



## Darwin Initiative Annual Report



Department  
for Environment  
Food & Rural Affairs

Submission Deadline: 30 April

### Darwin Project Information

Project Reference	20-010
Project Title	Social Assessment of Protected Areas (SAPA)
Host Country/ies	Gabon, Kenya, Liberia, Gambia, Senegal
Contract Holder Institution	International Institute for Environment and Development
Partner institutions	<b>Global:</b> International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) <b>Global:</b> United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) <b>Global and Gabon:</b> Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) <b>Global, Kenya and Liberia:</b> Fauna & Flora International (FFI) <b>Gabon:</b> Agence National des Parc Nationaux (ANPN) <b>Kenya:</b> Laikipia Wildlife Forum (LWF) <b>Liberia:</b> Forest Development Authority (FDA) <b>Gambia and Senegal:</b> TBD
Darwin Grant Value	£239,393
Start/end dates of project	1/4/13 – 31/3/16
Reporting period (eg Apr 2013 – Mar 2014) and number (eg Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	April 2013 – March 2014, annual report #1
Project Leader name	Dilys Roe, IIED
Project website	<a href="http://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-areas">http://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-areas</a>
Report author(s) and date	Phil Franks and Dilys Roe, April 28 <sup>th</sup> 2014

### 1. Project Rationale

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

Interest in the positive contribution of PAs to human well-being, and concerns over negative social impacts is not new, and numerous studies have been conducted by natural and social scientists using wide range of different methodologies. What has changed in recent years is the increase in political commitment to address issues of social equity in PA conservation. Initially agreed at the 2003 World Parks Congress (WPC), this principle has been further

elaborated in many different policy instruments at national and international levels, including the CBD Aichi target on expansion of PA systems which calls for the targets to be achieved through *effectively and equitably managed systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures*.

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

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

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

## 2. Project Partnerships

In line with the workplan, work in the four host countries started in January 2014 and therefore partnership development is at a very early stage.

- **Kenya:** FFI (replacing African Wildlife Foundation), Laikipia Wildlife Forum and OI Pejeta Conservancy. Initial meetings took place in January 2014 at which a stakeholder analysis was developed. This was followed by more in-depth meetings with FFI and OI Pejeta Conservancy in March and a workshop to introduce the project to the wider group of stakeholders including staff of Kenya Wildlife Service and Laikipia County Government. The approach to social assessment being developed by SAPA is, by nature, a multi-stakeholder process in which key stakeholder groups engage in the design of the assessment, data collection and the interpretation of findings.
- **Gabon:** WCS, Agence National des Parc Nationaux (ANPN) Initial discussions have been held with WCS staff in Gabon and they in turn have introduced the project to ANPN. In mid-May the IIED Project Leader will visit to fully introduce the project and start the assessment process .
- **Liberia:** Initial discussions have been held with FFI in Liberia, a site for the assessment has been selected, and it has been agreed that the process, including full engagement of government partners, will start in late 2014.

At the global level SAPA is being implemented in partnership with UNEP-WCMC. This partnership builds on a history of collaboration on a number of projects and has been further strengthened by the close working relationship required in the joint management of this Darwin project. Over the last year WCMC staff, and in particular Prof Neil Burgess, have been actively engaged in the further development of the SAPA framework, and in facilitating fieldwork in the

Gambia in collaboration with a WCMC project that is focusing on the contribution of PAs to climate change adaptation/ resilience. Furthermore WCMC is providing expertise on this key issue at global level in order to strengthen the overall SAPA framework in this respect.

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

IUCN is a key partner both in terms of engagement of the IUCN Secretariat and its regional and country offices, and the IUCN Commissions (WCPA and CEESP) and inter-commission initiatives (TILCEPA). Building on earlier work, strong collaboration has been established with communities of practice on PA Management Effectiveness and PA Governance Assessment, in particular with a view to the potential for SAPA to generate relevant information for PAME and the World Database on PAs, and for some level of integration with governance assessment.

### 3. Project Progress

#### 3.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

The following sections report on activities under the three outputs that were to be addressed during year 1 as planned in the implementation timetable (see the activity plan in annex 2). All activities are on track with the exception of work on tools (for reasons explained under activity 1.2). Work on outputs 3 and 4 will start in year two as planned.

##### Activity 1.1: Consultation and peer review to refine draft SAPA framework

The SAPA framework comprises a conceptual framework and a process. Building on earlier work (see section 1), IIED and UNEP-WCMC have, over the last year, further elaborated the SAPA framework. This started with developing the basic structure of the step-wise process and then further elaborating each of the steps (see annex 4 of this report – section 4). In parallel there has been a substantial amount of desk-based research on the key concepts that are central to the SAPA framework in order to ensure strong alignment of the SAPA framework with current discourse and understanding on these key concepts, e.g. social assessment, equity, well-being. This has been an iterative process in which the evolving framework has been peer-reviewed at several stages by colleagues in UNEP-WCMC, WCS and FFI.

##### Activity 1.2: Desk research to identify existing tools to support framework

This activity builds on the review of tools that was developed as one of the earlier outputs of SAPA prior to the start of this project. The task is now to update and expand this review. Work on this was postponed pending clarification of some of the core elements of the SAPA conceptual framework which have major implications for choice of tools and experimental design. Now that this is done, updating and expanding the SAPA toolbox is a priority for the next 3 months.

**Table 1: The SAPA Process**

<p><b>PREPARATION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Conduct an initial screening</b> to decide whether SAPA is appropriate and feasible</li> <li><b>2. Establish the facilitation team</b> who will organise and facilitate the SAPA process</li> </ol>
<p><b>OBJECTIVES AND CONTEXT</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>3. Define the objectives and approach</b> to tailor SAPA to stakeholder priorities/constraints</li> <li><b>4. Understand the context</b> to maximise relevance and build on what already exists</li> </ol>

## SCOPING AND INDICATORS

5. **Define the scale and scope** to define assessment boundaries and focus on priorities
6. **Develop questions and indicators** to specify what information to collect, where & how

## ASSESSMENT

7. **Collect and analyse information** in a way that optimises relevance & cost effectiveness
8. **Interpretation of results** by stakeholders to generate findings and recommendations

## ACTION AND COMMUNICATION

9. **Action planning** by key actors to enhance benefits and avoid/minimise/mitigate costs
10. **Communication** of findings, action plans and monitoring plans to stakeholders

### Activity 1.3: Development of additional tools and guidance

The first version of an overall guidance document has just been produced (see annex 4). Detailed guidance for specific elements of the process has also been developed.

Work on additional tools has focused on reviewing methodologies for assessing changes in human well-being since the tool that was earlier identified (basic necessities survey) addresses only the material aspects on well-being.

### Activity 1.4: Field testing

The four field sites that have been selected to date are listed in the following table including details of the PA management category and governance type based on the current IUCN classification (see annex 4 section 2). Field testing started in Kenya in January 2014.

Country	Protected area	Management category	Governance
Kenya	OI Pejeta Conservancy	VI	Private
Gabon	Monte de Cristal	II	Government
Gambia	Niumi National Park	N/A	Government
Liberia	East Nimba Nature Reserve	II	Shared (co-management with communities)

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

Work has started at the Kenya site and by the end of March had reached the end of step 4 of the SAPA process. Work in Gabon will start in May, and Gambia in June. A second cycle of field testing will begin in December which will include Liberia, a second site in Kenya and Gabon, and Senegal. Based on the level of interest in SAPA in international and national conservation communities it is expected that there will also be several other sites volunteering to acts as pilot sites using their own funding. The World Parks Congress in November 2014 will be an excellent platform to identify additional sites.

### Activity 5.1: Project web pages designed and uploaded

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

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

A flier that describes the SAPA project (see <http://pubs.iied.org/G03764.html>) has been developed. A blog has also been started (see <http://www.iied.org/time-for-new-look-social->

[impacts-protected-areas](#)). The draft guidance document has not yet been uploaded as it remains at a very early stage of development.

### 3.2 Progress towards project outputs

#### Output 1: SAPA framework document including tools and guidance material

SAPA is a complex undertaking, drawing upon a number of different disciplines that rarely interact:

- PA management
- Social impact assessment
- Economic valuation

Furthermore, in order to remain relevant, SAPA must evolve from the concept first developed in 2006 (assessment of the benefits and costs of PAs) to have an explicit focus on equity in PA management (as in Aichi target 11), and to assess the extent to which PA's contribute to climate change adaptation/resilience.

A further challenge which has been a priority from the start is to develop an assessment process that is simple and cheap enough to be a feasible option for conservation practitioners. The task is not only technical but also political in the sense that credibility is a function of both scientific robustness and the process used to generate the information. At present there is no methodology for PA social assessment that meets these criteria.

The indicator target for year 1 - *revised SAPA framework with tools and guidelines available for field testing* – has been met with the exception of some work on tools which has been postponed to year two for reasons given earlier. The project still has quite a long way to go in terms of development of the process and tools, including a second cycle of field testing in the period December 2014 to June 2015, but we believe that good progress has been made, and the project is on track to meet the targets for this output.

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

Field-testing has started and detailed records of the experience from the process are being maintained but it is too early to start documentation of this experience.

The project is on track to achieve the indicator targets for this output but not on the timeframe originally proposed. An initial report of lessons learned will be produced in October 2014 in time for the World Parks Congress, but full report of lessons learned will be delayed until September 2015. This is because of the decision to split field testing into two cycles which has been taken in order to enable two sequential learning cycles within the life of the project. This should also allow for a larger number of sites as new sites (with their own resources) express interest following presentation of initial results at the World Parks Congress.

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

The initial indicator target has been achieved but the SAPA web-pages are within the IIED web-site rather than the PCLG website. This reflects a change in IIED policy regarding spin-off web-sites – in particular concerns over the sustainability of these sites when the hosting project is time-bound (the current phase of PCLG ends within a year and funding for an extension is not yet assured. The PCLG site does, however, make reference to the project and provides a link to the main project page on the IIED site

#### Assumptions at output level

Assumption 1	Project team are able to develop a social assessment framework and guidance that is of sufficient quality to lend itself to field implementation in
--------------	---

	different contexts
Assumption 2	Country partners are able to understand assessment process and roll out approach to multiple field sites
Assumption 3	Field testing sites remain positive about the project, are willing to test framework and to share lessons learned

These three output-level assumptions remain valid but challenging because of the complexity of assessing the social impacts of PAs, and the trade-offs between credibility and cost/capacity that are inherent to this type of rapid assessment.

### 3.3 Progress towards the project Purpose/Outcome

Based on the current level of interest in SAPA within the partners at international level and the protected area managers in Kenya and Gabon who are already involved there should be no difficulty in meeting the indicator targets relating to year assessment and willingness of PA managers to address negative impacts.

Official endorsement of the SAPA approach to social assessment at the World Parks Congress in November 2014 is unlikely simply because field testing in three sites will only just have been completed and there will not be enough time to prepare effective advocacy on this issue.

Expansion of use of SAPA beyond the pilot sites to other PAs within the pilot countries is highly likely. Expansion beyond the pilot countries is also highly likely – expressions of interest have already been received from Brazil and Ecuador.

#### Assumptions at outcome level

<b>Assumption 1</b>	Assessment procedure developed accepted as scientifically and politically robust while being within the capacity of site managers to implement
<b>Assumption 2</b>	Political will and capacity exists at site level to adapt management plans and procedures according to outcomes of social assessment process
<b>Assumption 3</b>	National governments receptive to learning from project sites and rolling out approach to national PA systems
<b>Assumption 4</b>	CBD and WCPA influence and authority sufficient to encourage wider uptake

The first assumption is closely linked to the assumptions at output level and the same comment applies (see section 3.2).

Assumption 2 relates to the willingness of PA managers and policy to act on the findings of the assessment. Since the pilot sites are sites that volunteer to engage with SAPA because of an interest in social impacts it is likely that they will act on at least some of the findings.

Assumption 3 and 4 relate to the extent to which policy makers and planners at national and international levels prove willing to adopt and apply the SAPA assessment process more broadly. It is quite likely that CBD and WCPA processes will encourage wider uptake but to what extent PA authorities take notice is another issue. The review of the CBD Programme of Work on PAs noted that achievement versus goal 2.1 was poor. The implication for this project is that it needs to place more emphasis on developing the evidence base for why it is important from both a moral and instrumental perspective to do social assessment of PAs, and support effective communication and advocacy based on this evidence. Some additional activities in year three to address this will be proposed in the October 2014 mid-year report.

### **3.4 Goal/ Impact: achievement of impact on biodiversity and poverty alleviation**

The overall goal of this project is framed as follows:

*PAs achieve the CBD aspiration of contributing to poverty eradication and sustainable development as PA managers and national policy-makers use tools to improve knowledge of the links between biodiversity conservation actions, sustainable livelihoods and well-being.*

Most studies of the social impacts of PAs are conducted by highly qualified social scientists and/or economists. There are few examples of methods that can be used by conservation practitioners (government, civil society, private sector) at a relatively low cost. This was the reason for establishing the SAPA Initiative in 2006 and, as far as we are aware, SAPA is unique in addressing this need with an approach that has both a political as well as technical dimension. As noted in the previous section, the political dimension will need some strengthening if SAPA is to fully fulfil its potential.

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

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

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

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

In addition to assessing the equity of PA management SAPA aims to assess, at least in qualitative terms, the contribution that PAs and associated conservation and development initiatives make to enhancing human well-being/alleviating poverty, and provide information to PA managers that will assist them to improve performance in this respect through reducing/avoiding negative social impacts and enhancing positive social impacts.

At the sites where SAPA is being piloted it should be possible to see evidence of impact on poverty – not through change in well-being/poverty indicators by the end of the project (unrealistic), but at least through case studies of measures taken by PA managers to respond to the findings of SAPA assessment.

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

Beyond the results reported in earlier sections, M&E has been limited in the first year of the project but will become a more significant activity in years 2 and 3, particularly in relation to outcome level indicators which are more challenging to assess.

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

Not applicable

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

As described in earlier sections the design of the project has been strengthened by adopting a stronger focus on social equity and climate change adaptation/resilience (although the latter has yet to be reflected in the SAPA guidance document).

Section 3.4 makes a case to strengthen some communication and advocacy elements of the project in order to enhance the wider impact of the project. To this end we plan to submit some revisions to the year three workplan along with the mid term report for year 2 (October 2014).

## **9. Sustainability**

Since in country work only started in January and just in one country (Kenya) it is premature to comment on this issue.

## **10. Darwin Identity**

All SAPA external communications (notably the website and flier) make explicit reference to funding from the Darwin Initiative. Understanding at host country level of the role of the Darwin Initiative in supporting SAPA is limited because of country level work has only just started.

## **11. Project Expenditure**

**Table 1 project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2013 – 31 March 2014)**

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

## Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2013-2014

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2013 - March 2014	Actions required/planned for next period
<p><b>Goal/Impact</b></p> <p>Protected areas achieve the CBD aspiration of contributing to poverty eradication and sustainable development as PA managers and national policy-makers use tools to improve knowledge of the links between biodiversity conservation actions, sustainable livelihoods and well-being.</p>		<p>Premature to report at this level</p>	
<p><b>Purpose/Outcome</b></p> <p>Protected area managers and policy-makers have access to guidance and tools for assessing the impact of biodiversity conservation actions on local people living in and around protected areas, enabling them, through better engagement, to make informed decisions to minimise negative social and economic effects and maximize positive impacts for local communities. Benefits would be seen at the local level (in particular for the poor and for traditionally marginalised groups, including women) both through empowerment – as they engage with social assessment and articulate their priorities – and through subsequent improved management which takes those priorities into account.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By year 3 PA managers in at least 5 protected area sites have undertaken social assessments using the SAPA framework and guidance developed through the project</li> <li>▪ By year 3 social assessment process in at least 5 PA sites has resulted in improved awareness and willingness of PA managers to address negative effects</li> <li>▪ By the end of project PA managers in at least 3 sites adapt their conservation management strategies to promote net positive well-being outcomes compared with pre-assessment</li> <li>▪ At World Parks Congress in 2014 social assessment approach endorsed by CBD and WCPA and wide uptake recommended</li> <li>▪ By end of project, uptake of social assessment extends beyond project sites to national systems of protected areas in pilot countries</li> </ul>	<p>Based on the current level of interest in SAPA within the partners at international level and the protected area managers in Kenya and Gabon who are already involved there should be no difficulty in meeting the indicator targets relating to year assessment and willingness of PA managers to address negative impacts.</p> <p>Official endorsement of the SAPA approach to social assessment at the World Parks Congress in November 2014 is unlikely because field testing in three sites will only just have been completed and there will not be enough time to prepare effective advocacy on this issue.</p> <p>Expansion of use of SAPA beyond the pilot sites to other PAs within the pilot countries is highly likely. Expansion beyond the pilot countries is also highly likely – expressions of interest have been received from Brazil and Ecuador.</p>	<p>The main focus of the project for this year is the two cycles of field testing and further development of the SAPA guidance based on learning from this experience.</p>
<p>Output 1. SAPA framework document including tools and guidance material</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By September 2013, revised SAPA framework with tools and guidelines available for field testing</li> <li>▪ By September 2014 final framework incorporates lessons learned from</li> </ul>	<p>The indicator target for year 1 - <i>revised SAPA framework with tools and guidelines available for field testing</i> – has been met with the exception of some work on tools which has been postponed to year two for reasons given earlier. The project still has quite a long way to go in terms of development of the process and tools, including a second cycle of field testing in the period December 2014 to</p>	

	<p>field testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By November 2014 final version translated into French and Spanish and launched at World Parks Congress</li> </ul>	<p>June 2015, but we believe that good progress has been made, and the project is on track to meet the targets for this output.</p>
<p>Activity 1.1 Consultation and peer review to refine draft SAPA framework</p>		<p>Building on earlier work (see section 1), IIED and UNEP-WCMC have, over the last year, further elaborated the SAPA framework. This started with developing the basic structure of the step-wise process and then further elaborating each of the steps. In parallel there has been a substantial amount of desk-based research on the key concepts that are central to the SAPA framework in order to ensure strong alignment do the SAPA framework with current discourse and understanding on these key concepts, e.g. social assessment principles, equity, well-being. This has been an iterative process taking into account earlier experience from piloting in Kenya, in which the evolving framework has been peer-reviewed at several stages by colleagues in UNEP-WCMC, WCS and FFI.</p>
<p>Activity 1.2 Desk research to identify existing tools to support framework</p>		<p>This activity builds on one of the very systematic review of tools that was developed as one of the earlier outputs of SAPA prior to the start of this project. The task is now to update and expand this review. Work on this was postponed pending clarification of some of the core elements of the SAPA conceptual framework which have major implications for choice of tools and experimental design. Now that this is done, updating/expanding the SAPA toolbox is a priority for the next 3 months.</p>
<p>Activity 1.3 Development of additional tools and guidance</p>		<p>The first version of an overall guidance document has just been produced (see annex 4). Detailed guidance for specific elements of the process has also been developed.</p> <p>Work on additional tools has focused on reviewing methodologies for assessing changes in human well-being since the tool that was earlier identified (basic necessities survey) addresses only the material aspects on well-being.</p>
<p>Activity 1.4 Field testing</p>		<p>Four field sites have been selected to date in Kenya, Gabon, Liberia and the Gambia covering a range of PA management categories and governance type. Field testing started in Kenya in January 2014.</p>
<p>Output 2. Report documenting implementation and lessons learned from SAPA process at project sites</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By July 2014 fieldwork completed and lessons from each site collated</li> <li>By September 2014, lessons learned report drafted and posted on project website</li> </ul>	<p>The project is on track to achieve the indicator targets for this output but not on the timeframe originally proposed. An initial report of lessons learned will be produced in October 2014 in time for the World Parks Congress but full report of lessons learned will be delayed until September 2015. This is because of the decision to split field testing into two cycles which has been taken in order to enable two sequential learning cycles within the life of the project. This should allow for a larger number of sites as new sites (with their own resources) express interest following presentation of initial results at the World Parks Congress</p>

<p>Activity 2.1 Implementation of SAPA framework in one site in each host country</p>	<p>Work has started at the Kenya site and by the end of March had reached the end of step 4 of the SAPA process. Work in Gabon will start in May, and Gambia in June. A second cycle of field testing will begin in December which will include Liberia, a second site in Kenya and Gabon, and Senegal. Based on the level of interest in SAPA in international and national conservation communities it is expected that there will also be several other sites volunteering to acts as pilot sites using their own funding. The World Parks Congress in November 2014 will be an excellent platform to identify additional sites.</p>
<p>Output 5. Dedicated SAPA web page(s) within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group web portal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By June 2013 SAPA web site established within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group portal</li> <li>▪ By September 2014 all project outputs to date uploaded onto website in advance of World Parks Congress</li> <li>▪ By end of project all outputs available on project website</li> </ul> <p>The initial indicator target has been achieved but the SAPA web-pages are within the IIED web-site rather than the PCLG website. This reflects a change in IIED policy regarding spin-off web-sites – in particular concerns over the sustainability of these sites when the hosting project is time-bound (the current phase of PCLG ends within a year and funding for an extension is not yet assured..</p>
<p>Activity 5.1 Project web pages designed and uploaded</p>	<p>SAPA web-pages are located within the IIED web-site (see <a href="http://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-areas">http://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-areas</a>).</p>
<p>Activity 5.2 Project web pages regularly updated and all new outputs uploaded</p>	<p>A flier that describes the SAPA project (see <a href="http://pubs.iied.org/G03764.html">http://pubs.iied.org/G03764.html</a>) has been developed. A blog has also been started (see <a href="http://www.iied.org/time-for-new-look-social-impacts-protected-areas">http://www.iied.org/time-for-new-look-social-impacts-protected-areas</a>). The draft guidance document has not yet been uploaded as it remains at a very early stage of development.</p>

## Annex 2 Project's full current logframe

Hierarchy of Objectives	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
<p><b>Goal/Impact</b></p> <p>Protected areas achieve the CBD aspiration of contributing to poverty eradication and sustainable development as PA managers and national policy-makers use tools to improve knowledge of the links between biodiversity conservation actions, sustainable livelihoods and well-being.</p>			
<p><b>Purpose/Outcome</b></p> <p>Protected area managers and policy-makers have access to guidance and tools for assessing the impact of biodiversity conservation actions on local people living in and around protected areas, enabling them, through better engagement, to make informed decisions to minimise negative social and economic effects and maximize positive impacts for local communities. Benefits would be seen at the local level (in particular for the poor and for traditionally marginalised groups, including women) both through empowerment – as they engage with social assessment and articulate their priorities – and through subsequent improved management which takes those priorities into account.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By year 3 PA managers in at least 5 protected area sites have under-taken social assessments using the SAPA framework and guidance developed through the project</li> <li>▪ By year 3 social assessment process in at least 5 PA sites has resulted in improved awareness and willingness of PA managers to address negative effects</li> <li>▪ By the end of project PA managers in at least 3 sites adapt their conservation management strategies to promote net positive well-being outcomes compared with pre-assessment</li> <li>▪ At World Parks Congress in 2014 social assessment approach endorsed by CBD and WCPA and wide uptake recommended</li> <li>▪ By end of project, uptake of social assessment extends beyond project sites to national systems of protected areas in pilot countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reports from each study site on application of SAPA framework and assessment outcomes</li> <li>▪ Project reports including feedback from protected area managers on outcomes of SAPA process and anticipated changes; field datasheets</li> <li>▪ Individual PA management plans and/or guidance documents. Feedback from affected communities gathered in project workshops documented in reports</li> <li>▪ Official text in CBD meetings and within WCPA guidance</li> <li>▪ Relevant text in CBD national reports and reports to POWPA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment procedure developed accepted as scientifically and politically robust while being within the capacity of site managers to implement</li> <li>▪ Political will and capacity exists at site level to adapt management plans and procedures according to outcomes of social assessment process</li> <li>▪ National governments receptive to learning from project sites and rolling out approach to national PA systems</li> <li>▪ CBD and WCPA influence and authority sufficient to encourage wider uptake</li> </ul>
<p>Output 1. SAPA framework document including tools and guidance material</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By September 2013, revised SAPA framework with tools and guidelines available for field testing</li> <li>▪ By September 2014 final framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Publication of agreed outputs (framework and guidance document, policy brief, lessons learned report, journal article)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project team are able to develop a social assessment framework and guidance that is of sufficient quality to lend itself to field implementation</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>incorporates lessons learned from field testing</li> <li>▪ By November 2014 final version translated into French and Spanish and launched at WPC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Biannual project progress reports</li> <li>▪ Project website and website content</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in different contexts</li> <li>▪ Country partners are able to understand assessment process and roll out approach to multiple field sites</li> <li>▪ Field testing sites remain positive about the project, are willing to test framework and to share lessons learned</li> </ul>
Output 2. Report documenting implementation and lessons learned from SAPA process at project sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By July 2014 fieldwork completed and lessons from each site collated</li> <li>▪ By September 2014, lessons learned report drafted and posted on project website</li> </ul>		
Output 3. Policy brief summarising SAPA process and impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By March 2015, policy brief drafted based on final SAPA framework and lessons learned from implementation</li> <li>▪ By September 2015 policy brief disseminated via IUCN and CBD channels</li> <li>▪ By September 2015 policy brief disseminated by partner networks</li> </ul>		
Output 4. Peer reviewed journal article to promote review of methodology by academic community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By March 2015, project partners (including host country partners) produce draft journal article</li> <li>▪ By July 2015 journal article submitted</li> <li>▪ By end of project journal article accepted by, or published in, Oryx or other peer reviewed journal</li> </ul>		
Output 5. Dedicated SAPA web page(s) within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group web portal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By June 2013 SAPA web site established within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group portal</li> <li>▪ By September 2014 all project outputs to date uploaded onto website in advance of WPC</li> <li>▪ By end of project all outputs available on project website</li> </ul>		

	Activity	No of Months	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Output 1: SAPA framework, toolkit and guidance document														
1.1	Consultation and peer review to refine draft SAPA framework	4	X	X										
1.2	Desk research to identify existing tools to support framework	3		X	X									
1.3	Development of additional tools and guidance	4		X	X									
1.4	Field testing	9				X	X	X						
1.5	Revision of draft framework and guidance	3						X	X					
1.6	Launch at World Parks Congress	1							X					
1.7	Translation into French and Spanish	2								X	X			
1.8	Dissemination	16							X	X	X	X	X	X
Output 2: Lessons Learned Report														
2.1	Implementation of SAPA framework in one site in each host country	3				X	X	X						
2.2	Roll out of approach to other sites where appropriate	6					X	X						
2.3	Documentation of lessons learned from implementation in each site	9							X	X	X			
2.4	Publication and dissemination of lessons learned report	12									X	X	X	X
2.5	Regional workshop to share implementation findings	1										X		
Output 3: Policy Brief														
3.1	Meeting of project partners to agree policy brief structure	1								X				
3.2	Policy brief produced in collaboration with IIED communication team	3								x	x			
3.3	Dissemination via IUCN, CBD and partner networks	12									x	x	x	X
Output 4: Journal Article														
4.1	Meeting of project partners to agree journal article structure	1								X				
4.2	Journal article drafted and submitted	9								X	X	X		
Output 5: SAPA web pages														
5.1	Project web pages designed and uploaded	2	X	X										
5.2	Project web pages regularly updated and all new outputs uploaded	30		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

### Annex 3 Standard Measures

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

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

18C	programmes/features in UK Number of local TV programmes/features in host country(ies)							
18D	Number of local TV programmes/features in UK							
19A	Number of national radio interviews/features in host county(ies)							3
19B	Number of national radio interviews/features in UK							
19C	Number of local radio interviews/features in host country(ies)							
19D	Number of local radio interviews/features in UK							
	Policy brief							2
	Social assessment reports (1 per site)							6
	Lessons learned report (multi-country)							1
20	Estimated value (£'s) of physical assets to be handed over to host country(ies)							
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisations to be established and then continued after Darwin funding has ceased							
22	Number of permanent field plots to be established during the project and continued after Darwin funding has ceased							
23	Value of resources raised from other sources (ie. in addition to Darwin funding) for project work	£20,853						£100,716

**Table 2 Publications**

Type (eg journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (eg contact address, website)	Cost £
SAPA Flier			<a href="http://pubs.iied.org/G03764.html">http://pubs.iied.org/G03764.html</a>	Free

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

**Checklist for submission**

	Check
<b>Is the report less than 10MB?</b> If so, please email to <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> putting the project number in the Subject line.	X
<b>Is your report more than 10MB?</b> If so, please discuss with <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	
<b>Have you included means of verification?</b> You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	X
<b>Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report?</b> If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number.	
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	X
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	X
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	