Pejeta Conservancy 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 4th year. OI Pejeta Conservancy 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 OI Pejeta Conservancy 2030 strategic plan which is currently under development. Staff from the Conservancy have given technical support to the project at site-level in Ruma National Park and made significant contributions to the international learning event held in September 2019. In addition, Loisaba and Borana conservancies have applied SAPA assessments in Y2 of this project through the support of OI Pejeta Conservancy staff who provided training and data analysis of results.

2. *Outcome-level indicators should be revisited and 'SMARTened'. None are currently time-bound – and if they are, in fact, all end-of-project, then it would be useful to have a few additional interim indicators against which progress could be more easily be assessed. Likewise, the Output indicators.*

This comment was responded to in AR2:

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. Time-bound changes to indicators under output 3 were submitted and approved as part of a change request in Y3.

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 1.3, and we now propose extending this to 1.4 given the difficulty in accessing ranger-based monitoring data in a usable form, and also to 1.5 given the risk that we may not be able to conduct community focus groups before the end of December.

These changes to outcome indicators were requested and approved in Y3.

3. *Please comment on the management and maintenance of partnerships and on how any challenges have been addressed*

This comment was responded to in AR2:

Over the project period there have been several changes in point of contact at the KWS HQ. At site level, there have also been a number of staff changes. These changes at the HQ and sites have impacted on our efforts to institutionalise SAPA.

4. *Clarify the role and involvement of CEPA in the project since there is no mention about their involvement in the Annual Report, yet they are mentioned as partners in the application.*

CEPA was to be the NGO partner for implementing SAPA in Malawi. Funds for including a site in Malawi in the project were not secure at the time of application, and were subsequently not secured during the project. As CEPA was included based on the assumption that funding would be secured, the NGO has since been removed from all project reporting.

5. *Provide a narrative of progress towards outputs and outcomes against output and outcome level indicators.*

This report provides a narrative of achievements in line with outcome and output level indicators – see section 3.1 and 3.2.

6. *Clarify the strategies the project has put in place to achieve some of the projects outcome level indicators: (1) FDA in Liberia and Africa Parks in Malawi conduct social equity assessments at 2 PA sites and start an institutionalisation process; and (2) CBD*

strategic plan 2020-30 refers explicitly to the 3 dimensional equity framework as the basis for advancing equity in PA management/governance.

The first outcome indicator mentioned (1.2) was dependent on co-funding which was secure at the start of the FDA. However, site level work in Liberia was delayed because of a change in management, and most recently because of Covid-19. Therefore, as communicated in the Y3 change request, work in Liberia will be completed outside of the timeframe of the project. So, no change to the indicator was requested.

The second outcome indicator mentioned (1.6) was actually achieved earlier than expected with the inclusion of our equity framework in the protected areas decision of CBD COP14 (see <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-08-en.pdf>). This decision also made the important switch in language from “equitable management” that is in Aichi Target 11 to “equitable governance” in this decision which indicates CBD Parties recognising that equity is much more a matter of governance than management. This change in the language of equity has carried through into the post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the work of this project contributes to the evidence base that supports this change and illustrates the practical relevance of equity in conservation.

7. Include project’s contribution to SDG 14 (life below water) and SDG15 (life on land) in next Annual Report.

See section 4.1 of this report.

8. Despite the capacity provided to field staff on SAPA, staff have not effectively been able to independently conduct SAPA as mentioned in Section 4 of AR2 so the project will now be using a semi-automated tool. Provide a clear strategy on how the proposed semi-automated SAPA tool will be institutionalised in UWA and KWS in the project exit strategy.

This comment was responded to in HYR3. FFI and IIED have since finalised agreements with EU JRC to support the development of the SAPA semi-automated tool. However, the development of the software to beta stage is still under development. In September 2021, testing will be conducted with facilitation teams at UWA and KWS sites where SAPA household survey data was collected in Y1 and Y2 of the project. Additional field testing will also take place at Ol Pejeta Conservancy, Kenya which conducted its second SAPA in 2019-20 following the first piloting in 2015.

9. In relation to COVID-19: Provide details of measures the project has taken in relation to health and safety of project staff and beneficiaries.

The project strictly followed Covid-19 health and safety guidance in Uganda and Kenya, prioritising the health and safety of all project staff and beneficiaries. See section 8 of this report for more details.

7 Darwin identity

We have publicised the Darwin Initiative as the funder of this project in all communications and in all outputs, as well as on social media. We have done so by including the Darwin Initiative and UK Aid logos as well as acknowledgment statements that the output was funded by the Darwin Initiative through UK Government funding via the project ‘Enhancing Equity and Effectiveness of Protected Area Conservation (EEEPAC)’ (e.g., see Annex 7.8).

A link to the Darwin Initiative is on the SAPA webpage that sits within the IIED website.

8 Impact of COVID-19 on project delivery

Covid-19 had a number of impacts on the delivery of the project; however, the project team was able to adapt new ways of working (eg using WhatsApp and other forms of social media to engage with communities) as well as produce more timely outputs (eg guidance on addressing the negative impacts of PA law enforcement).

In Uganda and Kenya, the project team strictly adhered to all government guidance to ensure the health and safety of all project staff and beneficiaries. A key impact of the pandemic was having to halt the social equity assessments at Amboseli National Park and Bwindi Impenetrable National Park as in-person gatherings were no longer considered safe. Instead, funds for these assessments were used for extended follow-up activities at the other 6 sites (see site-specific folders in Annex 7 for details of follow-up activities) and to conduct the

outcome harvesting exercise (see Annex 7.1). KWS and UWA activities were also significantly impacted by Covid-19, as the pandemic took priority for the Kenyan and Ugandan governments. This resulted in loss of funding for both institutions - in Uganda for example, the loss of tourism funding meant UWA have serious financial constraints and challenges to ensure continued funding of their PA's core functions. Of course, this impacted action planning and implementation at project sites. However, many of the planned actions, especially those that required minimal funding, were completed successfully (see site-specific folders provided under Annex 7).

Some of the project activities aimed at international conservation policymakers were cancelled or postponed as they were no longer timely with the postponed of events such as the World Conservation Congress and CBD COP15. However, we will still be promoting social equity assessments at these events later this year.

Activities linked to co-funding such as the assessments planned in Liberia were also delayed due to Covid-19. During the course of the project, we flagged our plans to extend our work under 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) by collaborating with the EU JRC to develop a semi-automated tool for improving social equity assessment data analysis and reporting. As EU JRC is based in Italy, a country significantly impacted by Covid-19 in 2020, this caused delays to signing of the contract which means this work continues as a complementary follow-up post the project. This has made it difficult to institutionalise the SAPA process at KWS and UWA within the timeframe of the project.

Lastly, due to Covid-19 related challenges, we made changes to the project outcome indicators and means of verification. With the original means of verification – community focus groups – we would have used a Participatory Rural Appraisal method where group members would have estimated the proportion of households that benefited from the actions taken in response to SAPA. We had planned three meetings each with 12-15 participants, so around 40 people would have contributed to this estimate. As we were unable to conduct these focus groups, we proposed an alternative method – outcome harvesting. With this method, we interviewed 6-8 people per site via 45-minute phone interviews. We took the view that asking these individuals to estimate the proportion of people benefiting from our work is risky as they are likely to exaggerate the impact to please us, making the data unreliable. Outcome harvesting has strengths and weaknesses. It is strong where the information you are seeking is of a type that can be gathered from a few people – e.g., a change in the level of illegal activities from a park staff who is knowledgeable about law enforcement and might have access to law enforcement data; but weak where no one or two people have the information you are looking for – e.g., number of beneficiaries. The only reliable way of getting this information is to talk to a cross-section of people either with a survey or focus groups, which was not possible with COVID-19 restrictions. However, our outcome harvesting exercise has clearly demonstrated the value of SAPA at the site as well as system level with 50 outcomes harvested at 4 PA sites. The outcomes have shown SAPA's capacity to strengthen PA management and governance as well as improve positive social impacts of PAs while mitigating negative ones (see Annex 7.1).

9 Finance and administration

9.1 Project expenditure

Project spend (indicative) since last annual report	2020/21 Grant (£)	2020/21 Total actual Darwin Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)				
Consultancy costs				

Overhead Costs				
Travel and subsistence				
Operating Costs				
Capital items (see below)				
Others (see below)				
TOTAL				

Staff employed (Name and position)	Cost (£)
Phil Franks	
Francesca Booker	
Fiona Roberts or Ali Logan-Pang	
IIED communications and publications production	
Rob Small	
Helen Anthem	
Andy Cameron	
Josephine Nzilani	
Rogers Niwamanya	
Patrick Lelei	
Stella Ajilong	
TOTAL	

Capital items – description	Capital items – cost (£)
TOTAL	

Other items – description	Other items – cost (£)
Other costs - Publication production, printing etc	
Kenya & Uganda Office costs	
Publication production, printing etc	
TOTAL	

9.2 Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured

Source of funding for project lifetime	Total (£)
FFI support of implementation of SAPA in Mozambique	
UWA staff time at protected area sites and HQ	
KWS staff time at protected area sites and HQ	
IIED Biodiversity team frame funds	

TOTAL	
--------------	--

Source of funding for additional work after project lifetime	Total (£)
FFI consultancy with EC JRC on SAPA work (€14,997)	
TOTAL	

9.3 Value for Money

The project has had a strong emphasis on value for money as it uses a relatively low-cost methodology for social equity assessment of PAs that strikes a balance between rigour and credibility on the one hand and practicality in terms of available capacity and resources. Furthermore, the assessment methodology is part of IIED's larger Conservation Communities and Equity programme which includes a strategy for scaling up SAPA drawing on the learnings of this project and thus leveraging considerably more impact than that achieved at the specific sites of this project.

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

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

Annex 1 Project’s original (or most recently approved) logframe, including indicators, means of verification and assumptions.

Note: Insert your full logframe. If your logframe was changed since your Stage 2 application and was approved by a Change Request the newest approved version should be inserted here, otherwise insert the Stage 2 logframe.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Impact: Impact (by 30th 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>Outcome (by 31st 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>1.1 KWS and UWA and other key stakeholders conduct social equity assessments at a total of 7 PA sites with active engagement of their central planning, research & monitoring units.</p> <p>1.2 FDA in Liberia and Africa Parks in Malawi conduct social equity assessments at 2 PA sites and start an institutionalisation process.</p> <p>1.3 Changes in PA management and governance at site and system levels that will plausibly deliver better conservation and social outcomes.</p> <p>1.4 At least a quarter of households (at each of 4 sites) experience poverty reduction and improved equity attributable to changes in PA management and governance</p> <p>1.5 Decreased threat to biodiversity in 4 PAs in Kenya and Uganda as a result of significant reduction in poaching</p> <p>1.6 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>1.1 Review of site assessment reports for all 7 sites</p> <p>1.2 Review of site assessment reports for 2 sites</p> <p>1.3 Key informant interviews with representatives of key stakeholder groups from 4 sites using an outcome harvesting method, plus focused case studies to further investigate outcome quality and causality</p> <p>1.4 Key informant interviews with representatives of key stakeholder groups from 4 sites using an outcome harvesting method, plus focused case studies to further investigate outcome quality and causality</p> <p>1.5 Key informant interviews with representatives of key stakeholder groups from 4 sites using an outcome harvesting method, plus focused case studies to further investigate outcome quality and causality</p> <p>1.6 Review of CBD documents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least two major international conservation agencies adopt PA social equity assessment and action planning as recommended procedures for PAs that they support ▪ Evidence of results from using social equity assessment demonstrates that it is a good investment from a conservation perspective ▪ 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

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. Social equity assessment and action planning have been conducted at 7 PA sites in Uganda and Kenya</p>	<p>1.1 KWS and UWA conduct social equity assessments at a total of 7 sites by end December 2020</p> <p>1.2 Key stakeholders at 7 PAs have responded to social equity assessment findings through their own annual planning processes by end March 2021</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 7 sites</p> <p>1.2 Survey conducted by the project</p> <p>1.3 Project reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ 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. ▪ Funding is secured by FFI and FDA in Liberia to implement social equity assessment for at least at 1 PA site
<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"> ▪ 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 ▪ At least 4 other social equity assessments conducted in other countries that already expressed interest in SAPA following launch of version 1 of the SAPA manual. ▪ Close collaboration with the IUCN Green List Certification process
<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 3 staff of PA Authorities and NGOs in Liberia, Mozambique plus other countries participate in training and peer to peer learning by end March 2020.</p> <p>3.2 Report of a meta-analysis of social equity assessments from 7 sites by end March 2021</p> <p>3.3 An annex to the SAPA manual which describes action planning</p>	<p>3.1 Project reports</p> <p>3.2 Quality of research report</p> <p>3.3 Download statistics from the IIED website; Quality of action planning guidance as confirmed by SAPA facilitators</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
	guidance to address negative impacts related to law enforcement by end March 2021		
<p>Activities (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 7 sites (3 Kenya, 4 Uganda) 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, Mozambique and others)</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 Conduct synthesis of results from 7 PA sites including basic PA management effectiveness data, and outcome harvesting data from 4 of these sites and produce a report for launch before World Conservation Congress & CBD COP15</p> <p>3.4 Develop guidance on action planning to address negative impacts related to law enforcement for future SAPA users</p> <p>3.5 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 Organise capacity building events in the lead up to World Conservation Congress) and CBD COP15</p>			

Annex 2 Report of progress and achievements against final project logframe for the life of the project

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements
<p>Impact:</p> <p>Impact (by 30th 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>As of June 2021, social equity assessments have been completed at 16 PAs in Kenya, Uganda, Mozambique, Chad, Cameroon, Congo-Brazzaville and Central African Republic, with at least 7 more assessments planned for 2021.</p> <p>In Uganda and Kenya, interviews with representatives of key stakeholder groups from 4 sites using an outcome harvesting method, plus focused case studies were used to investigate overall impact of the project. In total, 50 different outcomes were harvested. Most of the outcomes relate to management and governance. These, in turn, should lead to changes in wellbeing, but they are not yet reported in these terms. For more detailed description of the outcomes, see Annex 7.1.</p> <p>KWS and UWA integrated actions planned post the assessments into their wider management plans. Some of these activities have contributed to improving conservation as well as poverty alleviation at 6 PAs. Details and evidence on actions taken that we anticipate contributing to improving conservation and poverty alleviation by 30th June 2023 are presented under Annex 7 in each of the site folders.</p> <p>As mentioned in the Y3 approved change request, the inclusion of Liberia in this impact statement was dependent on co-funding which was secure at the start of the project. However, site level work in Liberia was delayed because of a change in management, and most recently because of Covid-19. As a result, work in Liberia will be completed outside of the timeframe of the project. This reflects the fact that one of our key project assumptions was not fulfilled. Similarly, the inclusion of Malawi was dependent on co-funding which was not secure at the start of the project and has since not been secured. This too reflects the fact that one of our key project assumptions was not fulfilled.</p>
<p>Outcome (by 31st March 2021):</p> <p>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>1.1 KWS and UWA and other key stakeholders conduct social equity assessments at a total of 7 PA sites with active engagement of their central planning, research & monitoring units.</p> <p>1.2 FDA in Liberia and Africa Parks in Malawi conduct social equity assessments at 2 PA sites and start an institutionalisation process.</p>	<p>1.1 Site assessment reports are available for all sites except for Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, where the assessment is yet to be completed due to Covid-19 restrictions (see Annex 7, under each of the site folders).</p> <p>1.2 FDA in Liberia attended a learning event on SAPA in Y2. The inclusion of Liberia was dependent on co-funding which was secure at the start of the project. However, site level work in Liberia was delayed because of a change in management, and most recently because of Covid-19. Therefore, as communicated in the Y3 change request, work in Liberia will be completed outside of the timeframe of the project. The inclusion of Malawi was dependent on co-funding which was not secure at the start of the project and was not</p>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements
	<p>1.3 Changes in PA management and governance at site and system levels that will plausibly deliver better conservation and social outcomes.</p> <p>1.4 At least a quarter of households (at each of 4 sites) experience poverty reduction and improved equity attributable to changes in PA management and governance</p> <p>1.5 Decreased threat to biodiversity in 4 PAs in Kenya and Uganda as a result of significant reduction in poaching</p> <p>1.6 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>secured during the project. This reflects the fact that one of our key project assumptions was not fulfilled.</p> <p>1.3 – 1.5 Interviews with representatives of key stakeholder groups from 4 sites using an outcome harvesting method, plus focused case studies were used to investigate outcome quality and causality (see Annex 7.1). This identified changes in behaviour and other actions that have taken place since the equity assessment that may be at least partially attributable to the assessment.</p> <p>1.6 CBD decision COP/DEC/14/8 on protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures includes the 3-dimensional equity framework as the basis for advancing equity in PA management and governance (see https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-08-en.pdf).</p>
<p>Output 1. Social equity assessment and action planning have been conducted at 7 PA sites in Uganda and Kenya</p>	<p>1.1 KWS and UWA conduct social equity assessments at a total of 7 sites by end December 2020</p> <p>1.2 Key stakeholders at 7 PAs have responded to social equity assessment findings through their own annual planning processes by end March 2021</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 Site assessment reports produced for 6 of the 7 sites (see Annex 7 under each of the site folders)</p> <p>1.2 Action plans were produced and many of the actions implemented at 6 of the 7 sites (see Annex 7 under each of the site folders). An outcome harvesting survey was also conducted by the project with key stakeholders at 4 of the 6 sites commenting on the assessment findings and related actions planned and implemented (see Annex 7.1).</p> <p>1.3 In total, 21 women and 46 men in Uganda and Kenya have received in-depth training on understanding equity and social equity assessment (see Annex 7 under each of the site folders).</p>
<p>Activity 1.1 Capacity building workshop for assessment facilitation teams and monitoring staff of PA agencies in Kenya and Uganda</p>		<p>Completed. 21 women and 46 men in Uganda and Kenya (assessment facilitation teams and monitoring staff of PA agencies) having attended capacity building workshops (see site-specific folders under Annex 7).</p>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements
Activity 1.2. Conduct assessments in 7 sites (3 Kenya, 4 Uganda) with targeted hands-on technical support for site 1 and remote technical support for all other sites		Completed. Social equity assessments conducted at 7 sites (3 in Kenya and 4 in Uganda) (see assessment reports in Annex 7 in each of the site folders)
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.		Completed. Reports of key assessment results with use of maps and graphics produced and shared with site-level and national stakeholders (see Annex 7 in each of the site folders)
Activity 1.4 Facilitate a follow-up meeting at each site to prioritise actions and assign responsibilities		Completed. Action planning meetings held at each site (see Annex 7, where each of the site folders contain action planning documents).
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		Completed. Facilitation teams engaged in action planning processes of key stakeholders at each site (see Annex 7, where each of the site folders contain action planning documents).
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		Completed. Learning event held in September 2019 (see Annex 7, in the learning event folder).
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	<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 11 senior managers at UWA and 14 senior managers from KWS reported a good understand of social equity in relation to PAs following a training in September 2018 (see Annex 7.5 and 7.6)</p> <p>2.2 A total of 44 staff of civil society organisations or tourism operators were included in the social equity assessments (see section 3.1 for site-wise list of organisations).</p> <p>2.3 6 UWA staff and 9 KWS staff from Community, M&E and Tourism sections of PAs received training in social equity assessments (see Annex 7 under each of the site folders). Capacity of KWS and UWA staff has been increased to a level that staff have been able to support project activities in other sites. As described in the Y3 change request and sections 5 and 8 of this report, we have also prioritised development of a semi-automated analysis and reporting tool with EU JRC to assist KWS and UWA planning, research and monitoring units</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)		Completed. Workshops held in Y1 (see Annex 7.5 and 7.6).
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.		A data analysis workshop was held with staff from UWA in February 2018 (see Annex 7.10). After this workshop, we concluded that such a training was not an effective means of institutionalising SAPA and therefore decided against a similar workshop for KWS staff. Instead, as described in the Y3 change request and section 5 of this report, we began developing a semi-automated analysis and

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements
		reporting tool with EU JRC to assist KWS and UWA planning, research and monitoring units in undertaking data analysis, produce summary reports of results and apply results through annual plans and PA management plans. Later this year, this tool will be trialled with staff from KWS and UWA and subsequently launched for use in Kenya, Uganda as well as elsewhere in Africa.
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		Completed. Briefing papers for Uganda and Kenya produced (see Annex 7.2 and 7.3).
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)		Completed. Event held in September 2019 (see Annex 7, in the learning event folder).
Activity 2.5 Facilitate effective linkages with related processes in focal countries (IUCN Green list certification, PA system-level governance assessment)		Although none of the project sites are yet involved in the Green List process IIED continues to collaborate closely with IUCN on the Green List process at the global level and in new Green List programmes in Kenya, Mozambique, Seychelles, Zambia and five countries in Latin America.
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	<p>3.1 3 staff of PA Authorities and NGOs in Liberia, Mozambique plus other countries participate in training and peer to peer learning by end March 2020.</p> <p>3.2 Report of a meta-analysis of social equity assessments from 7 sites by end March 2021</p> <p>3.3 An annex to the SAPA manual which describes action planning guidance to address negative impacts related to law enforcement by end March 2021</p>	<p>3.1 Staff from PA agencies – KWS (13), UWA (6), the Liberian Forest Development Authority (1) and Administração Nacional das Áreas de Conservação, Mozambique (1) – participated in a learning event in September 2019 (see Annex 7, in the learning event folder).</p> <p>3.2 Report of a meta-analysis of social equity assessments from 6 sites published (see Annex 7.1). The report went through the IIED peer-review quality assurance process prior to publication. Site 7 – Bwindi Impenetrable National Park – was not included in the report due to delays in the assessment caused by Covid-19 (see section 8 of this report).</p> <p>3.3 Supplementary material (to be incorporated as an annex in the next version of the SAPA manual) which describes action planning guidance to address negative impacts related to law enforcement was published on the IIED website (Annex 7.8). The guidance has since been downloaded 31 times. For feedback from a SAPA facilitator on the quality of the guidance see Annex 7.9.</p>
Activity 3.1 Organise a cross visit for peer to peer learning between learning group countries (Kenya, Uganda, Liberia, Mozambique and others)		Completed. Event held in September 2019 (see Annex 7, in the learning event folder).
Activity 3.2 Organise a capacity building event for the PA social equity assessment learning group (2 days in Nairobi)		Completed. Event held in September 2019 (see Annex 7, in the learning event folder).
Activity 3.3 Conduct synthesis of results from 7 PA sites including basic PA management effectiveness data, and outcome harvesting data from 4 of these		Completed. Report published with synthesis of results from 6 of the 7 sites (see Annex 7.1). As described in section 8 of this report, Site 7 – Bwindi Impenetrable

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements
sites and produce a report for launch before World Conservation Congress & CBD COP15		National Park – was not included in the report due to delays in the assessment caused by Covid-19.
Activity 3.4 Develop guidance on action planning to address negative impacts related to law enforcement for future SAPA users		Completed. The guidance was published on the IIED website (Annex 7.8).
Activity 3.5 Facilitate inclusion of sessions on social equity assessment in relevant regional and sub-regional events organised by CBD Secretariat and IUCN		Side events including SAPA at WCC and CBD SBSTTA have been scheduled, but due to the postponement of these international events, this activity now falls outside of the project timeframe.
Activity 3.6 Organise capacity building events in the lead up to World Conservation Congress) and CBD COP15		Side events including SAPA at WCC and CBD SBSTTA have been scheduled, but due to the postponement of these international events, this activity now falls outside of the project timeframe.

Annex 3 Standard Measures

Code	Description	Total	Nationality	Gender	Title or Focus	Language	Comments
Training Measures							
1a	Number of people to submit PhD thesis						
1b	Number of PhD qualifications obtained						
2	Number of Masters qualifications obtained						
3	Number of other qualifications obtained						
4a	Number of undergraduate students receiving training						
4b	Number of training weeks provided to undergraduate students						
4c	Number of postgraduate students receiving training (not 1-3 above)						
4d	Number of training weeks for postgraduate students						
5	Number of people receiving other forms of long-term (>1yr) training not leading to formal qualification (e.g., not categories 1-4 above)						
6a	Number of people receiving other forms of short-term education/training (e.g., not categories 1-5 above)	67	34 Ugandan, 33 Kenyan	46 men, 21 women	Hands on training provided on undertaking the five phases of social equity assessment	English	
6b	Number of training weeks not leading to formal qualification						
7	Number of types of training materials produced for use by host country(s) (describe training materials)	11	NA	NA	Social Equity Assessment Manual and	English, French	

					associated detailed guidance on tools		
Research Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Title	Language	Comments/ Weblink if available
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) produced for Governments, public authorities or other implementing agencies in the host country (ies)						Participatory process?
10	Number of formal documents produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording.						
11a	Number of papers published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals						
11b	Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere						Location?
12a	Number of computer-based databases established (containing species/generic information) and handed over to host country						
12b	Number of computer-based databases enhanced (containing species/genetic information) and handed over to host country						
13a	Number of species reference collections established and handed over to host country(s)						
13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced and handed over to host country(s)						

Dissemination Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
14a	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops organised to present/disseminate findings from Darwin project work	3	NA	NA	SAPA workshops, including an international learning event	English	
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	1	NA	NA	Anthropology and Conservation conference	English	Sharing of project findings on the usefulness of SAPA for capturing socially differentiated perspectives, especially gendered differences

Physical Measures		Total	Comments
20	Estimated value (£s) of physical assets handed over to host country(s)		
21	Number of permanent educational, training, research facilities or organisation established		
22	Number of permanent field plots established		Please describe

Financial Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
23	Value of additional resources raised from other sources (e.g., in addition to Darwin funding) for project work (<i>please note that the figure provided here should align with financial information provided in section 9.2</i>)						

Annex 4 Aichi Targets

	Aichi Target	Tick if applicable to your project
1	People are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.	
2	Biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.	
3	Incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio economic conditions.	
4	Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.	
5	The rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced.	
6	All fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits.	
7	Areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.	
8	Pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.	
9	Invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment.	
10	The multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.	
11	At least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.	✓
12	The extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.	
13	The genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and	

	implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.	
14	Ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.	
15	Ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.	
16	The Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.	
17	Each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.	
18	The traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.	
19	Knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.	
20	The mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties.	

Annex 5 Publications

Type *	Detail (title, author, year)	Nationality of lead author	Nationality of institution of lead author	Gender of lead author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. web link, contact address etc)
Research report	Franks, P., Booker, F., Small, R., Nzilani, J., Niwamanya, R., Pinto, R. (2021). <i>Assessing and improving the social impacts of protected areas: case studies from Kenya and Uganda.</i>	British	British	Male	IIED, London	https://pubs.iied.org/20151iied
Supplementary material / annex	Franks, P., Small, R. (2021). <i>Supplement for the Social Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (SAPA) Methodology manual for SAPA facilitators: General guidance on follow-up actions for enabling fair and effective law enforcement.</i>	British	British	Male	IIED, London	https://pubs.iied.org/20031iied
Briefing paper	Niwamanya, R., Small, R. (2021).	Ugandan	British	Male	FFI, Cambridge	Annex 7.2

	<i>Implementation of SAPA in Uganda for enhanced equity & effectiveness of protected area conservation.</i>					
Briefing paper	Nzilani, J., Small, R. (2021). <i>Implementation of SAPA in Kenya for enhanced equity & effectiveness of protected area conservation.</i>	Kenyan	British	Female	FFI, Cambridge	Annex 7.3

Annex 6 Darwin Contacts

Ref No	25-006
Project Title	Enhancing Equity and Effectiveness of Protected Area Conservation (EEEEPAC)
Project Leader Details	
Name	Phil Franks (Principal Researcher), International Institute for Environment and Development
Role within Darwin Project	Project leader
Address	
Phone	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 1	
Name	Rob Small (Senior Technical Specialist)
Organisation	Fauna and Flora International
Role within Darwin Project	Project Partner
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 2	
Name	Bernard Kuloba (Senior Research Scientist, Biodiversity Information)
Organisation	Kenya Wildlife Service
Role within Darwin Project	Project Partner
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 3	
Name	Bintora Adonia (Senior Manager, Community Benefits and Wildlife Enterprises)
Organisation	Uganda Wildlife Authority
Role within Darwin Project	Project Partner
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	

Checklist for submission

	Check
Is the report less than 10MB? If so, please email to Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk putting the project number in the Subject line.	
Is your report more than 10MB? If so, please discuss with Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	
If you are submitting photos for publicity purposes, do these meet the outlined requirements (see section 10)?	
Have you included means of verification? You should not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	
Do you have hard copies of material you need to submit with the report? If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number. 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	
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	