



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs



Darwin Initiative Final Report

Darwin project information

Project Reference	20-010
Project Title	Social Assessment of Protected Areas (SAPA)
Host country(ies)	Gabon, Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia, Zambia
Contract Holder Institution	IIED
Partner Institution(s)	<p>Global: United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)</p> <p>Global and Gabon: Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)</p> <p>Global, Kenya & Uganda: Fauna & Flora International (FFI)</p> <p>Global: International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)</p> <p>Gabon: Agence National des Parc Nationaux (ANPN)</p> <p>Kenya: Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT)</p> <p>Uganda: Uganda Wildlife Authority</p> <p>Ethiopia: Population, Health and Environment (PHE) and Ethiopia Wildlife Conservation Authority</p> <p>Zambia: Copperbelt University, Global Environment Facility</p>
Darwin Grant Value	£239,393
Funder (DFID/Defra)	DFID
Start/End dates of Project	1/4/13-31/3/16
Project Leader's Name	Phil Franks, IIED
Project Website/blog/twitter	http://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-areas
Report Author(s) and date	Phil Franks, June 30 th 2016

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 a number of 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. A review of progress in implementing CBD PoWPA highlighted very limited progress under goal 2.1. This is the challenge that this project addresses – development and demonstrating the value of simpler, more participatory approaches to assessing the social impacts of PAs.

Within the terrestrial biomes in Africa that are currently the focus of SAPA the primary drivers of biodiversity loss are habitat conversion to agriculture (crop and livestock production) and illegal wildlife trade. With food demand in sub-Saharan likely to triple by 2050 (see: <http://www.iied.org/food-demand-forests-sub-saharan-africa>) traditional protection regimes will face increasing political and economic pressures both a local level and national level. Reducing resentment and building support amongst communities living in and around PAs will be increasingly crucial to achieve effective and sustainable conservation outcomes. Over the years investment in community engagement in PA conservation and alternative livelihoods interventions have produced very mixed results. One of the main reasons for the poor performance of much of this investment has been failure to adequately understand the social, economic, cultural and political relationship between PAs and their local communities, and in particular how PAs impact the well-being of different social groups within neighbouring communities. This SAPA project directly addresses this gap.

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

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

Building on this strong foundation, this SAPA project was designed to:

- fully develop a relatively simple, low cost PA social assessment methodology through two iterations of piloting,
- prove that a multi-stakeholder approach is viable and that the assessment methodology can be implemented largely by local-level stakeholders, and
- produce evidence of the value of this type of social assessment to promote a process of scaling up within target countries.

2 Project Achievements

2.1 Outcome

As summarised in the table below, the project has achieved twice its target in terms of the number of PA sites that have used all or part of the SAPA methodology.

Country	Protected Area	Full/partial use	Source of funding for SAPA
Kenya	Oi Pejeta Conservancy	Full	Darwin Initiative
	Sera Conservancy	Partial	Darwin Initiative and Northern Rangelands Trust
Uganda	Ruwenzori National Park	Full	Darwin Initiative
	Lake Mburo National Park	Full	Darwin Initiative
Gabon	Monts de Cristal National Park	Full	Darwin Initiative
	Loango National Park	Full	Darwin Initiative
Zambia	Mumbwa Game Management Area	Full	Global Environmental Facility/DFID funds to IIED
	South Luangwa National Park	Partial	Global Environmental Facility/IIED Frame Funds
Ethiopia	Awash National Park	Full	DFID funding to IIED
Liberia	Sapo National Park	Full	Fauna and Flora International

The other targets have all been met and would have been exceeded had the project been able to keep to the original timeframe. As it was, the delays in starting at field starts meant these was less time to observe changes in PA management in response to SAPA findings.

In addition to the 10 sites in 6 countries where SAPA was conducted, PA managers in a further 5 countries have expressed interest in using SAPA but have not proceeded due to lack of funding and IIED's inability to provide the technical backstopping needed (Malawi, Madagascar, Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam).

Outcome:	Protected area managers and policy-makers have access to guidance and tools for assessing the impact of biodiversity conservation actions on local people living in and around protected areas, enabling them, through better engagement, to make informed decisions to minimise negative social and economic effects and maximize positive impacts for local communities. Benefits would be seen at the local level (in particular for the poor and for traditionally marginalised groups, including women) both through empowerment – as they engage with social assessment and articulate their priorities – and through subsequent improved management which takes those priorities into account.			
	Baseline	Change by March 2016	Source of evidence	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By year 3 PA managers in at least 5 protected area sites have under-taken social assessments using the SAPA framework and guidance developed through the project ▪ By year 3 social assessment process in at least 5 PA sites has resulted in improved awareness and willingness of PA managers to address negative effects ▪ By the end of project PA managers in at least 3 sites adapt their conservation management strategies to promote net positive well-being outcomes compared with pre-assessment ▪ At World Parks Congress in 2014 social assessment approach endorsed by CBD and WCPA and 	Zero	<p>By March 2016 social assessments had been completed in 6 PAs – 1 in Kenya, 1 in Uganda, 1 in Ethiopia, 1 in Zambia and 2 in Gabon. By end of June assessments in a further 2 PAs were completed - 1 in Liberia, 1 in Uganda. Furthermore 2 PAs used parts of the SAPA methodology – 1 in Kenya and 1 in Zambia. Total 10 sites</p> <p>This is not easy to measure but we know from the following indicator that at least 4 sites are actually implemented changes in management as a results of SAPA and feedback from stakeholder meetings at 2 other sites indicates anecdotal evidence suggests that there is improved willingness at Awash NP in Ethiopia and Lake Mburo NP in Uganda</p> <p>The table in Annex 6 presents the results of a survey of the first 4 sites that conducted SAPA. Three of these sites indicate changes in PA management that have already taken place while one response indicates that a supporting GEF funded project intends to support changes.</p> <p>Our efforts to influence the outcome of the World Parks Congress (WPC) focused on the “equitable management” element of Aichi target 11 and to this</p>	<p>The research report documents results from the first 4 sites.</p> <p>Survey of SAPA users conducted in April 2016.</p>	The achievement is double the target.

<p>wide uptake recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By end of project, uptake of social assessment extends beyond project sites to national systems of protected areas in pilot countries 		<p>end we made a significant contribution to recommendation #11 of the governance stream: <i>develop guidance on: assessing the “equitable management” dimension of Aichi Target 11.</i></p> <p>The PA authorities of 5 countries (Kenya, Zambia, Uganda, Ethiopia, and Gabon) have all expressed interest to extend SAPA to other PAs</p>	<p>Support letters from the 5 PA Authorities to support funding proposals to extend use of SAPA</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

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

Impact statement from logframe: 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.

Since SAPA, by its very nature, assesses specific impacts of PAs on well-being it is fair to assume that any changes attributable to SAPA in the factors causing these impacts will in turn translate into impacts on well-being/poverty alleviation. We have clear evidence of such changes from the SAPA Users survey at OI Pejeta Conservancy in Kenya and Ruwenzori National Park in Uganda. In Gabon, whether the changes in PA management and PA related community work translate into poverty alleviation will depend on whether the measures that are being promoted to reduce crop damage by elephants actually work; evidence from other PAs in Gabon and other countries suggest that they will to some extent at least. In the 5 other PAs where SAPA has been used it is too early to be able to see impacts on poverty alleviation but the pathway to impact on poverty is clear and once we see management actions to reduce costs and increase benefits then we can be confident of a significant contribution to poverty alleviation.

In all cases it is too early to actually measure any positive contribution to biodiversity conservation. However there is a growing body of evidence that the type of improved social and governance outcomes that are described in annex 6 will contribute to better conservation outcomes¹, not only as a result on more equitable distribution of benefits and costs but also as a result of advances in the procedure and recognition dimensions of equity².

2.3 Outputs

The project has delivered all the planned outputs plus a report of SAPA results from 4 sites and 4 blogs which are additional to the project plan. Most of these outputs were produced at least a year later than originally planned owing to delays in recruitment of the lead researcher at the start of the project and a decision (endorsed by Darwin) to reorganise field testing into two cycles rather than one to allow a more iterative approach.

¹ Oldekop, JA et al. (2015) A global assessment of the social and conservation outcomes of protected areas. Conservation Biology DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12568

² Franks, P and Schreckenber, K (2016) Advancing equity in protected area conservation. IIED, London. <http://pubs.iied.org/14630IIED.html>

Output 1:	SAPA framework document including tools and guidance material		
	Baseline	Change recorded by 2016	Source of evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By September 2013, revised SAPA framework with tools and guidelines available for field testing ▪ By September 2014 final framework incorporates lessons learned from field testing ▪ By November 2014 final version translated into French and Spanish and launched at WPC 	Zero	<p>A zero draft of SAPA analytical framework, guidance and tools were all produced</p> <p>A final version of SAPA analytical framework, guidance and tools was produced</p> <p>A French version was produced although not in time for WPC for reasons explained in earlier reports</p>	<p>http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html</p> <p>http://pubs.iied.org/14659IIED.html</p> <p>http://pubs.iied.org/14659FIIED.html</p>

Output 2:	Report documenting implementation and lessons learned from SAPA process at project sites		
	Baseline	Change recorded by 2016	Source of evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By July 2014 fieldwork completed and lessons from each site collated ▪ By September 2014, lessons learned report drafted and posted on project website 	Zero	<p>For reasons explained in earlier reports and accepted by Darwin fieldwork at the 5 target PA sites was not completed until September 2015.</p> <p>Chapter 3 of the publication SAPA Discussion paper describes and discusses lessons learned from the first two sites in Gabon and Kenya where work had been concluded by September 2014.</p>	<p>http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html</p>

Output 3:	Policy brief summarising SAPA process and impacts		
	Baseline	Change recorded by 2016	Source of evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By March 2015, policy brief drafted based on final SAPA framework and lessons learned from implementation ▪ By September 2015 policy brief disseminated via IUCN and CBD channels 	Zero	<p>IIED decided to be more ambitious in documenting SAPA results and produced a full report of the results from 4 sites which was released in March 2016.</p> <p>In addition IIED produced a policy brief on the issue of equity in PA conservation which provides the framework for linking</p>	<p>http://pubs.iied.org/14661IIED.html</p> <p>http://pubs.iied.org/17344IIED.html</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By September 2015 policy brief disseminated by partner networks 		social and governance assessment	
---	--	----------------------------------	--

Output 4:	Peer reviewed journal article to promote review of methodology by academic community		
	Baseline	Change recorded by March 2016	Source of evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By March 2015, project partners (including host country partners) produce draft journal article By July 2015 journal article submitted By end of project journal article accepted by, or published in, Oryx or other peer reviewed journal 	Zero	<p>A journal article has been prepared by WCMC, submitted to <i>Conservation Letters</i> and accepted. This article focuses on the extent to which different tools for Protected Area Management Effectiveness Assessment can information relevant to social assessment.</p> <p>In addition a second article for <i>Conservation Letters</i> has been drafted and will be submitted by the end of July 2016. This article focuses on experience from using the SAPA methodology</p>	The two articles will be sent separately

Output 5:	Dedicated SAPA web page(s) within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group web portal		
	Baseline	Change recorded by March 2016	Source of evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By June 2013 SAPA web site established within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group portal By September 2014 all project outputs to date uploaded onto website in advance of WPC By end of project all outputs available on project website 	Zero	All the outputs of the project plus 4 blogs are available on the SAPA page within the IIED website with the exception of the two journal articles which have not yet been published.	http://www.iied.org/assessing-social-impacts-protected-areas

3 Project Partnerships

- **Gabon:** As planned, we have worked with WCS and the national PA Authority, ANPN, in the use of SAPA at the two field sites, and ANPN is interested to extend SAPA to other sites.
- **Kenya:** As planned, work at the first site in Kenya (OI Pejeta Conservancy) took place in partnership with the management of the Conservancy and FFI and has now been completed. Results were presented to the Board of the Conservancy in November 2014. Building on the success of this initial work we have been able to establish a partnership with the nearby Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT) and elements of SAPA have been used at the Sera Conservancy that is supported by NRT. The main challenge with NRT which we frequently encounter is the view that they are “already doing it”. However more in depth discussion revealed that their social surveys have a very different objective (supporting the work of NRT) versus SAPA which focuses on addressing the information needs of PA management. We are currently in discussion with UWA and FFI on a second phase that would extend SAPA to 4 other PAs in Kenya.
- **Uganda:** Uganda has been brought into the project as a substitute for Liberia because of the Ebola epidemic making Liberia inaccessible. Work is focused on Ruwenzori National Park where both the Uganda Wildlife Authority and local government have been very actively engaged in the work alongside FFI. Based on the positive experience at Ruwenzori UWA has supported using SAPA at a second PA site – Lake Mburo NP – and we are currently in discussion with UWA and FFI on a second phase that would extend SAPA to 4 other PAs in Uganda..
- **Ethiopia:** In late 2014 Population, Health and Environment (PHE) Ethiopia heard about SAPA and approached us regarding a site in Ethiopia. PHE has an ongoing project supporting three PAs in Ethiopia to introduce shared governance arrangements and supporting local livelihood interventions. The national PA Authority – Ethiopia Wildlife Conservation Authority (EWCA) has been supportive of the work and is interested in a follow on project to extend SAPA to other sites. SAPA work in Ethiopia has been funded from DFID’s Accountable Grant to IIED.
- **Zambia:** Discussions with Brian Child, advisor to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on the social dimension of GEF investments in PAs, have led to applying SAPA at two sites that they support in Zambia in partnership with the Copperbelt University in Zambia. GEF has been looking for something like SAPA so this is a partnership with great potential. SAPA work in Zambia is funded by GEF with the exception of technical input from IIED which is funded from DFID’s Accountable Grant to IIED.

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

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 have made a substantial contribution to the development of the SAPA methodology.

4 Contribution to Darwin Initiative Programme Outputs

4.1 Contribution to SDGs

By providing PA managers with a tool to assess the impacts of a protected area on the well-being of local communities and basic elements of PA governance, and by doing this through a multi-stakeholder process that builds stakeholder ownership and accountability for action, SAPA makes a substantial contribution to SDG 15 (protecting and restoring terrestrial ecosystems and halting biodiversity loss). This claim is based on the increasingly widely accepted instrumental argument for equity that has been presented earlier in this report, namely around the contribution of equity in conservation to the sustainability and effectiveness of conservation efforts. Once use of SAPA is extended to marine ecosystems the same argument can be made for contribution of this project to SDG14.

SAPA is also very much about the moral argument for promoting equity in conservation related to identifying and addressing inequalities in the distribution of the costs and benefits of conservation and in the recognition and fulfilment of human rights. As illustrated by the results summarised in annex 7, and notably results from Gabon and Uganda, these inequalities are all too often reflected in the costs and benefits of conservation. In helping stakeholders in a PA to identify and address these inequalities SAPA also makes a significant contribution to SDG 10.

4.2 Project support to the Conventions or Treaties

The SAPA Initiative was launched back in 2006 as a direct response to activity 2.1.1. of the CBD PoWPA - the need for a simple, credible and cost effective tool to assess the benefits and costs of PAs to indigenous and local communities. A review of progress in implementation of PoWPA in 2010 noted that the goal on equity and benefit sharing to which this activity relates was one of the areas of least progress in PoWPA implementation. Since 2013, with support from Darwin Initiative, SAPA has, at least within Africa, been the leading initiative in this area.

Furthermore, as noted earlier, SAPA along with IIED's closely related work on equity in PA conservation, is at the forefront of efforts at the international level to address the "equitable management" element of CBD Aichi Target 11, and to provide practical tools to assess the contribution of PA conservation to poverty alleviation in the broadest sense of this term. As illustrated by the summary of results in Annex 7, SAPA identifies contributions of PAs to poverty alleviation in terms of regulating and cultural ecosystem services as well as provisioning services, and thereby revealing a range of benefits (and costs) that is broader and more significant than many critics of PAs might have thought. As SAPA is extended to more sites and results are aggregated, this more nuanced understanding of PA benefits should make an important contribution to facilitating a more informed and less polarised debate on the contribution of PAs to conservation and sustainable development and how to promote equitable PA management, and assess progress in this respect.

4.3 Project support to poverty alleviation

The contribution of SAPA to poverty alleviation lies in the action stage of the SAPA process that follows the assessment. As shown in Annex 6, the first 4 sites where SAPA was used have made varying degrees of progress in responding to SAPA findings, but in 2 out of these 4 sites actions have been taken that make a significant contribution to poverty alleviation, notably:

- Ruwenzori NP, Uganda: extending to new communities the agreements that allow communities to harvest certain non-timber forest products
- OI Pejeta Conservancy, Kenya: more equitable allocation for development projects funded from tourism revenues

Although it is too soon to expect most of the other sites where SAPA has been used to be reporting actions in response to the findings, it is reasonable to assume that the contribution to poverty alleviation will be significant at many, if not most, of these sites. That said, with the exception of PAs where there is substantial tourism-related employment and revenues to be shared, it is disingenuous to suggest that PAs are generally a vehicle for poverty alleviation in the sense of lifting significant numbers of people out of poverty. However, the ecosystem

services from PAs provide an important, and in many cases vital, foundation for the poverty alleviation and sustainable development investments of other actors, for example:

- Awash NP in Ethiopia: reducing climate change impacts
- Monts de Cristal NP in Gabon: making logging companies comply with social safeguards
- Ruwenzori NP in Uganda: improved security in an insecure border region

Although these impacts are not attributable to SAPA, SAPA helps PA managers to identify these impacts and, where possible, enhance their contribution to human-wellbeing.

4.4 Gender equality

SAPA enables the analysis of social impacts of PAs to be disaggregated by gender which reveals important gender differences. This is particularly apparent in governance indicators such as access to information and influence over decision-making. While the disadvantage faced by women in issues of governance is generally known, the solid evidence produced by SAPA makes the issue much more visible to PA managers and other key decision-makers and provides a more solid basis for holding them accountable for action. More generally, the strong focus on gender in the SAPA methodology, notably in the focus group discussions where women and men discuss separately, helps to make PA staff and other key stakeholders more aware of the importance of gender differences and the meaning of gender equality. This has already been seen at OI Pejeta Conservancy in Kenya where more emphasis has been placed on effective representation of women in the community-park liaison committee. Further details on the gender differentiated approach of SAPA are available in the results report – see <http://pubs.iied.org/14661IIED.html>

4.5 Programme indicators

- Did the project lead to greater representation of local poor people in management structures of biodiversity? At the OI Pejeta Conservancy in Kenya the domination of the community-conservancy liaison committee by local elites was revealed by the assessment and a new process to select properly elect community representative has taken place. Likewise in Zambia the Community Resource Board for Mumbwa GMA has been reformed with better representation of poor people and women.
- Were any management plans for biodiversity developed? No
- Were these formally accepted? N/A
- Were they participatory in nature or were they 'top-down'? How well represented are the local poor including women, in any proposed management structures? N/A
- Were there any positive gains in household (HH) income as a result of this project? It is only possible to answer this question with respect to the first site – OI Pejeta Conservancy - which completed the SAPA assessment nearly 2 years ago. Here the following outcomes that lead to improvement in household income have been reported:
 - Upgrading for fences to stop baboons getting into farmers fields
 - Affirmative action for local community members to get jobs with the conservancy
 - More equitable distribution of community projects
- How many HHs saw an increase in their HH income? There are no detailed records of beneficiaries but there are around 4000 households in the 18 communities that border OI Pejeta conservancy and given that at least one fifth of these are affected by baboon damage to crops it is fair to assume at least 800 beneficiary households.
- How much did their HH income increase (e.g. x% above baseline, x% above national average)? How was this measured? Not measured.

4.6 Transfer of knowledge

Did the project result in any formal qualifications? No

- i. How many people achieved formal qualifications?
- ii. Were they from developing countries or developed countries?
- iii. What gender were they?

The project has produced the following publications that are primarily targeted at conservation practitioners and policy makers (see section 2.3 for the hyperlinks):

- Discussion paper on early experience and results from SAPA
- SAPA Methodology Manual
- SAPA Results Report
- Advancing Equity in PA Conservation policy brief

Copies have been sent to all the in-country partners.

At international level the first of these was promoted through an event on PA social assessment at the World Parks Congress (November 2014). The three more recent publications were promoted at a meeting of the CBD PoWPA Focal Points for Africa in March 2016, and will be further promoted through an event on PA social and governance assessment led by IIED at the World Conservation Congress in September 2016.

4.7 Capacity building

- i. Did any staff from developing country partners see an increase in their status nationally, regionally or internationally? For example, have they been invited to participate in any national expert committees, expert panels, have they had a promotion at work? At each of the 10 PA sites the SAPA process has been led by a small facilitation teams comprising at least one staff of the PA management agencies and one NGO staff with at least one of these being a women. Towards the end of the project (Sept 2015) two of these facilitation team members from each country were invited to a workshop in Kenya to review the results and experience using the methodology. Of these 8 people 3 were women.
- ii. What gender were they? See above.

4.8 Sustainability and Legacy

The ultimate impact of this SAPA project should be far greater than the impact at 10 sites as the project serves as a springboard for uptake of PA social assessment as a mainstream conservation activity.

National PA authorities in Kenya, Uganda and Zambia are keen to extend SAPA to other PAs within their PA system and, at international level, GEF, and KFW have expressed interest in applying elements of SAPA in their large portfolios of support to PAs. Some of this uptake will occur without further support from IIED but IIED believes that the potential for SAPA is much greater. While PA social assessment may not achieve the same level of uptake as PA management effectiveness assessment (20,000 sites to date) IIED is aiming for use of SAPA by at least 500 sites within 10 years. However to achieve this scale of uptake will require:

- Integration of elements of PA governance assessment to enable assessment of advances in the equity of PA management (ie progress towards Aichi Target 11).
- capacity building for SAPA facilitators supported by innovative practical guidance (eg YouTube videos) and a platform for sharing experience.
- further evidence of the value of social and governance assessment to PA managers and other key stakeholders at both PA site and system levels to encourage uptake by other countries and endorsement by key agencies at global level (CBD, GEF, IUCN).

IIED is currently exploring options for funding this work.

5 Lessons learned

- What worked well?

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

- What didn't work well?

The section of the SAPA household survey that looks at perceptions of equity did not work well. Now that IIED has done a significant amount of work on better understanding the meaning of equity in the context of REDD+ and PAs it is clear that the weakness of the SAPA questionnaire lies in the fact that we ourselves did not have a good enough understanding of equity when we designed the questionnaire. We have now addressed this through a dedicated programme of work on equity in PA conservation which is at the forefront on work in this area.

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

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

- Learning that could inform the wider Darwin programme

The work that IIED is doing of equity in PA conservation builds on, and strengthens, SAPA has some quite profound implications for the social dimension of PA conservation. We are currently producing a policy brief on this issue which will be released at the World Conservation Congress. In short the message is that agencies working on the social dimension of conservation will achieve better results both in terms of conservation and the contribution of conservation to human well-being if this social dimension of conservation is framed in terms of advancing equity in conservation rather than improving livelihoods and alleviating poverty.

5.1 Monitoring and evaluation

The only changes to the project design, both approved by Darwin, were:

- Change of target countries. Dropped Liberia, Senegal and the Gambia and added Uganda, Zambia, and Ethiopia
- Rescheduled project activities to enable a more incremental approach to methodology development with two cycles of field testing rather than one.

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.

The meeting of the SAPA Facilitation teams from each country in September 2015 served as an internal evaluation in terms of reviewing results and sharing learning on use of the SAPA methodology.

5.2 Actions taken in response to annual report reviews

Comments on the year 1 annual report that we addressed in the year 2 report:

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

Comments on the year 2 report that we are addressing in this report:

- *Do you have a copy of the workshop report/slides/attendee list for the World Parks Congress? If so, please include with the Final Report.* Included with the submission.
- *In terms of Output 4, the journal article, what are the expected timelines for acceptance? Will it be possible to report on Indicator 3 within the project timeframe?* Addressed in this report.
- *It would be useful if you could please cite the evidence for the validity of your ToC.* Addressed in section 2.2.

6 Darwin identity

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

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

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

7 Finance and administration

7.1 Project expenditure

Project spend since last annual report	2015/2016 Grant (£)	2015/2016 Total actual Darwin Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)			9%	
Consultancy costs			0%	
Overhead costs			-5%	
Travel and subsistence			-14%	Results from WCS moving costs from travel and subsistence to their staff budget lines. Increased capacity in incountry team meant work could be completed locally. This freed up funds for WCS to increase funds allocated to staff costs which increased in Year 3 as a result of new salary related benefits and taxes payable by employer on quarterly basis.
Operating costs			8%	
Capital items (see below)	0	0	0%	
Others (see below)	0	0	0%	
TOTAL	77,216	77,216	0	

Staff employed (Name and position)	Cost (£)
IIED, Dilys Roe, Advisor	
IIED, Phil Franks, Project Leader	
IIED, Fiona Roberts, Project Coordinator	
WCMC, Colleen Corrigan, Researcher	
WCMC, Neil Burgess, Researcher	
FFI, Helen Schneider, Researcher	
FFI, Rob Small, Field Coordinator	
FFI, Joy Juma, Fieldwork Coordinator Kenya	
FFI, NRT Fieldwork	
FFI, Helen Anthem, Advisor	
FFI, Uganda Fieldwork Coordinator	
FFI, Uganda Fieldwork Coordinator	
WCS, David Wilkie, Advisor	
WCS, Malcolm Starkey, Researcher	
WCS, Gabonese Team Leader	
TOTAL	34,111

Capital items - description	Capital items - cost (£)
None	
TOTAL	0
Other items - description	Other items - cost (£)
None	
TOTAL	0

7.2 Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured

Source of funding for project lifetime	£
FFI	
WCMC	
IIED	
GEF	
TOTAL	

Source of funding for additional work after project lifetime	£
IIED	
GEF	
TOTAL	

7.3 Value for Money

The project has had a strong emphasis on value for money in its aim to develop a relatively low cost methodology for social assessment of PAs that strikes the optimal balance between rigour and credibility of the one hand and practicality in terms of available capacity and resources. Central to this strategy has been developing very detailed, high quality guidance based on an iterative process of piloting and refinement methodology.

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

Hierarchy of Objectives	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
<p>Goal/Impact</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>Purpose/Outcome</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"> ▪ By year 3 PA managers in at least 5 protected area sites have under-taken social assessments using the SAPA framework and guidance developed through the project ▪ By year 3 social assessment process in at least 5 PA sites has resulted in improved awareness and willingness of PA managers to address negative effects ▪ By the end of project PA managers in at least 3 sites adapt their conservation management strategies to promote net positive well-being outcomes compared with pre-assessment ▪ At World Parks Congress in 2014 social assessment approach endorsed by CBD and WCPA and wide uptake recommended ▪ By end of project, uptake of social assessment extends beyond project sites to national systems of protected areas in pilot countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reports from each study site on application of SAPA framework and assessment outcomes ▪ Project reports including feedback from protected area managers on outcomes of SAPA process and anticipated changes; field datasheets ▪ Individual PA management plans and/or guidance documents. Feedback from affected communities gathered in project workshops documented in reports ▪ Official text in CBD meetings and within WCPA guidance ▪ Relevant text in CBD national reports and reports to POWPA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment procedure developed accepted as scientifically and politically robust while being within the capacity of site managers to implement ▪ Political will and capacity exists at site level to adapt management plans and procedures according to outcomes of social assessment process ▪ National governments receptive to learning from project sites and rolling out approach to national PA systems ▪ CBD and WCPA influence and authority sufficient to encourage wider uptake

Hierarchy of Objectives	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
Output 1. SAPA framework document including tools and guidance material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By September 2013, revised SAPA framework with tools and guidelines available for field testing ▪ By September 2014 final framework incorporates lessons learned from field testing ▪ By November 2014 final version translated into French and Spanish and launched at WPC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publication of agreed outputs (framework and guidance document, policy brief, lessons learned report, journal article) ▪ Biannual project progress reports ▪ Project website and website content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project team can develop a social assessment framework and guidance that is of sufficient quality for field implementation in different contexts ▪ Country partners are able to understand assessment process and roll out approach to multiple field sites ▪ Field testing sites remain positive about the project, are willing to test framework & share lessons learned
Output 2. Report documenting implementation and lessons learned from SAPA process at project sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By July 2014 fieldwork completed and lessons from each site collated ▪ By Sept 2014, lessons learned report drafted & posted on project website 		
Output 3. Policy brief summarising SAPA process and impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By March 2015, policy brief drafted based on final SAPA framework and lessons learned from implementation ▪ By Sept '15 policy brief disseminated via IUCN and CBD channels ▪ By September 2015 policy brief disseminated by partner networks 		
Output 4. Peer reviewed journal article to promote review of methodology by academic community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By March 2015, project partners (including host country partners) produce draft journal article ▪ By July 2015 journal article submitted ▪ By end of project journal article accepted by, or published in, Oryx or other peer reviewed journal 		
Output 5. Dedicated SAPA web page(s) within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group web portal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By June 2013 SAPA web site established within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group portal ▪ By September 2014 all project outputs to date uploaded onto website in advance of WPC ▪ By end of project all outputs available on project website 		

Activity	No of 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	6	X	X	X									
1.2 Desk research to identify existing tools to support framework	3			X	X								
1.3 Development of additional tools	6			X	X		X						
1.4 Field testing (2 phases)	15				X	X	X		X	X			
1.5 Revision of draft framework and development of draft guidance	4						X	X					
1.6 Present and consult on draft guidance at World Parks Congress	1							X					
1.7a Translation into French and Spanish	2							X				X	
1.7b Revision and expansion of draft guidance										X	X		
1.8 Dissemination	6										X	X	
Output 2 Lessons Learned Report													
2.1 Implementation of SAPA framework in one site in each host country	3				X	X	X						
2.2 Roll out of approach to other sites where appropriate	6								X	X			
2.3 Documentation of lessons learned from implementation in each site	9							X	X	X	X		
2.4 Publication and dissemination of lessons learned report	12										X	X	X
2.5 Regional workshop to share implementation findings	1											X	
Output 3 Policy Brief													
3.1 Meeting of project partners to agree policy brief structure	1									X			
3.2 Policy brief produced in collaboration with IIED communications team	3										X		
3.3 Dissemination via IUCN, CBD and partner networks	12											x	X
Output 4 Journal Article													
4.1 Meeting of project partners to agree journal article structure	1									X			
4.2 Journal article drafted and submitted	5									X	X		
Output 5 SAPA web pages													
5.1 Project web pages designed and uploaded	2					X							
5.2 Project web pages regularly updated and all new outputs uploaded	24					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

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

Note: For projects that commenced after 2012 the terminology used for the logframe was changed to reflect DFID's terminology.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2013 - March 2016
<p>Goal/Impact</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>Since SAPA, by its very nature, assesses specific impacts of PAs on well-being it is fair to assume that any changes attributable to SAPA in the factors causing these impacts will in turn translate into impacts on well-being/poverty alleviation. We have clear evidence of such changes from the SAPA Users survey at OI Pejeta Conservancy in Kenya and Ruwenzori National Park in Uganda. In Gabon, whether the changes in PA management and PA related community work translate into poverty alleviation will depend on whether the measures that are being promoted to reduce crop damage by elephants actually work; evidence from other PAs in Gabon and other countries suggest that they will to some extent at least. In the 5 other PAs where SAPA has been used it is too early to be able to see impacts on poverty alleviation but the pathway to impact on poverty is clear and once we see management actions to reduce costs and increase benefits then we can be confident of a significant contribution to poverty alleviation.</p> <p>In all cases it is too early to actually measure any positive contribution to biodiversity conservation. However there is a growing body of evidence that the type of improved social and governance outcomes that are described in annex 6 will contribute to better conservation outcomes³, not only as a result on more equitable distribution of benefits and costs but also as a result of advances in the procedure and recognition dimensions of equity</p>
<p>Purpose/Outcome</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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 ▪ By year 3 social assessment process in at least 5 PA sites has resulted in improved awareness and willingness of PA managers to address negative effects ▪ By the end of project PA managers in at least 3 sites adapt their conservation management strategies to promote net positive 	<p>By March 2016 social assessments had been completed in 6 PAs – 1 in Kenya, 1 in Uganda, 1 in Ethiopia, 1 in Zambia and 2 in Gabon. By end of June assessments in a further 2 PAs were completed - 1 in Liberia, 1 in Uganda. Furthermore 2 PAs used parts of the SAPA methodology – 1 in Kenya and 1 in Zambia. Total 10 sites</p> <p>This is not easy to measure but we know from the following indicator that at least 4 sites are actually implemented changes in management as a results of SAPA and feedback from stakeholder meetings at 2 other sites indicates anecdotal evidence suggests that there is improved willingness at Awash NP in Ethiopia and Lake Mburo NP in Uganda</p> <p>The table in Annex 6 presents the results of a survey of the first 4 sites that conducted SAPA. Three of these sites indicate changes in PA management that have already taken</p>

³ Oldekop, JA et al. (2015) A global assessment of the social and conservation outcomes of protected areas. Conservation Biology DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12568

<p>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>	<p>well-being outcomes compared with pre-assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At World Parks Congress in 2014 social assessment approach endorsed by CBD and WCPA and wide uptake recommended ▪ By end of project, uptake of social assessment extends beyond project sites to national systems of protected areas in pilot countries 	<p>place while one response indicates that a supporting GEF funded project intends to support changes.</p> <p>Our efforts to influence the outcome of the World Parks Congress (WPC) focused on the “equitable management” element of Aichi target 11 and to this end we made a significant contribution to recommendation #11 of the governance stream: <i>develop guidance on: assessing the “equitable management” dimension of Aichi Target 11.</i></p> <p>The PA authorities of 5 countries (Kenya, Zambia, Uganda, Ethiopia, and Gabon) have all expressed interest to extend SAPA to other PAs</p>
<p>Output 1. SAPA framework document including tools and guidance material</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By September 2013, revised SAPA framework with tools and guidelines available for field testing ▪ By September 2014 final framework incorporates lessons learned from field testing ▪ By November 2014 final version translated into French and Spanish and launched at World Parks Congress 	<p>A zero draft of SAPA analytical framework, guidance and tools were all produced</p> <p>A final version of SAPA analytical framework, guidance and tools was produced</p> <p>A French version was produced although not in time for WPC for reasons explained in earlier reports</p>
<p>Activity 1.1 Consultation and peer review to refine draft SAPA framework</p>	<p>Completed</p>	
<p>Activity 1.2 Desk research to identify existing tools to support framework</p>	<p>Completed</p>	
<p>Activity 1.3 Development of additional tools and guidance</p>	<p>Completed</p>	
<p>Activity 1.4 Field testing</p>	<p>Completed</p>	
<p>Activity 1.5: Revision of draft framework and guidance</p>	<p>Completed</p>	
<p>Activity 1.6: Present and consult on draft guidance at World Parks Congress</p>	<p>Presentation took place at a side event on SAPA but consultation on draft guidance did not as this guidance had not been developed at this point.</p>	

Activity 1.7a Translation into French and Spanish of draft guidance		The core tools (focus group discussion, users' template, household survey template) were translated into French but not Spanish since we had no Spanish speaking countries
Output 2. Report documenting implementation and lessons learned from SAPA process at project sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By July 2014 fieldwork completed and lessons from each site collated ▪ By September 2014, lessons learned report drafted and posted on project website 	<p>For reasons explained in earlier reports and accepted by Darwin fieldwork at the 5 target PA sites was not completed until September 2015.</p> <p>Chapter 3 of the publication SAPA Discussion paper describes and discusses lessons learned from the first two sites in Gabon and Kenya where work had been concluded by September 2014.</p>
Activity 2.1 Implementation of SAPA framework in one site in each host country		Completed
Activity 2.2: Roll out of approach to other sites where appropriate		Completed
Activity 2.3: Documentation of lessons learned from implementation in each site		Completed
Activity 2.4 Publication and dissemination of lessons learned report		Completed
Activity 2.5 Regional workshop to share implementation findings		Completed
Output 3. Policy brief summarising SAPA process and impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By March 2015, policy brief drafted based on final SAPA framework and lessons learned from implementation ▪ By Sept '15 policy brief disseminated via IUCN and CBD channels <p>By September 2015 policy brief disseminated by partner networks</p>	<p>IIED decided to be more ambitious in documenting SAPA results and produced a full report of the results from 4 sites which was released in March 2016.</p> <p>In addition IIED produced a policy brief on the issue of equity in PA conservation which provides the framework for linking social and governance assessment</p>
▪ Meeting of project partners to agree policy brief structure		Completed
▪ Policy brief produced in collaboration with IIED communications team		Completed
▪ Dissemination via IUCN, CBD and partner networks		Completed

<p>Output 4. Peer reviewed journal article to promote review of methodology by academic community</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By March 2015, project partners (including host country partners) produce draft journal article ▪ By July 2015 journal article submitted <p>By end of project journal article accepted by, or published in, Oryx or other peer reviewed journal</p>	<p>A journal article has been prepared by WCMC, submitted to Conservation Letters and accepted. This article focuses on the extent to which different tools for Protected Area Management Effectiveness Assessment can information relevant to social assessment.</p> <p>In addition a second article for Conservation Letters has been drafted and will be submitted by the end of July 2016. This article focuses on experience from using the SAPA methodology</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting of project partners to agree journal article structure 		<p>Completed</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Journal article drafted and submitted 		<p>Completed</p>
<p>Output 5. Dedicated SAPA web page(s) within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group web portal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By June 2013 SAPA web site established within Poverty and Conservation Learning Group portal ▪ By September 2014 all project outputs to date uploaded onto website in advance of World Parks Congress ▪ By end of project all outputs available on project website 	<p>All the outputs of the project plus 4 blogs are available on the SAPA page within the IIED website with the exception of the two journal articles which have not yet been published</p>
<p>Activity 5.1 Project web pages designed and uploaded</p>		<p>Completed</p>
<p>Activity 5.2 Project web pages regularly updated and all new outputs uploaded</p>		<p>Completed</p>

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)	20					
6b	Number of training weeks not leading to formal qualification	20					
7	Number of types of training materials produced for use by host country(s) (describe training materials)	2					

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	1					

11b	Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere						
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	2					World Parks Congress World Conservation Congress
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	3					World Parks Congress CBD Regional Workshop

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	£232,697					

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.	X
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 * (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	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)
Working Paper	Social Assessment of Protected Areas: Phil Franks and Rob Small, 2014	British	British	Male	IIED, London	http://pubs.iied.org/14643IIED.html
Discussion Paper	Towards equitably managed protected areas: Neil Burgess, Fiona Danks, Rebecca Newham, Phil Franks, Dilys Roe, 2014		British	Male	IIED, London	
Policy Briefing	Advancing equity in protected area conservation: Kate Schreckenberg and Phil Franks, 2016	British	British	Female	IIED, London	http://pubs.iied.org/17344IIED.html
Methodology Manual (English and French)	SAPA Methodology Manual: Phil Franks and Rob Small, 2016	British	British	Male	IIED, London	http://pubs.iied.org/14659IIED.html http://pubs.iied.org/14659FIIED.html
Research Report	Understanding the social impacts of protected areas: Phil Franks and Rob Small, 2016	British	British	Male	IIED, London	http://pubs.iied.org/14661IIED.html
Journal Article	Colleen Corrigan, 2016	British	British	Female	Conservation Letters	Submitted and accepted
Journal Article	Phil Franks, 2016	British	British	Male	Conservation Letters	To be finalised by 1/8/16

Annex 6 Reports of usage of SAPA results at 4 sites

Protected Area	SAPA completed	SAPA Strengths	SAPA weaknesses	Outcomes to date in response
OI Pejeta Conservancy, Kenya	September 2014	<p>Reported by park staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involved communities thus creating ownership - Informs guidelines for engagement - Brings a range of different stakeholders on board 	<p>Reported by park staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not address all positive and negative impact issues - Impact identification is from sample communities that may not give the full picture of the range of impacts in different areas 	<p>Reported by park staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upgrading for fences to stop baboons getting into farmers fields - Affirmative action for local community members to get jobs with OPC - More equitable distribution of community projects - Increased frequency of meetings with communities and other stakeholders - Information on allocation of development projects shared with communities - More effort to mitigate human wildlife conflict - Reselection of community representatives using democratic processes
Monts de Cristal National Park, Gabon	March 2015	<p>From NGO facilitator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Simple and easy to implement on the ground - Method for identifying impacts that communities find very interesting and fun - Participatory, convenient and freedom to answer questions - Identification of problems / significant impacts by the people themselves and without any influence - Obtaining results rapidly 	<p>From NGO facilitator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issues with standardising the bean-count method for rating impacts with communities 	<p>From NGO facilitator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support to communities to test a range of techniques to protect their fields from elephants - Support to communities to manufacture beehives for use in elephant control

Mumbwa Game Management Area, Zambia	September 2015	From community facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ideas on impacts come from the community - Results are presented back to the communities so they feel a sense of ownership - Multi-stakeholder process – communities and other key stakeholders are involved in developing recommendations for action to improve things and so they are more willing to support implementation - Engages local government – most research doesn't do this 	From community facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There has been no action planning to turn the general recommendations into specific actions [Note: SAPA process has since been modified to include this] 	From community facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New GEF funded project will be taking on some recommendations developed through SAPA process - Committees at community level for managing the GMA (CRBs) have been reformed using a bottom up process - "Helped me very much to better understand key issues"
Ruwenzori National Park, Uganda	October 2015	From local government facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It brings all stakeholders together - It considers the issue considered by the majority - ideas for improvement are obtained right away - It focuses on improving the livelihood of those who bear the brunt of living adjacent to PA - It is easy to conduct and provides feedback - 	From local government facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community members expect financial assistance to attend the SAPA meetings 	From local government facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Joint (local government/park) programs to sensitization communities and leaders - Plan to extend tourism to other park-adjacent communities where there is potential (as it is currently all concentrated in one area) - Extending the resource use program to additional communities - Plan to ensure more equitable allocation of tourism revenue sharing funds - More frequent park-community meetings - Plan to provide training on control of problem animals that raid crops