

## Darwin Initiative Capability & Capacity Annual Report

To be completed with reference to the “Project Reporting Information Note”:  
(<https://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/resources-for-projects/information-notes-learning-notes-briefing-papers-and-reviews/> ).

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

**Submission Deadline: 30<sup>th</sup> April 2023**

**Submit to: [BCF-Reports@niras.com](mailto:BCF-Reports@niras.com) including your project ref in the subject line**

### Darwin Initiative Project Information

Project reference	DARCC010
Project title	Building effective and equitable multi-stakeholder mitigation for HWC in Tsavo
Country/ies	Kenya
Lead Partner	Zoological Society of London
Project partner(s)	Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), Conservation Alliance Kenya (CAK), The Universal Ranger Support Alliance (URSA)
Darwin Initiative grant value	£199,462.00
Start/end dates of project	1/05/2022 – 31/03/2024
Reporting period (e.g. Apr 2022 – Mar 2023) and number (e.g. Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	Apr 2022 – Mar 2023 Annual Report 1
Project Leader name	Gurveena Ghataure
Project website/blog/social media	<a href="https://www.zsl.org/conservation/regions/africa/kenya-conservation-work">https://www.zsl.org/conservation/regions/africa/kenya-conservation-work</a> Twitter: @ZSLAfrica
Report author(s) and date	Gurveena Ghataure, Alex Perham-Marchant, Fridah Mutili & Moses Wekesa – 30 April 2023

### 1. Project summary

ZSL has worked in Tsavo for over 30 years, focusing on critically endangered species protection. Since 2019, ZSL has partnered with two communities (Mang’etele and Kamungi) located on either side of the Mombasa-Nairobi highway, forming a buffer on the northern edge of Tsavo East National Park (TENP) and Tsavo West National Park (TWNP) and the eastern edge of Chyulu Hills (see map: Annex 4). The communities are predominantly subsistence arable farmers, with some livestock. They are poverty-stricken and highly vulnerable due to an over reliance on limited natural resources and poor climatic conditions. Human-wildlife conflict (HWC) – including conflict between people over wildlife – is drastically and increasingly worsening poverty and vulnerability for communities in the biodiversity-rich Tsavo landscape. The challenges these communities face have been identified throughout our four-year partnership and supported by data collected from partners and through surveys and discussions with community members. Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) recorded a staggering 30,664 cases of HWC between 2001 and 2016. According to KWS and Tsavo Trust (a long-term partner of ZSL and a key stakeholder in this landscape), incidences of HWC, particularly human-elephant conflict (HEC) in Kamungi, are increasing. Surveys conducted with these communities in 2021 found that in Kamungi, 100% of respondents experience conflict with wildlife: 85% experience livestock predation, 98% crop trampling and

87% wildlife attacks (with 98% of these being elephants). In Mang'etele, 56% of respondents reported conflict with wildlife: 71% reported livestock predation, 58% crop trampling and 5% wildlife attacks. Across both communities, respondents reported an average annual loss of 51% of crops and 55% of livestock. These results suggest that the conflict between wildlife and the communities in Mang'etele is significant and has a direct impact on the livelihoods of residents. The losses of crops and livestock due to animal predation and destruction, as well as wildlife attacks, are taking a toll on the community, leading to increased poverty and food insecurity.

This difference in reported HWC between communities is likely the result of a 12-strand electric fence built in Mang'etele in 2020. More recently, in 2022, a 90km 3-strand electric fence was built to protect Kamungi (Annex 5). Although it has had a positive impact on HEC in Kamungi, this is not a panacea, and HEC appears to have moved to other communities. Recently, owing to extended periods of drought and reduced browse availability in the park following extensive fires in August 2020, increased numbers of wildlife (particularly elephants) are entering community areas searching for resources, increasing HWC. As a result of the Mang'etele fence being constructed it has exacerbated conflict in Kamungi as the historical elephant migratory routes have been disrupted. Now available exits from the park take elephants through Kamungi. It is reported that since completion, neighbouring communities have been similarly impacted.

These communities have extremely fragile relationships with both wildlife and protected area management. ZSL's priority in Tsavo is encouraging community attitude change towards ecosystem stewardship and co-existence with wildlife. One aspect of our work has been to improve relations between communities and protected area management. This is an issue which has been raised anecdotally when we have been working with communities and KWS. Through this we have heard directly from communities and KWS about these issues, that helped us to design this project. The COVID-19 pandemic meant KWS, who heavily relied on tourism for its revenue, has had greatly depleted resources, including for responding to HWC incidences in communities and compensating affected people, leading to frustrations on both sides.

Consequently, this project sought to build the capacity of KWS-Tsavo to reduce community grievances regarding KWS and protected areas, resulting from HWC, through improving KWS-community collaboration, decision-making processes, and governance structures, guided by international best practice, including IUCN Guidelines for HWC (published in early 2022 by the IUCN HWC Task Force). By doing this we are working to reduce the number of HWC incidences and prevent retaliatory killing of wildlife, therefore reducing wildlife deaths. We anticipate that as HWC continues to decrease beyond the project period, partner communities will experience fewer damages to farms, livestock, community infrastructure and thus reducing the economic costs of HWC to communities.

## **2. Project stakeholders/ partners**

Our collaborative approach involved three key partners: Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), Conservation Alliance Kenya (CAK) and Universal Ranger Support Alliance (URSA). ZSL has found the last year to be successful both in terms of strengthening existing relationships in Tsavo (with KWS and partner communities Mang'etele and Kamungi) as well as building new partnerships through this project (CAK, URSA – a new engagement for ZSL Kenya, although ZSL and URSA have an existing relationship).

The partnership with KWS was based on joint demand from KWS and ZSL. ZSL has worked with KWS in Tsavo for approximately 30 years, initially supporting conservation of the Critically Endangered black rhino, and more recently partnering with KWS on community work (since 2019). We partner with KWS on all aspects of work in Tsavo West National Park. Broadly, KWS holds the legal mandate to conserve (protect & manage) all wildlife on behalf of the people of Kenya. At the same time, they have the responsibility to safeguard "*mwananchi*" (citizens) from disturbances by wildlife. This is achieved by reporting incidences of wildlife conflicts with humans to the Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife & Heritage (MTWH) and then initiating input from other government ministries (Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Livestock Development (MALD) on compensation matters. As such, ZSL's partnership with KWS on the project is natural and an absolute necessity to achieve our goal. KWS has the authority which, if well exercised, can

streamline and increase the functionality of key aspects of the conservation sector, making it a key candidate to benefit from capability and capacity building activities through this project. Within KWS, officers and rangers with community-facing roles as well as a handful of senior managers (ensuring project buy-in) have been prioritised for capability and capacity building training.

KWS have been continuously involved in all aspects of the project, including project design, the project launch and the activities undertaken throughout the year. We engaged with senior KWS leadership and the MTWH to socialise the project goal and objectives. In addition, we ensured that the project was aligned with the ongoing national processes pertaining to Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC). These processes include the development of a HWC strategy for Kenya with site-based action plans, a review of the ranger training curriculum, and looking at the Code of Conduct for rangers when dealing with HWC.

A key part of project success is engaging all stakeholders in the landscape, ensuring that positive changes relating to HWC can be incorporated at all levels of the KWS framework. To achieve this, ZSL partnered with CAK. CAK are an alliance of 66 conservation NGOs operating in Kenya with an extensive network. This network of members represents a diversity of stakeholders, from conservation practitioners to local government and community groups. CAK's strength is convening stakeholders together, and they also have a deep interest in HWC in Kenya. CAK's added value to the project is clear, and in addition, CAK were interested in partnering to scale-up the implementation of best practices developed in this project across Kenya.

Furthermore, CAK has strong pre-existing relationships with high level government officials and are well-placed to facilitate engagement with other players in the sector that have not traditionally been in the ZSL network. A key positive outcome of this partnership is that CAK were able to bring top parastatal and ministry officials to the project launch, a significant contribution towards project visibility as recommended by the British High Commission via an email exchange. CAK have been integral in project delivery; with close support given to the project launch, the KWS competency assessment workshop, the SAGE workshop, facilitating the trust building workshop with ZSL and consultants, as well as convening the first HWC stakeholder meeting in the Tsavo landscape together with ZSL.

The ZSL and URSA partnership was the result of a coalition of organisations coming together at the International Ranger Federation (IRF) to form URSA in July 2020, of which ZSL is a member. URSA led the development of an international Code of Conduct for rangers and have been developing this with other partners across the globe. During this first year, URSA has been instrumental in discussions around trust building and code of conduct and have developed a training package to understand and develop a code of conduct together with ZSL for KWS in TWNP.

Beyond these formal partnerships, the project has collaborated with other stakeholders and has benefitted from continued collaborations with partner communities, fostering positive relationships as well as other government bodies, including the Government of Makueni County who participated in relevant project meetings and contributed to these with constructive feedback. Key people that attended from the County Government of Makueni were the County Wildlife Liaison Officer, the Ward Administrators and the Village Administrators. Again, this wide variety of stakeholders engaged will be essential to continued project progress in Y2 and success beyond the project period. In addition, the national government of Kenya has been involved in the project. Key contacts that were engaged in meetings included the Assistant County Commissioner (ACC), Chiefs, Assistant Chiefs, and village heads (incl. men and women). All these levels attended the project launch and gave constructive feedback. Community members to be engaged in HWC governance and related capacity building activities were identified and voted for in public meetings; two men, two women, a person living with a disability, and two youth representatives were chosen from each community.

Finally, a systems-change expert from Leaders' Quest, was involved in providing advice on the trust building workshop to improve relationships between KWS and communities (elements we sought her advice on are found within Annex 7). The reason this expert was approached was because of Leaders Quest's experience of working in hierarchical organisations to build change within organisations. We shared key learnings from the SAGE process conducted with communities and sought her advice on how best to approach the trust building workshop. The expert underscored the need to incorporate SAGE recommendations into trust building initiatives.

Further, she highlighted the value of careful listening & learning, acts of empathy (e.g., rangers participating in social events like funerals, weddings in community neighbourhoods), recognition of cultural norms, learning local languages, location of ranger outposts within villages, volunteer ranger arrangements, involving communities and offering job opportunities to locals as additional elements to the trust building processes.

### Lessons Learned

- Relationship building and trust has been a critical component of project development, and frequent community visits and the communities having easy access to the ZSL team on the ground have been important to facilitate this. In order to ensure the participation of the whole community and enhance their ownership of the project, we must engage representatives from across each community, not just self-appointed representatives.
- There has been slow communication with some partners, and this is a challenge that needs to be overcome moving into Year 2. The project plans to implement fixed regular catch-up calls with each partner, ensuring everyone is on the same page and to help with project timetabling, ensuring delays are avoided.

## **3. Project progress**

### **3.1 Progress in carrying out project Activities**

**Output 1: Structured gap assessment of KWS community-focused training materials and practices, utilising the IUCN HWC Task Force Guidelines, IIED's SAGE Tool and a capacity assessment, informs the development of Best Practice Standards.**

*Activity 1.1: Hold an inception meeting with KWS to set objectives and plan.*

A formal meeting organised and facilitated by the ZSL project team, with Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), representatives from both communities (Kamungi and Mang'elete), as well as project stakeholders (County Government, National Government and Tsavo Trust) was held in July 2022 to launch the project. The main objective was to explain the project, its timeline, objectives, and activities to attendants. This meeting also ensured that all stakeholders were well known to each other. During the meeting, HWC was highlighted as the greatest concern both to the communities and KWS (including conservation partners). It was therefore felt that the project was timely and would bring some relief to communities, park management, and law enforcement alike. While lauding the project as timely, the Assistant Director for Tsavo West National Park expressed optimism about the project - helping reduce levels of damage and losses resulting from wildlife related conflicts hence the demand for compensation. He emphasised the need for collaboration between stakeholders and explained that this is a critical strategic pillar for the agency. He thanked ZSL and the Darwin Initiative for the effort to bring the new project in addition to existing ones. This was both on the community front and for biodiversity. Finally, ZSL affirmed our commitment and dedication to working with all stakeholders in the landscape to make a difference for communities and wildlife (Annex 8).

A separate inception meeting was held in August with CAK (Annex 9), who were unable to participate in the initial launch with KWS. Again, the main objective was to review the project's approach, timeline, objectives, activities, and associated budget. Monthly meetings have been established and scheduled with partners CAK as key advisors on the project. Potential avenues for sharing project outputs were also discussed at the meeting. Generally, the avenues suggested included meetings, conferences, and workshops nationally, regionally, and internationally. Instagram and Twitter were also mentioned as important engagement platforms.

Upon discussions with CAK, a high-level meeting with heads of departments at KWS HQ and from the MTWH was agreed; to present the project, increase visibility of the project's outcomes and enhance the potential of working towards common goals and shared visions, which took place in October 2022 (Evidence saved, however cannot share due to sensitivities) The project benefitted from our new partnership with CAK, and the partner's connections and advantaged position to liaise with higher level KWS and MTWH staff. This is being taken forward by the HWC stakeholder workshops that CAK will lead on and will hold with KWS and stakeholders.

*Activity 1.2: Set up of project processes including FPIC, stakeholder mapping, socialising the feedback mechanisms etc.*

The project has followed an inclusive engagement process to ensure project affected peoples (PAPs) have been considered, identified, heard and meaningfully consulted at appropriate phases of the project. As part of this, a stakeholder analysis and mapping exercise was conducted to further evaluate the actors that may be affected by the project, or who may have an interest or be able to influence the project in different ways. The barriers to engaging each actor group were also analysed and methods to help remove these barriers to facilitate engagement were identified. As part of this engagement process, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) principles were followed, and the existing Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) was reviewed to ensure it is an effective mechanism accessible to everyone. Consent for engagement in specific activities has also been sought (e.g., consent from participants for activities that took place through the SAGE process), and we will continue to seek consent for any further activities (Evidence saved but cannot be shared due to sensitivity). Further to this, the project is reviewing these existing mechanisms to support KWS in the implementation of such processes. This is part of capacity development. As part of the KWS meeting which included the capacity assessments held in November 2022, the team introduced these processes and will continue to engage in further discussions regarding KWS' needs for support.

*Activity 1.3: Use IIED SAGE governance tool to understand and assess equity in protected area conservation.*

The use of the IIED SAGE governance tool was discussed and agreed by the project team, based on ZSL's experience in Mozambique. We engaged with the services of a consultant who was identified by the IIED network. The SAGE assessment was undertaken in December 2022. The main purpose of SAGE is to improve the governance and equity of conservation in order to achieve better results for both nature and people - in particular poor and vulnerable groups. The actor groups were identified during the stakeholder / rights owner's analysis with key informants from the Tsavo Conservation Area. The process was successful in bringing together a range of stakeholders including KWS, WRTI, communities, NGOs, CBOs, National and County governments, with 54 people participating in the process in total.

The assessment covered eight of the ten SAGE principles as follows: Respect for rights, Respect for actors, Participation in decision making, Transparency and accountability, Fair law enforcement, Equitable benefit sharing, Achieving conservation objectives and Effective collaboration and coordination between actors. This analysis informed activity 1.5 below. Please see Annex 10 for a detailed report.

*Activity 1.4: Review KWS community training materials with IUCN HWC task force guidelines.*

KWS have no existing training materials for both rangers and communities but are interested in incorporating HWC-training at the KWS Law Enforcement Academy (LEA) in Manyani. The capacity needs assessment and areas of weakness around community engagement allowed this to be brought forward on KWS' agenda. A senior officer at the KWS Law Enforcement Academy participated in the dialogues at the trust building workshop and the HWC stakeholders' meetings. She is keen to embed and socialise it into the Academy training curriculum. In Q2Y2, the project will continue to engage on this issue.

*Activity 1.5: Conduct a capacity needs assessment to identify knowledge gaps among KWS officers on community centred HWC mitigation.*

Several consultative meetings were held with KWS officers on the ground and potential knowledge gaps in community-centred conservation were identified. These were harmonized with the IUCN Global Protected Area Competencies Register and consolidated into an assessment questionnaire (Annex 11). The questionnaire was further tailored to suit the rangers (lower cadre) and wardens (higher cadre). This was deemed necessary because within the KWS, duties are allocated to ranks and governed by Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) with different mandates and responsibilities. A total of ten officers / wardens (two females, eight males) consented to participate in the self-assessment indicating a score (0-4) against listed competency statements whereby zero implied not needed or relevant in current role and four

implied relevant in current role and working as an authority. Similar procedures were followed by the ranger cadre (three females: 26 males). A total of 39 people were assessed in the process. The results can be seen in Annex 12 and 12.1

The assessment scores were analysed in Microsoft Excel and results were shared in a separate workshop attended by representatives from both cadres (Activity 1.7), singling out awareness and education, advanced personal competencies, local communities and cultures, biodiversity conservation and technology as the top areas with the lowest scores which will require training.

The next steps are to share the results and findings with the KWS senior team at headquarters and the Ministry Officials. This is so that the actions identified can be prioritised by KWS.

*Activity 1.6: Hold a community consultation and conduct community attitude surveys towards KWS and wildlife.*

The attitudinal surveys (as described in Annex 13) were conducted in September 2022, with data analysis carried out between October and November of the same year. A total of 154 respondents participated in the survey, consisting of 27 male and 127 female individuals. Additionally, community consultation meetings were held, and 10 community members were invited to attend the project launch. Community members were consulted and engaged in the site-level assessment of governance and equity. They participated in selecting village representatives for the HWC committees and were involved in the identification and voting of representatives for HWC governance and capacity-building activities. The selected representatives, comprising two men, two women, a person living with a disability, and two youth representatives from each community, were chosen to represent the diversity of each community and their roles were clearly defined (evidence saved but cannot be shared due to sensitivities). To ensure the success of HWC mitigation strategies, these representatives will undergo a trust-building workshop, both separately and jointly with park managers, to develop sustainable relationships and build trust.

*Activity 1.7: Hold a consultative meeting and present findings of the needs assessment and draft of the best practice standards to get input and buy-in from KWS.*

The attitudinal surveys (as described in Annex 13) were conducted in September 2022, with data analysis carried out between October and November of the same year. A total of 154 respondents participated in the survey, consisting of 27 male and 127 female individuals. Additionally, community consultation meetings were held, and 10 community members were invited to attend the project launch. Community members were consulted and engaged in the site-level assessment of governance and equity. They participated in selecting village representatives for the HWC committees and were involved in the identification and voting of representatives for HWC governance and capacity-building activities. The selected representatives, comprising two men, two women, a person living with a disability, and two youth representatives from each community, were chosen to represent the diversity of each community and their roles were clearly defined (evidence saved but cannot be shared due to sensitivities). To ensure the success of HWC mitigation strategies, these representatives will undergo a trust-building workshop, both separately and jointly with park managers, to develop sustainable relationships and build trust.

*Activity 1.8: Design training plan and materials and assessment for learning.*

This activity is still in development, but we have started a training plan based on the SAGE results and competency assessments and are working with various partners to complete this. This activity was slightly delayed owing to an incident within the community, for which we submitted a change request in March 2023. See Annex 14 and 19 for change requests outlining delays.

*Activity 1.9: Develop and propose Best Practice Standards for piloting based on the capacity assessment and gap analysis.*

This activity has begun, although slightly delayed due to the reasons outlined in the agreed change request (Annex 15) and will be finalised by Y2Q2.

**Output 2: KWS staff implement Best Practice Standards in community engagement and equitable governance for HWC prevention and mitigation.**

*Activity 2.1: Conduct training sessions targeting different capacity building aspects identified in the gap assessment including 20 people to be trained as trainers.*

We have started this process by conducting trust building with KWS, as this is an area that came out as a weakness in the capacity assessment and is a prerequisite to moving any work on HWC mitigation forward with KWS and the communities. With CAK support, we managed to discuss this at national and regional levels with KWS and have buy-in from the various directors. To start developing these best practice guidelines we conducted a trust building workshop with KWS to support the improvement of relationships with the communities to better support them in addressing HWC incidences (Annex 16 and additional evidence saved but cannot be shared due to sensitivities). We initially intended to bring together KWS and the communities for this workshop; however, due to an incident where an elephant killed a community member (more details in Annexes 18 & 19), we had to separate the session and focus on KWS and communities separately. We will aim to bring the two together in Year 2 once tensions have been alleviated post the incident. The workshop was attended by 33 rangers, out of which six were female. The workshop highlighted that there is a lot of work to be done on building trust between the rangers and communities, with suggestions to improve this put forward, encouraging KWS to understand the viewpoint of community members. The workshop also included an exercise which outlined different scenarios to highlight what behaviours count as misconduct. The project has incorporated outputs from this workshop into the initial drafts of the best practice standards and will include additional outputs following the joint KWS-community workshop.

*Activity 2.2: Design and implementation of trust building workshops between KWS, community reps and other relevant stakeholders to improve relationships.*

This was conducted in March 2023 with a consultant from Equilibrium Research. The consultant had conducted similar exercises before and had worked with partner URSA in developing the ranger Code of Conduct. The 2-day workshop was attended by 35 people, with representatives from KWS, Tsavo Trust, the Department of Education, Community Wildlife Service, ZSL and an officer from CAK. The key objective of the workshop was to increase knowledge and awareness of elements of the trust building framework, focusing on how to engage communities. The workshop was received well by KWS and from discussions, rangers had a deeper understanding and appreciation of communities and other stakeholders having different assumptions and viewpoints. There was an understanding that how they approached communities made a difference and needed to change e.g., body language, choice of words etc (Annex 16) The trust building workshop also highlighted some areas that need to be worked on and we conducted scenarios with KWS on different situations that might qualify as misconduct for them to have a better understanding of acceptable behaviour. This workshop will inform the Code of Conduct work going forward into Year 2. Whilst the rangers from the Tsavo Trust and the KWS rangers were at very different start points, there was something in the awareness raising workshop for everyone: from conflict de-escalation to soft skills and developing working relationships. There is a long way to go, particularly for the KWS rangers who have had no prior training on the human-side of HWC and who regularly deal with high-stake situations with the public. Much of the feedback seemed to focus on asking for more time and more training. However, all rangers seemed very engaged and will hopefully apply the lessons learned in their working life.

*Activity 2.3: ZSL to deliver training in situation analysis and de-escalation; facilitation; poverty and biodiversity conservation, personal safety and gender equity and social inclusion training.*

Activity scheduled for Year 2.

*Activity 2.4: Equip KWS with participatory learning and action research skills as well as integrate citizen science to develop effective approaches for HWC Prevention and mitigation resulting in better sensitivities to community challenges in regard to HWC.*

Activity scheduled for Year 2.

*Activity 2.5: KWS to lead and facilitate two quarterly stakeholder meetings that include community members, relevant NGOs and private sector putting into practice the skills learnt in the Project.*

The project convened the first stakeholders' workshop in March 2023, led by CAK. This was the first meeting where stakeholders from Makueni and Taita Taveta Counties met to discuss and mitigate HWC and related issues (i.e., conflict between different stakeholders). Stakeholders included national and county governments, elected leaders – Member of Parliament (MP), Senate and Member County Assembly (MCA), KWS, community representatives, conservation organizations and conservancies. The participants endorsed the quarterly stakeholders' forum

and an upscaling of proactive preventive measures to key conflict areas. They also put forward the suggestion of holding regular meetings at the grassroots level, where conflict occurs, so that communities and decision-makers can be brought together to discuss issues and solutions together (Evidence saved but cannot be shared due to sensitivities).

As described in Activity 1.2, the project conducted stakeholder analysis and mapping in order to establish actors, where they operate, and the conflict preventive measures currently in place.

*Activity 2.6: A Joint KWS-Community mentorship and advisory group formalised consisting of a senior member of KWS Community Wildlife Service staff, Ministry of Wildlife, CAK and a respected community member with support from ZSL's international best practice network, the group provides ongoing advice to KWS staff.*

The mentorship group was discussed at the HWC stakeholder meeting in March 2023, and it was agreed that the group would be formalised and would start meeting in Year 2, with plans to establish the terms of reference (ToR) and attached advisory group at the next meeting (Evidence saved however cannot be shared due to sensitivities).

*Activity 2.7: Conduct an exchange visit to learn from promising practice in community centred HWC mitigation strategies.*

Activity scheduled for Year 2.

*Activity 2.8: Incorporate learnings into Best Practice Standards developed and promote to KWS for integration into KWS ranger training.*

Activity scheduled for Year 2.

**Output 3: Equitable HWC governance plans, detailing decision-making processes and allocations of responsibilities which ensure the inclusion of community and stakeholders' voices in the planning and implementation of all HWC interventions.**

*Activity 3.1: CAK and Project staff lead quarterly stakeholder meetings to formalise consortium with key stakeholders, agree good governance principles and synergise activities.*

CAK launched the first HWC workshop in TWNP in March 2023. We implemented activities 2.5, 2.6 and 3.1 during this meeting. The project mapped key stakeholders and during the next meeting, we will formalize the consortium to develop good governance principles and synergize the implementation of conflict-preventive measures and report progress (Evidence saved however cannot share due to sensitivities).

*Activity 3.2: Support KWS to lead quarterly stakeholder meetings (consortium) to build partnerships and plan conservation and HWC mitigation activities.*

As reported under Activity 3.1, CAK launched the first stakeholder workshop in March 2023, during which Activity 3.2 was begun. KWS and CAK will coordinate the consortium and develop a conflict mitigation work plan for Makueni and Taita Taveta counties during Year 2 (Evidence saved however cannot share due to sensitivities).

*Activity 3.3: HWC governance plans to be developed, led by KWS with multi-stakeholder consortium and community input.*

As reported under Activity 3.1, CAK launched the first stakeholder workshop in March 2023, during which Activity 3.3 began. KWS and CAK will coordinate the consortium and develop a conflict mitigation work plan for Makueni and Taita Taveta counties during Year 2 (Evidence saved, however cannot be shared due to sensitivities).

**Output 4: Piloted and updated Best Practice Standards and package of equitable human-wildlife coexistence management techniques recommended to national KWS and conservation stakeholders for adoption and shared as a case study with IUCN HWC Task Force.**

*Activity 4.1: HWC governance plans to be developed, led by KWS with multi-stakeholder consortium and community input.*

Activity scheduled for Year 2.



*Activity 4.2: Impact report detailing key findings and policy recommendations developed and presented at key conferences (African Park Congress convened by IUCN/ Annual Wildlife conservation congress convened by the MOTW and CAK, CITES and CBD convention).*

CAK attended the African Protected Areas Congress (APAC) (July 2022) in Kigali, Rwanda, where communities raised concerns about the lack of benefit sharing mechanisms and increasing conflict between communities and wildlife. CAK had a stand at the conference and were able to raise awareness on what CAK and its members are doing in connecting ecosystems and fostering coexistence between people and nature.

During the ongoing development of the Kenyan national human-wildlife coexistence strategy and action plan, CAK have been able to discuss the potential impact of this project. The clear alignment between the objectives of this project and the national strategy is encouraging and will ease harmonisation between the two.

Finally, CAK attended the CITES CoP18 meeting. CAK contributed to the sessions working on IPLC, which among other things discuss community involvement in decision-making.

All of these engagements in Year 1 have laid key groundwork for the dissemination of the project impact report in Year 2.

*Activity 4.3: Impact report disseminated to the IUCN HWC Task Force and URSA.*

Activity scheduled for Year 2.

## **3.2 Progress towards project Outputs**

**Output 1: Structured gap assessment of KWS community-focused training materials and practices, utilising the IUCN HWC Task Force Guidelines, IIED's SAGE Tool and a capacity assessment, informs the development of Best Practice Standards.**

### **1.1 Structured assessment process agreed by KWS and communities by Y1Q2.**

*Means of Verification (MOV) 1.1 Structured Assessment plan; reports from KWS and community meetings.*

We have started a draft of a structured assessment plan, however due to delays as outlined in the approved change request (Annex 15), it has not been completed. The project has conducted the capacity needs assessment which informs the structured assessment plan. This will be completed in Year 2.

Through the capacity needs assessment, a training gap was identified, and we are working closely with the KWS training school management to directly feed into ongoing training programmes. We have received a verbal invite from KWS to discuss a way forward on this. Further, we will explore an opportunity for incorporation into the overall training curriculum (this is currently in draft - awaiting launch). According to the assessment results, the key themes that came up with low to medium scores were advanced personal competencies, biodiversity conservation, tourism & recreation, local communities & cultures, technology, as well as the education and awareness component.

We are currently narrowing down on very specific aspects of the above-mentioned competencies and are identifying trainers to deliver the most needed training sessions. Some KWS officers present in the room during the result sharing conversation expressed an interest in being enlisted as trainers if there was an opportunity, which is something we will look at on YR2 if it can happen or will be something beyond the project.

### **1.2 Recommended Best Practice Standards developed by Y1Q3.**

This has been delayed to YR2 as outlined in the approved change request submitted in March 2023 (Annex 15).

**1.3 Participatory assessment of KWS Tsavo community practices and training materials in relation to HWCx, including findings and Best Practice Standards, agreed by stakeholders and submitted to KWS by Y1Q3.**

*MOV 1.3 Participatory assessment submitted to KWS Tsavo*

The project has made some progress on this Output. We have conducted a capacity gap assessment and have undertaken the SAGE assessment and are in the process of conducting trainings and sessions to develop Best Practice Standards. This is expected to be completed by end of YR2Q1.

**Output 2: KWS staff implement Best Practice Standards in community engagement and equitable governance for HWC prevention and mitigation.**

**2.1 Piloting of Best Practice Standards is agreed for trial implementation in Tsavo by Y1Q3.**

*MOV: KWS Tsavo documents detailing conditions of pilot of Best Practice Standards*

This was delayed due to the human-elephant conflict incident which resulted in the death of a community member. See change request that was approved in March 2023 (Annex 15). The project expects the pilot of the agreed Best Practice Standards to take place in YR2Q4.

**Output 3: Equitable HWC governance plans, detailing decision-making processes and allocations of responsibilities which ensure the inclusion of community and stakeholders' voices in the planning and implementation of all HWC interventions.**

Scheduled for EOY2.

**Output 4: Piloted and updated Best Practice Standards and package of equitable human-wildlife coexistence management techniques recommended to national KWS and conservation stakeholders for adoption and shared as a case study with IUCN HWC Task Force.**

Scheduled for EOY2.

### **3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome**

As this is the first year of the project, the main focus has been on strengthening relationships and socialising the project. The activities have focused on setting up discussions and getting KWS, partners, and other stakeholders together. We conducted the first HWC mitigation stakeholders' workshop in Tsavo, with our partners CAK, that brought together all stakeholders working or dealing with HWC in the area. We conducted a baseline for attitudes with community members and KWS so we can measure a change in the project period. Some activities have started and there has so far been a positive uptake of the project from partners and stakeholders. We have had a few setbacks as outlined due to circumstances beyond our control (see change request annex 15), however we will be able to get this project back on track in Year 2. The indicators so far are adequate, and we are aiming to achieve the desired outcome at the end of the project.

*Outcome indicator 1: 25% increase in favourable attitude to protected areas among community members by end of Y2*

*Means of Verification: ZSL's Conservation Attitude Index, from baseline and endline community surveys (Likert scale 1 - 5, quantified for percentage calculation)*

The project has gathered baselines on attitudes of KWS and communities towards Protected Areas and HWC (See Annex 17 for results, we have additional evidence but cannot share due to sensitivities). It is too early to tell now if there is a favourable attitude to Protected Areas amongst community members and this is something we will investigate in Year 2 over the project period.

*Outcome indicator 2: 30% reduction in extent of HWC grievances and KWS's management of HWC among community members by end of Y2*

*MoV: ZSL's HWC Index, focused on grievances to HWC and KWS's management of HWC, from baseline and endline community surveys (Likert scale 1 - 5, quantified for percentage calculation)*

During this project, attitudes toward HWC have been gained from both KWS and the communities. Attitudinal surveys with community members have established a baseline for this indicator. The results are as follows: Kamungi: 100% of respondents from the survey experienced HWC. Mang'elele: 67% of respondents experienced HWC. Across both communities there was an average of 48.9% of crops lost; and 56.4% of livestock lost (perception-based impact

assessment). It is however too early to tell whether there has been a reduction in the extent of HWC grievances at this stage, and we are aiming to measure this by the end of Year 2.

*Outcome indicator 3: 30% increase in favourable attitude to community members among KWS staff in Tsavo by end of Y2*

*MoV: Anonymised KWS attitude survey, baseline and endline (Likert scale 1 - 5, quantified for percentage calculation)*

At this stage, it is too early to draw any definitive conclusions. However, we have gathered valuable data on the attitudes of KWS staff towards community members through an attitudinal survey conducted in Q3 2022 (Evidence gathered but cannot be shared due to sensitive content). The survey found a baseline figure of 0.642, indicating favourable attitudes towards community members among KWS staff.

Of the 36 KWS staff who conducted the survey, 13 strongly agreed that the voice of communities bordering the PA could be well represented in PA governance. Additionally, 13 staff strongly agreed and 16 staff agreed that the opinions and interests of communities bordering the PA could be better factored into HWC decision-making, with only 2 rangers being neutral on this point.

It is important to note that these findings provide some initial insights into the attitudes of KWS staff towards community engagement. However, further analysis and engagement with KWS staff and community members will be necessary to fully understand the opportunities and challenges related to community engagement in the context of HWC mitigation strategies.

*Outcome indicator 4: Improvement in perceptions of female and minority groups voices being heard in PA management decision making by end of Y2.*

*Mov: Qualitative baseline and endline Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions with KWS and Community groups.*

Too early to tell. We will conduct surveys in Y2Q1 to assess the perceptions of whether female and minority group voices are being heard. A follow up survey will be conducted in Y2Q4 to compare and assess the project's progress.

*Outcome indicator 5: National KWS and at least 50% of Kenyan conservation actors in Tsavo express interest in support to adopt/expand the package of measures end of Y2.*

*MoV: Reports and communications from project impact workshop facilitated by Conservation Alliance Kenya*

This will be realised at the end of the project and so far, the project has been socialising and working with KWS at an early stage on processes towards HWC mitigation. However, already the project has seen a keen interest from KWS and Kenyan conservation actors in supporting the project and HWC mitigation strategies.

### **3.4 Monitoring of assumptions**

**Assumption 1:** *National KWS engagement with the project's pilot work in and around Tsavo lays the groundwork for nationwide adoption of equitable human-wildlife coexistence management.*

Our partners CAK, and URSA, are working at a nationwide level with KWS HQ to ensure that these best practices are adopted and upscaled in Tsavo and realigned in the national human-wildlife co-existence strategy and action plan. We are also in discussions with WWF, who are working on a Nation-wide Code of Conduct for KWS to uptake. In the next quarter we will conduct joint activities with WWF to support the uptake of Human-Wildlife Coexistence (HWCx) management at a national level. This project will be the pilot and will support this as a case study for uptake with KWS at a national level.

**Assumption 2:** *Improved governance decreases conflict around negative human-wildlife interactions and improves people-PA relations with benefits for biodiversity conservation.*

This stays true. We do envisage that with improved governance and better relationships between KWS and communities creating improved trust and communication that negative interactions with

HWC will reduce. In addition, KWS will look more sympathetically at how wildlife and PA management should support communities better and include them in decision making.

**Assumption 3:** *Improved outcomes for conservation from equitable and participatory approaches to working with communities in Tsavo increases the appetite for further protected area governance amendments – laying the groundwork for equitable protected area governance nationwide and resulting benefits for biodiversity conservation.*

The SAGE process under this project was undertaken and received positively and will hopefully help break ground especially around state-owned Protected Areas.

**Assumption 4:** *Ease and access to grievance mechanisms stays equal.*

We will continue to work with KWS and other stakeholders in the area to ensure that the grievance mechanism is effective, and grievances can be aired easily, documented and acted on.

**Assumption 5:** *KWS, communities, and all other stakeholders are receptive to use of IUCN HWC Guidelines and best practice recommendations.*

IUCN HWC guidelines have been referenced in the launch of the project, competency assessments, competency assessments result sharing, SAGE, Trust building, and Stakeholder workshops. From initial discussions around implementing / adopting the best practice recommendations, stakeholders have received the idea positively. Additionally, it has been suggested by stakeholders that to further improve the efficacy of the best practice guidelines, implementers should adapt it to deliver site-specific interventions.

**Assumption 6:** *KWS have requested support from ZSL to improve the approach to and practice of HWC management in Tsavo, as such we assume they will continue to be open to ZSL's recommendations including the structured gap assessments proposed, and to taking the necessary steps to fill identified gaps.*

KWS TWNP management expressly recognises the role ZSL played in transforming the rhino monitoring protocols on the ground in TWNP and hopes similar efforts and goodwill can be replicated in transforming the Park's Community Wildlife service. There has been cooperation through all activities, including attendance at meetings, contributing to meeting agendas, sharing new ideas, thoughts and other forms of knowledge, and following up on next steps.

**Assumption 7:** *Capacity to implement equitable human-wildlife coexistence practices, when supported by on the job mentoring, is the key gap in KWS current practice. With this capacity provided the project will see improvements in outcomes.*

When conducting the capacity assessment and trust building workshop, it was clear from the discussions that KWS were able to see that current capacity and ability to engage with communities in the correct way was a key barrier. KWS are also aware that until now, they view their role solely to protect wildlife, and moving forward they need to incorporate community needs and understand these needs much better.

**Assumption 8:** *Communities and stakeholders are willing and able to engage together to discuss matters. Community representation is representative of all affected and marginalised groups.*

The SAGE process reported under this project brought together an array of representatives from actor groups namely: KWS, WRTI, communities, NGOs, CBOs, National and County governments. All stakeholders engaged very openly and communicated the need for these discussions and meetings to continue. Additionally, community members were highly encouraged to elect women and youth representatives to the HWC committees to improve gender representation. Additionally, the project team have reserved some seats on the committee to achieve gender balance in the event this is not organically met as well as inclusion of people living with disability and youth. This further guarantees the inclusion of marginalised groups in the project.

**Assumption 9:** *Sufficient ability for KWS staff to make decision on governance processes, including, if necessary, approval from senior National or Regional KWS staff.*

So far, the project has engaged with National and Regional KWS staff to draw input and get buy-in. With CAK support, a significant breakfast meeting (Evidence saved but cannot share due to sensitivities) was held with Ministry of wildlife officials and senior KWS from HQ; ideally to socialize the project, discuss tools, draw input, and get buy-in. A key take-away was that the government is concerned with the number of HWC incidents, as these incidents are leading to compensation claims that are costly to resolve. As a result, they are fully supportive of initiatives that aim to improve the on-ground management of HWC incidents that promote peaceful HWCx, improving the welfare of communities living with wildlife, and reduce the number of compensation claims as a result of HWC. Generally, they felt the project was quite ambitious given the activity budgets and timelines but lauded the project initiative and affirmed their support. Site-level Assistant Directors (also present at the workshops) commented positively and affirmed their support too; demonstrable through increased follow-up on action plans, activity briefs and reports. With this level of commitment, we are confident requisite approvals will be received.

**Assumption 10:** *KWS 2030 Wildlife Strategy's commitments on equitable human wildlife coexistence (Strategic Objective 2, Initiative 6 in particular) provide a basis on which the package developed under this project can be recommended. KWS have already welcomed support from ZSL to achieve these objectives.*

This still holds true.

**Assumption 11:** *CAK's involvement as a partner will lay the groundwork for adoption by Kenyan conservation stakeholders, and for alignment in working practices.*

There is goodwill from stakeholders to ensure adoption is cognisant of community needs, including those of elected leaders.

### **3.5 Achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty reduction**

It is too early to say what impact the project has had on biodiversity and poverty reduction at this stage. However, through the capacity building exercised we are carrying out, we expect to see relations improve over the project period between KWS and communities, which we will measure with attitudinal surveys. We would expect to see trust and relationship building between KWS and communities and see an improvement on HWC incidents being handled. In turn, this will increase the effectiveness of wildlife conservation efforts in the TCA, helping to protect people's livelihoods, which will contribute to poverty reduction.

In addition, over time, we hope to see HWC incidents or reports of complaints reducing and the ability to respond and react to HWC incidents improved regarding the elephant incident and working with communities. Overall, the impact of the project will create a decrease in retaliation killings, leading to positive impact on biodiversity, and increased Human Wildlife Co-existence.

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

The project is contributing to the following:

### **Convention on Biological Diversity**

CBD 8 & 10: Implementation of equitable human-wildlife coexistence (HWCx) management (also Aichi Target C11) the project is incorporating both community practices for HWC (also Aichi Target E18) and considering biodiversity in decision making. Through the formation of HWC committees with members voted for by the community, we are developing reliable avenues that park management will use to engage communities in HWC in a structured way. The project also promotes the protection of biodiversity. So far, the project has started discussions on HWC mitigation with KWS to incorporate community practices and will be developing training for community engagement on HWC. The Committee members will be upskilled in HWC mitigation methods as TOTs to enable them to safely respond to HWC as well as prioritise interventions.

CBD 12 – Training and capacity building of KWS in community-centred HWC mitigation, situation analysis, facilitation, poverty and biodiversity conservation, and GESI. The project has already delivered a trust building workshop for KWS equipping them with critical community awareness and engagement skills that build trust between park management and community members in the long term. For sustainability some KWS officers will be trained as TOTs in Trust building to ensure new staff stationed in the TCA benefit from this training beyond the project period.

CBD 17 – The project will disseminate findings to African Park Congress, IUCN HWC Task Force, and Universal Ranger Support Alliance (URSA). The project has also been earmarked as a case study for community-centred HWC management and the results herein will be integrated into the national HWC mitigation strategy. The project will continue to contribute to this, and the project team (CAK and ZSL) will attend these future meetings as it was too soon in Year 1.

### **Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species:**

CITES convened the African Elephant Action Plan (of which Kenya is a range state), which includes a major focus on HEC. The project significantly builds local capacity to address HEC and will share the lessons learnt as well as promising practice for wider adoption and replication. Habitat loss combined with the increasing human population has resulted in increased conflict between humans and wild animals living in closer proximity and sharing resources. The conflict has become a global concern, with those living with wildlife bearing the conservation cost, including loss of income, essential crops to support their livelihoods, and tragically, sometimes, loss of human life. The project is contributing to the development of Kenya's human-wildlife coexistence strategy and action plan and has already provided data in lobbying for the establishment of the elephant fund at the CITES CoP19 meeting. CAK is part of the CITES IPLC Working Group which is developing a framework to address communities concerns and livelihood in conserving the elephant which is a conflict species.

### **Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals:**

The Second Meeting of the Range States of the Joint CITES-CMS African Carnivores Initiative (ACI) will be held from 1 to 4 May 2023 in Entebbe, Uganda. CAK has engaged KWS to present conservation concerns. We shall review the outcomes of the meeting and develop a framework for African carnivore conflict. African carnivores are vulnerable due to habitat loss, and CAK are engaging the government for a multi-sector approach to ensure spatial plans recognize the need for suitable habitats for African carnivores. The project will inform our strategies for the species listing under CMS CoP14 meeting in 2023.

### **Sustainable Development Goals:**

**SDGs 1&2: No Poverty & Zero Hunger** – Working to reduce HWC grievances, including loss of crops, livestock and livelihoods.

**SDG 5: Gender Equality** – The project has set aside 10 slots for women in the HWC committees to ensure that there is at least one-third female representation on the committees. A reduction in human-wildlife conflict, and a more collaborative response to wildlife conservation will improve the lives of women in the villages surrounding TWNP. For example, when an elephant raids a village and household granaries, women suffer disproportionately as culturally, they are responsible for feeding their families. Likewise, when there are high incidences of HEC conflict, women take time to walk the children to and from school, to ensure their safety, consequently losing viable time for economic development or wellbeing activities.

**SDG 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities** – Reducing people-park conflict and HWC grievances through equitable coexistence management systems – making human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable.

**SDG 15: Life on Land** – Project promotes the protection of Tsavo ecosystem.

**SDG 16: Promote just, peaceful, and inclusive societies** – Reduction of people-park management conflict through equitable management will promote peaceful and inclusive societies.

**KWS Strategic Plan 2019-2024:**

The project is aligned with this strategy, which names mitigation of HWC as one of KWS’ six priorities in this strategic planning period, where it falls under “Strengthening Institutional Capacity” as well as “Strengthen relationships with stakeholders and partners to support conservation and reduce HWC”.

**National Wildlife Strategy 2030:**

Goal 2 “*Enhance species protection and management to ensure healthier, more resilient wildlife communities and populations*”. The project aligns with Goal 2 actions to reverse the negative impacts of HWC through developing innovative approaches to offset costs of living alongside wildlife, reduce HWC, and promote coexistence.

**5. Gender equality and social inclusion**

Kenyan society is traditionally patriarchal, with men holding primary decision-making roles. However, women play a crucial role as socio-economic actors in communities such as Mang’etele and Kamungi, which are predominantly Kamba tribes where both men and women engage in agricultural livelihood activities. Unfortunately, these communities face limited income sources and weak financial security, with only 10% of the local population employed, with 70% of the jobs involving manual labour and taken by men.

The female Chief of Mang’etele has emphasized that while women participate in decision-making processes, they face limited income-generating opportunities that could be improved. Despite being a predominantly male organization, KWS does have female rangers and officers. Although the number of female participants has been low, we have had female KWS staff participate in project activities. ZSL actively encourages female participation in project activities and requests that KWS ensure their female staff attend and actively participate in all project activities and workshops. During the attitudinal surveys, 5 out of 36 participants were female, while the Trust Building Workshop had 6 out of 33 female participants. Going forward, we aim to engage a higher proportion of women and marginalised groups to ensure their voices are heard and taken into account when designing capacity building trainings.

<p>Please quantify the proportion of women on the Project Board<sup>1</sup>.</p>	<p>The project board is predominantly made up of women. The ZSL Country Manager is a woman, as is our Community Manager who is working on the project at 50%. The Country Manager is supported by another female manager at ZSL HQ. The CAK board has three males (33%) and six females (67%).</p>
<p>Please quantify the proportion of project partners that are led by women, or which have a senior leadership team consisting of at least 50% women<sup>2</sup>.</p>	<p>The project lead from KWS on the education component at KWS is female.</p>

<sup>1</sup> A Project Board has overall authority for the project, is accountable for its success or failure, and supports the senior project manager to successfully deliver the project.

<sup>2</sup> Partners that have formal governance role in the project, and a formal relationship with the project that may involve staff costs and/or budget management responsibilities.

	<p>URSA is led by a woman. There is also a woman that is supporting in CAK; however, the lead is male.</p> <p>Our main partners KWS is largely male as it is a security-based wildlife management and we do not have control over how many women are rangers or in positions at KWS.</p> <p>At the management level, CAK has one male (50%) and one female (50%) member of staff. We shall advise on the future gender balance after a project officer to support on this project is recruited soon.</p>
--	--

## 6. Monitoring and evaluation

ZSL is overseeing the M&E and progress of the project using the logframe and implementation table. The team regularly have meetings to follow up on progress and ensure that we are collecting baseline data, we have monthly calls, emails and meetings between the Kenya and the UK team, and regularly with project partners. Within the first half of the project, sub-grant agreements were drawn up with project NGO partners which included schedules of work and timeframes to ensure activities are implemented in a timely manner. The project lead also has monthly meetings with partner CAK to ensure the project is on track. Our Field Manager also meets with KWS in Tsavo on a bi-monthly basis.

The project's M&E has been designed by the project management team. Progress has been overseen by the project team and is tracked via existing annual planning tools, bi-annual and annual reports. To show that Output and Activities contribute to the Outcome, we will undertake some baselines and compare data across the project years. As a lot of this work is based around qualitative data and attitudes. Perceptions we will use attitudinal surveys. ZSL carries out most of the M&E work, but partners such as Tsavo Trust and KWS also contribute significantly through monitoring wildlife crime in the target area (snares collected, arrests, illegal killing of wildlife) as well as HWC in Kamungi (the community which Tsavo Trust has worked with since 2014). This information is shared through monthly reports, but also through using our 'indicator tracker'. Tsavo Trust is also sharing raw data to upload to our SMART database on HWC. KWS has struggled to collect data from Mang'elele over the past year due to a dispute between the two stakeholders alluded to earlier in the report. The relationship has improved over recent months, but it has made data collection on illegal killing of wildlife and HWC difficult to obtain for Mang'elele. We hope this will improve over year 2. The data we do have from year 1 on illegal activity is sensitive; the reports and data from Tsavo Trust and KWS reports should be treated as confidential.

The implementation of human-wildlife conflict (HWC) mitigation strategies in the second year of the project will be subject to monitoring and evaluation by both ZSL community teams and CAK. Progress of implementation and effectiveness of interventions will be reported on a monthly basis. Baseline data has been collected by ZSL where feasible, with a focus on qualitative data obtained through interviews and group discussions to capture attitudes and perceptions. Work activities have been monitored primarily through activity reports, meeting agendas and minutes, and follow-up actions. CAK has provided support in this regard. As for monitoring HWC incidents, KWS and Tsavo Trust, are relied upon for data collection and analysis.

As this project is centred on establishing trust among all stakeholders involved in wildlife conservation, with the goal of promoting effective conservation efforts. As part of this initiative, participants in workshops, meetings, and training sessions are encouraged to speak freely and openly about potentially sensitive topics. Therefore, the sharing of reports, data, and discussions must be handled with sensitivity and discretion to maintain the trust of all parties involved.



## **7. Lessons learnt**

Several lessons have been learnt over the past year as we work to strengthen the capacity of stakeholders in Tsavo.

There was a serious HWC incident on 1 March 2023 in which an elephant killed a community member in Ilikoni, one of the villages within a 5-kilometer range of the TWNP boundary. Tensions have risen on the ground because the community is very upset and KWS has faced criticism for not doing more to prevent HWC. Because of this, it is even more crucial that we work with all stakeholders to ensure HWC are dealt with in an equitable and sensitive manner going forward. However, as a result, we had to delay the scheduled activities to allow the community time to grieve and process the event before re-engaging. We will continue working with KWS to establish trust, but the trust-building workshop scheduled for Y1 Q4 to be held with communities has been postponed until Year 2 until tensions have reduced and the community feels safe and ready to engage in this activity. This has impacted our project budget as the expenditure related to the activities has been moved from March 2023 to the next financial year. This change request was submitted in March 2023 and approved (Annex 15).

In addition, 2022 saw an extreme drought that put excessive pressures in the field and combined with a fuel crisis, fieldwork was unable to be carried out for parts of the year. Consequently, certain activities have been postponed to next year. Our activities for Q4 were also going to be determined by the competency assessments, that happened later than planned – and as a result we did not have enough time to prepare targeted trainings and workshops. We therefore have moved these to Year 2, giving us time to analyze the assessments and form targeted interventions. A change request was submitted for this and approved (See Annex 14 and Annex 15).

Furthermore, there have been some staff changes in the project year. The ZSL Project Manager went on maternity leave earlier than expected and as a result there was a gap in project management with no opportunity for a handover. Consequently, the management of the project has fallen under the Country Manager who joined ZSL in November 2022.

Lastly, if we were to design this project differently, given our learnings and current understanding, we would perhaps allow more time to work on some of the best practice guidelines and build more time for working with KWS. As KWS is an extension of the government, the national elections in 2022 brought about change of personnel in senior positions. As a result, a lot of decision making was put on hold making it harder to organise meetings with KWS. ZSL has since had to spend more time building new relationships and bringing the new KWS staff on board and up to speed with our work in TWNP.

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

N/A

## **9. Risk Management**

With increasing inflation and the decline of the Kenyan shilling, the exchange rate has increased, which meant we needed additional funds above what was budgeted to cover increasing costs. The project is trying to maximise outputs with the current funds by amalgamating compatible workshops and partnering with organisations to be as effective as possible. For example, in Year 2 we hope to conduct a training and workshop around a Code of Conduct exercise to develop a Code of Conduct for KWS rangers in TWNP to inform the best practice guidelines. We are in discussion with WWF to upscale this work and ensure that the project work in Tsavo feeds into and is embedded in the higher-level discussions that WWF are having at a National Level with KWS to ensure Code of Conduct is embedded into KWS' wider framework on ranger training and SOPs. We also hoping WWF can contribute to some additional workshop costs that will be needed to ensure this does happen.

Please see Annex 18 for an updated project Risk Register.

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

N/A

## **11. Sustainability and legacy**

The profile of the project has been raised with KWS at a national and regional level and has also been raised with communities and other stakeholders working on conservation and HWC in the Tsavo area, through the HWC mitigation workshop. Our Partners CAK have also been profiling this project in their networks and to other partners.

Sharing of project processes and progress has also been disseminated on social media (Twitter and Instagram). We have tweeted 5 times about the project and will aim to increase this 10-fold as we proceed with the project next year. Our most recent tweets made 938 impressions and had 58 engagements. The reason there has been low engagement is due to staffing gaps at ZSL and we are aiming to pick this up in the next project period now we have a full team in place.

As a result of the project, international Best Practice Standards for managing HWC will be promoted to KWS, and the learnings will be shared with URSA to inform its Code of Conduct for rangers. We are also in discussion with WWF who are working with KWS HQ to ensure these best practices and Code of conduct have uptake nationally. This will ensure these can be taken up at all KWS parks and are embedded in the national framework. There will also be learning assessment feedback throughout the project, which will help inform the Best Practice Standards. This will be supported by the training plan and learning assessment that will be developed within this project and will be provided to KWS to deliver internal training. Additionally, key KWS staff will go through a training-of-trainers course to be able to deliver future training. The Best Practice Standards will be made available for KWS staff outside of Tsavo and the project's approach to HWC will also be promulgated across Kenya by CAK. KWS staff will be invited to join the community of practice where they can consult other HWC experts on how to deal with conflict situations after the lifetime of the project. This approach will allow KWS staff to have the capacity and capability to deliver equitable human-wildlife coexistence management within Tsavo West and throughout Kenya beyond the lifetime of the project. The project will work with URSA and feed into its Code of Conduct (and vice versa) making recommendations for ranger policies and training. CAK will continue to lead the consortium meetings in Tsavo and work together to plan conservation and HWC mitigation activities.

The MTWH initiated the development of the first national human-wildlife coexistence strategy and action plan. CAK convened a virtual meeting with the consultant and shared valuable input from this project with the consultant. The projected activities are aligned with the national strategy and action plan. In a nutshell, the project is implementing activities outlined in the action plan, and we shall be reporting the outcomes at the next high-level meeting between KWS and the Ministry. CAK provided further input during the validation workshop, based on this project, and the strategy and action plan are at its final stages.

## **12. Darwin Initiative identity**

We have used the Darwin Initiative logo in all presentations and workshop materials. We reached out to the British High Commission in Kenya and have spoken with them about the project (Annex 6). The Ambassador also visited the project site.

The Darwin Initiative C&C project has been recognised as a distinct project with a clear identity and is pivotal in developing the framework around HWC in Kenya and the Code of Conduct with rangers. There are broader discussions going on with KWS and WWF, which ZSL has been involved in and this project is very timely in that it will be used as a case study for a PA for KWS and how to roll it out across other PAs.

ZSL has 8 social media channels covering the major social platforms (Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, YouTube) with 17 accounts in total, including a dedicated 'ZSL Africa' Twitter account. Via their online presence, ZSL has a total reach of 64.9 million (Facebook) with 4 million unique users to the ZSL website per annum. @ZSLConservation has over 24,000 followers on Twitter, which regularly features Africa-specific posts on ZSL's overseas conservation work, complemented by @ZSLAfrica, which posts about ZSL's Africa conservation work around 10 times per month and has 1,384 followers. We use this extensive social media reach to

publicise our donors’ support (including Darwin). All social media posts reporting on project activities credit the donors responsible (whereby DEFRA/Darwin Initiative and the UK Government are recognised, and logos added to images where possible) or via the use of a hashtag (following guidelines presented at LTS’ grantee workshop in 2019). In addition to crediting donors on social media, each ZSL Africa country programme has a page on the ZSL Conservation website. On this page, all donors are listed next to the project they support. ZSL’s external communications to its Fellows, Members, and supporters list DEFRA Darwin Initiative as a key supporter of our Conservation and Policy work.

As Darwin are currently the sole donor for the community work in this landscape, they are recognised as the sole supporter of the project currently. If further funds are secured, DEFRA will continue to be recognised as a key contributor to the activities for which they are responsible. All reports and training materials produced from the project so far have featured the Darwin Initiative logo or credited Darwin Initiative in the narrative. ZSL keeps the British High Commission in Kenya informed on project progress (both formally and informally) and the BHC in-country social media account is also tagged to raise the profile of the fund’s work to those at a national level. However, ZSL also exercises caution on communications around sensitive activities (like arrests and illegal wildlife crime etc.) and publication of information or pictures that could endanger some people, is closely monitored, limiting ZSL’s capacity to publish publicly on law enforcement issues.

**13. Safeguarding**

Has your Safeguarding Policy been updated in the past 12 months?	No
Have any concerns been investigated in the past 12 months	No
Does your project have a Safeguarding focal point?	<p>Yes - Moses Wekesa (ZSL Kenya Field Manager) and Fridah Mutili (ZSL Kenya Community Manager)</p> <p>ZSL has a safeguarding Policy (annex 19). The project has also an updated Risk Register (annex 18). ZSL has rigorous in-house safeguarding protocols and policies, binding on all partners. ZSL trains all project staff in safeguarding, GDPR and ZSL’s Global Code of Conduct. Through locally-relevant grievance and feedback mechanisms – (already established here and open to all project participants, partners, and stakeholders), the project has existing mechanisms for project affected peoples to raise concerns, provide feedback and report safeguarding issues. Gender, Equality, and Social Inclusion (GESI) is mainstreamed into the project approach, ensuring the inclusion of marginalised groups. This includes the implementation of participatory stakeholder engagement and Free, Prior and Informed Consent. Regular checks ensure guidelines and processes are adhered to and the grievance mechanism is constantly reviewed.</p>
Has the focal point attended any formal training in the last 12 months?	Yes - internal ZSL training on safeguarding in November 2022.
What proportion (and number) of project staff have received formal training on Safeguarding?	Past: 46% [6/13] Planned: 54% [remaining 7/13]

Has there been any lessons learnt or challenges on Safeguarding in the past 12 months? Please ensure no sensitive data is included within responses.

It is critical to prioritize FPIC before any project activities take place. This approach helps to build trust with communities, ensures that their rights and interests are respected, and fosters a sense of ownership and partnership in the project. We have found that taking the time to engage in a meaningful consultation process with communities has been key to achieving successful outcomes. We recognize the importance of creating safe spaces for people to feel confident in sharing their views. This has required careful consideration and planning to ensure that community members feel comfortable and safe in engaging with us. Through the engagement process, we have learned that it is essential to establish relationships based on trust and respect, to listen actively to KWS/community members' concerns, and to provide clear and transparent communication throughout the project's lifespan. Overall, we have learned that effective community engagement requires ongoing commitment, sensitivity, and adaptability to respond to changing circumstances and community needs. Through the engagement process, we have gained valuable insights and understanding of the communities we work with and the importance of creating meaningful partnerships to achieve sustainable outcomes.

Does the project have any developments or activities planned around Safeguarding in the coming 12 months? If so please specify.

In the next year the project will be working with KWS to go through the Code of Conduct with rangers and support KWS on safeguarding issues and supporting them with best practice guidelines on ranger code of conduct and safeguarding.

#### 14. Project expenditure

**Table 1: Project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2022 – 31 March 2023)**

Project spend (indicative) since last Annual Report	2022/23 Grant (£)	2022/23 Total Darwin Initiative Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)				
Consultancy costs				
Overhead Costs				
Travel and subsistence				
Operating Costs				
Capital items (see below)				
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)				
Others (see below)				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£73,073</b>	<b>£73,073</b>		

**Table 2: Project mobilising of matched funding during the reporting period (1 April 2022 – 31 March 2023)**

	Matched funding secured to date	Total matched funding expected by end of project
Matched funding leveraged by the partners to deliver the project.		
Total additional finance mobilised by new activities		

building on evidence, best practices and project (£)		
--	--	--

**15. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements or progress of your project so far (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes**

- N/A

## Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Indicators of Success for Financial Year 2022-2023

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2022 - March 2023	Actions required/planned for next period
<p><b>Outcome</b></p> <p>KWS Tsavo reduce people-park conflict and human-wildlife conflict grievances through implementation of equitable human-wildlife coexistence management, aligned with and supported by international best-practice, and enabled through an engaged civil-society network.</p>	<p>0.1 25% increase in favourable attitude to protected areas among community members by end of Y2.</p> <p>0.2 30% reduction in extent of HWC grievances and KWS's management of HWC among community members by end of Y2.</p> <p>0.3 30% increase in favourable attitude to community members among KWS staff in Tsavo by end of Y2.</p> <p>0.4 Improvement in perceptions of female and minority groups voices being heard in PA management decision making by end of Y2.</p> <p>0.5 National KWS and at least 50% of Kenyan conservation actors in Tsavo express interest in support to adopt/expand the package of measures end of Y2.</p>	<p>0.1 <i>The project has established a baseline for this indicator, from attitudinal surveys undertaken with community members. <b>Baseline:</b> 0.87 (results from a Likert scale, where 1 is "Strongly Disagree" and 5 is "Strongly Agree", which has been converted to a score between 0 and 1).</i></p> <p>0.2 <i>This project has gained an increased understanding on the attitudes towards HWC both from KWS and the communities. The project has established a baseline for this indicator based on attitudinal surveys undertaken with community members. <b>Baseline:</b> <u>Kamunji:</u> 100% of respondents from the survey experienced HWC. <u>Mang'elete:</u> 67% of respondents experienced HWC. Across both communities there was an average of 48.9% of crops lost; and 56.4% of livestock lost (perception-based impact assessment).</i></p> <p>0.3 <i>The project has established a baseline for this indicator through attitudinal surveys carried out with KWS rangers and senior wardens. <b>Baseline:</b> 0.642l.</i></p> <p>0.4 <i>The project will conduct the baseline in Y2Q1.</i></p>	<p>0.1 <i>Endline attitudinal surveys will be undertaken in Y2 with community members for comparison against the baseline.</i></p> <p>0.2 <i>Endline attitudinal surveys will be undertaken in Y2 with community members for comparison against the baseline.</i></p> <p>0.3 <i>Endline surveys will be conducted with KWS staff for comparison against the baseline.</i></p> <p>0.4 <i>The project will conduct a perception of female and youth survey in Y2Q1. An endline survey will be conducted in Y2Q4.</i></p> <p>0.5 <i>The project will conduct a project impact workshop, facilitated by partner CAK, in Y2Q34 during which this indicator will be measured.</i></p>

		<p><i>0.5 This will be measured in Y2. However, already the project has seen a keen interest from KWS and Kenyan conservation actors in supporting the project and HWC mitigation strategies.</i></p>	
<p><b>Output 1.</b> Structured gap assessment of KWS community-focused training materials and practices, utilising the IUCN HWC Task Force Guidelines, IIED's SAGE Tool and a capacity assessment, informs the development of Best Practice Standards.</p>	<p>1.1 Structured assessment process agreed by KWS and communities by Y1Q2.</p> <p>1.2 Recommended Best Practice Standards developed by Y1Q3.</p> <p>1.3 Participatory assessment of KWS Tsavo community practices and training materials in relation to HWCx, including findings and Best Practice Standards, agreed by stakeholders and submitted to KWS by Y1Q3.</p> <p>1.4 Participatory project impact report of progress against gap assessment submitted to KWS by Y2Q4.</p>	<p><i>1.1 Competency assessment undertaken. Evidence Annex 11. However, the structured assessment process agreed by both KWS, and communities was delayed as per section 3 and change request Annex 15. To be completed in YR2.</i></p> <p><i>1.2 As Above</i></p> <p><i>1.3 Partly done. See competency assessment of KWS on HWC and other competencies. Best Practice guidelines will be drafted in Y2. SAGE governance tool feeding into this (see annex 10 for SAGE results)</i></p> <p><i>1.4 This indicator is scheduled for Y2.</i></p>	
Activity 1.1 Hold an inception meeting with KWS to set objectives and plan.	Inception meeting conducted to launch project. See Annex 8 & 9.  1 breakfast meeting held with KWS and stakeholders to set objectives and plans.	N/A	
Activity 1.2: Set up of project processes including FPIC, stakeholder mapping, socialising the feedback mechanisms etc.	Project processes for FPIC, stakeholder mapping and feedback mechanism set up.	Continuous monitoring of processes will take place and will be reviewed and amended if necessary.	
Activity 1.3: Use IIED SAGE governance tool to understand and assess equity in protected area conservation.	SAGE governance tool was implemented in Y1 Q3.	N/A	
Activity 1.4: Review KWS community training materials with IUCN HWC task force guidelines.	Review of training materials found that no Training materials existed at KWS.	Develop draft training materials with KWS.	

		Discussions around training required started in Q1.	
Activity 1.5: Conduct a capacity needs assessment to identify knowledge gaps among KWS officers on community centred HWC mitigation.		Capacity needs assessment was conducted in Y1 Q3.	Review this in Y2 to follow up on a plan to address the gaps key to HWC mitigation.
Activity 1.6: Hold a community consultation and conduct community attitude surveys towards KWS and wildlife.		ZSL have held community consultation meetings, and community members were invited to the project launch. Surveys were conducted with communities where attitudes were captured.	Repeat this survey in YR2 to compare with baseline data.
Activity 1.7: Hold a consultative meeting and present findings of the needs assessment and draft of the best practice standards to get input and buy-in from KWS.		This meeting was conducted, and results shared and discussed with KWS	Follow up on drafting best practice guidelines in YR2
Activity 1.8: Design training plan and materials and assessment for learning.		Started and to be completed in next period	Development of training sessions and materials to be completed in YR2
Activity 1.9: Develop and propose Best Practice Standards for piloting based on the capacity assessment and gap analysis.		Gap Analysis conducted	Best Practice Standards to be developed in Year 2
<b>Output 2.</b> KWS staff implement Best Practice Standards in community engagement and equitable governance for HWC prevention and mitigation.	2.1 Piloting of Best Practice Standards is agreed for trial implementation in Tsavo by Y1Q3. 2.2 50 front-line KWS Tsavo officers demonstrate ability to implement Best Practice Standards (30 from security, animal control, intelligence, and investigations departments, 20 from community wildlife service department), by Y2Q4. 2.3 10 KWS Tsavo senior officials demonstrate situational judgement to determine appropriate implementation of piloted Best Practice Standards (Assistant Director level), by Y2Q4.	2.1 Started drafting this however activity was delayed as per Annex 15 2.2 Not relevant in this period 2.3 Not relevant for this period	Best Practice guidelines developed in YR2 and completed with input from partners and stakeholders. 2.2 Roll out Best Practice guidelines with 50 front-line KWS staff. 2.3 Work with the AD and Tsavo senior officials to implement.



	<p>2.4 Previously identified human resource developmental needs identified in the gap assessment, have been met by Y2Q2.</p> <p>2.5 Gender Sensitive and Equitable human-wildlife coexistence techniques deployed in Tsavo by end of Y2.</p>	<p>2.4 Not relevant for this period</p> <p>2.5 Not relevant for this period</p>	<p>2.4 Trainings identified in the gap assessment conducted.</p> <p>To be completed in YR2</p>
Activity 2.1. Conduct training sessions targeting different capacity building aspects identified in the gap assessment including 20 people to be trained as trainers.		Due to the delays outlined in the project training sessions will be done in the next period.	Training sessions to be conducted including 20 people to undergo ToT.
Activity 2.2: Design and implementation of trust building workshops between KWS, community reps and other relevant stakeholders to improve relationships.		Conducted in Q4 of YR1 by a consultant with KWS officers and rangers.	Follow up on key findings and recommendations from the workshop and use it to steer activities in YR2 on Code of Conduct etc
Activity 2.3: ZSL to deliver training in situation analysis and de-escalation; facilitation; poverty and biodiversity conservation, personal safety and gender equity and social inclusion training.		Not relevant for this period	To be completed in YR2
Activity 2.4: Equip KWS with participatory learning and action research skills as well as integrate citizen science to develop effective approaches for HWC Prevention and mitigation resulting in better sensitivities to community challenges in regard to HWC.		Not relevant for this period	To be completed in YR2
Activity 2.5: KWS to lead and facilitate two quarterly stakeholder meetings that include community members, relevant NGOs and private sector putting into practice the skills learnt in the Project.		Not relevant for this period	To be completed in YR2
Activity 2.6: A Joint KWS-Community mentorship and advisory group formalised consisting of a senior member of KWS Community Wildlife Service staff, Ministry of Wildlife, CAK and a respected community member with support from ZSL's international best practice network, the group provides ongoing advice to KWS staff.		Not relevant for this period	To be completed in YR2
Activity 2.7: Conduct an exchange visit to learn from promising practice in community centred HWC mitigation strategies.		Not relevant for this period	To be completed in YR2
Activity 2.8: Incorporate learnings into Best Practice Standards developed and promote to KWS for integration into KWS ranger training.		Not relevant for this period	To be completed in YR2

<p><b>Output 3.</b></p> <p>Equitable HWC governance plans, detailing decision-making processes and allocations of responsibilities which ensure the inclusion of community and stakeholders' voices in the planning and implementation of all HWC interventions.</p>	<p>3.1 Agreements on good governance principles approved by KWS, key stakeholders and community members by Y1Q4.</p> <p>3.2 Two multi-stakeholder meetings (including community members) are convened, led and facilitated by KWS staff by Y2Q2 with project support.</p> <p>3.3 HWC multi-stakeholder governance plans developed by Y2Q3.</p> <p>3.4 Relations and communications between KWS, communities and multi-stakeholders in Tsavo improve by Y2Q3.</p>	<p>Started discussions during the HWC stakeholder meetings, however this is not relevant for this period</p>	<p>To be completed in YR2</p>
<p>Activity 3.1: CAK and Project staff lead quarterly stakeholder meetings to formalise consortium with key stakeholders, agree good governance principles and synergise activities.</p>	<p>Continued throughout project period.</p>	<p>Quarterly stakeholder meetings will be continued throughout project period.</p>	
<p>Activity 3.2: Support KWS to lead quarterly stakeholder meetings (consortium) to build partnerships and plan conservation and HWC mitigation activities.</p>	<p>Started in Q4 during the HWC stakeholder workshop</p>	<p>To be continued in YR2</p>	
<p>Activity 3.3: HWC governance plans to be developed, led by KWS with multi-stakeholder consortium and community input.</p>	<p>Discussion started during the HWC stakeholder workshop, however not relevant for this period and will be finalised in YR2</p>	<p>Meetings to follow up on drafting governance plans in YR2</p>	
<p><b>Output 4.</b></p> <p>Piloted and updated Best Practice Standards and package of equitable human-wildlife coexistence management techniques recommended to national KWS and conservation stakeholders for adoption and shared as a case study with IUCN HWC Task Force.</p>	<p>4.1 Senior representatives from National KWS and Kenyan conservation stakeholders attend Tsavo-based knowledge exchange workshop with community participation by Y2Q4.</p> <p>4.2 Impact report presented key findings disseminated at high profile conferences in Kenya and the region by Y2Q4 (Africa Protected Area Congress, Annual</p>	<p>Not relevant for this period</p>	<p>To be completed in YR2</p>

	<p>Kenyan Wildlife Conservation Congress, CITES and CBD Convention).</p> <p>4.3 Impact report submitted to IUCN HWC Task Force and Universal Ranger Support Alliance (URSA) by Y2Q4.</p>		
Activity 4.1: Knowledge exchange exposure visit to Tsavo with HQ KWS staff and conservation actors.		Not relevant for this period	To be completed in YR2
Activity 4.2: Impact report detailing key findings and policy recommendations developed and presented at key conferences (African Park Congress convened by IUCN/ Annual Wildlife conservation congress convened by the MOTW and CAK, CITES and CBD convention).		Not relevant for this period	To be completed in YR2
Activity 4.3: Impact report disseminated to IUCN HWC Task Force and URSA.		Not relevant for this period	To be completed in YR2

## Annex 2: Project’s full current Indicators of Success as presented in the application form (unless changes have been agreed)

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p><b>Impact:</b> Kenya's biodiversity is sustainably conserved for the long-term through effective and equitable governance, which ensures strong local support for conservation, and enables future Human-Wildlife and Protected Area conflicts to be resolved.</p>			
<p><b>Outcome:</b> KWS Tsavo reduce people-park conflict and human-wildlife conflict grievances through implementation of equitable human-wildlife coexistence management, aligned with and supported by international best-practice, and enabled through an engaged civil-society network.</p>	<p>0.1 25% increase in favourable attitude to protected areas among community members by end of Y2.</p> <p>0.2 30% reduction in extent of HWC grievances and KWS's management of HWC among community members by end of Y2.</p> <p>0.3 30% increase in favourable attitude to community members among KWS staff in Tsavo by end of Y2.</p> <p>0.4 Improvement in perceptions of female and minority groups voices being heard in PA management decision making by end of Y2.</p> <p>0.5 National KWS and at least 50% of Kenyan conservation actors in Tsavo express interest in support to adopt/expand the package of measures end of Y2.</p>	<p>0.1 ZSL's Conservation Attitude Index, from baseline and endline community surveys (Likert scale 1 - 5, quantified for percentage calculation).</p> <p>0.2 ZSL's HWC Index, focused on grievances to HWC and KWS's management of HWC, from baseline and endline community surveys (Likert scale 1 - 5, quantified for percentage calculation).</p> <p>0.3 Anonymised KWS attitude survey, baseline and endline (Likert scale 1 - 5, quantified for percentage calculation).</p> <p>0.4 Qualitative baseline and endline Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions with KWS and Community groups.</p> <p>0.5 Reports and communications from project impact workshop facilitated by Conservation Alliance Kenya.</p>	<p>National KWS engagement with the project's pilot work in and around Tsavo lays the groundwork for nationwide adoption of equitable human-wildlife coexistence management.</p> <p>Improved governance decreases conflict around negative human-wildlife interactions and improves people-PA relations with benefits for biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>Improved outcomes for conservation from equitable and participatory approaches to working with communities in Tsavo increases the appetite for further protected area governance amendments – laying the groundwork for equitable protected area governance nationwide and resulting benefits for biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>Ease and access to grievance mechanisms stays equal.</p> <p>KWS, communities, and all other stakeholders are receptive to use of IUCN HWC Guidelines and best practice recommendations.</p>

<p><b>Output 1</b></p> <p>Structured gap assessment of KWS community-focused training materials and practices, utilising the IUCN HWC Task Force Guidelines, IIED's SAGE Tool and a capacity assessment, informs the development of Best Practice Standards.</p>	<p>1.5 Structured assessment process agreed by KWS and communities by Y1Q2.</p> <p>1.6 Recommended Best Practice Standards developed by Y1Q3.</p> <p>1.7 Participatory assessment of KWS Tsavo community practices and training materials in relation to HWCx, including findings and Best Practice Standards, agreed by stakeholders and submitted to KWS by Y1Q3.</p> <p>1.8 Participatory project impact report of progress against gap assessment submitted to KWS by Y2Q4.</p>	<p>1.1 Structured Assessment plan; reports from KWS and community meetings.</p> <p>1.2 Best Practice Standards.</p> <p>1.3 Participatory assessment submitted to KWS Tsavo.</p> <p>1.4 Participatory project impact report of progress against gap assessment submitted to KWS.</p>	<p>KWS have requested support from ZSL to improve the approach to and practice of HWC management in Tsavo, as such we assume they will continue to be open to ZSL's recommendations including the structured gap assessments proposed, and to taking the necessary steps to fill identified gaps.</p>
<p><b>Output 2</b></p> <p>KWS staff implement Best Practice Standards in community engagement and equitable governance for HWC prevention and mitigation.</p>	<p>2.6 Piloting of Best Practice Standards is agreed for trial implementation in Tsavo by Y1Q3.</p> <p>2.7 50 front-line KWS Tsavo officers demonstrate ability to implement Best Practice Standards (30 from security, animal control, intelligence, and investigations departments, 20 from community wildlife service department), by Y2Q4.</p> <p>2.8 10 KWS Tsavo senior officials demonstrate situational judgement to determine appropriate implementation of piloted Best Practice Standards (Assistant Director level), by Y2Q4.</p> <p>2.9 Previously identified human resource developmental needs identified in the gap assessment, have been met by Y2Q2.</p> <p>2.10 Gender Sensitive and Equitable human-wildlife coexistence techniques deployed in Tsavo by end of Y2.</p>	<p>2.1 KWS Tsavo documents detailing conditions of pilot of Best Practice Standards.</p> <p>2.2 Training assessments conducted by experts.</p> <p>2.3 Situation Judgement Assessments conducted by experts.</p> <p>2.4 Community feedback; mentor assessments; summative assessments post follow-up training.</p> <p>2.5 Reports from joint KWS and Community Teams on GESI Sensitive programming.</p>	<p>Capacity to implement equitable human-wildlife coexistence practices, when supported by on the job mentoring, is the key gap in KWS current practice. With this capacity provided the project will see improvements in outcomes.</p>
<p><b>Output 3</b></p> <p>Equitable HWC governance plans, detailing decision-making processes and allocations</p>	<p>3.5 Agreements on good governance principles approved by KWS, key</p>	<p>3.1 Stakeholder meeting minutes, summary document of good governance principles.</p>	<p>Communities and stakeholders are willing and able to engage together to discuss matters. Community representation is</p>

<p>of responsibilities which ensure the inclusion of community and stakeholders' voices in the planning and implementation of all HWC interventions.</p>	<p>stakeholders and community members by Y1Q4.</p> <p>3.6 Two multi-stakeholder meetings (including community members) are convened, led and facilitated by KWS staff by Y2Q2 with project support.</p> <p>3.7 HWC multi-stakeholder governance plans developed by Y2Q3.</p> <p>3.8 Relations and communications between KWS, communities and multi-stakeholders in Tsavo improve by Y2Q3.</p>	<p>3.2 Meeting agenda and minutes, feedback report on the stakeholder meetings.</p> <p>3.3 Signed governance plans.</p> <p>3.4 Community attitude survey report.</p>	<p>representative of all affected and marginalised groups.</p> <p>Sufficient ability for KWS staff to make decision on governance processes, including, if necessary, approval from senior National or Regional KWS staff.</p>
<p><b>Output 4</b></p> <p>Piloted and updated Best Practice Standards and package of equitable human-wildlife coexistence management techniques recommended to national KWS and conservation stakeholders for adoption and shared as a case study with IUCN HWC Task Force.</p>	<p>4.4 Senior representatives from National KWS and Kenyan conservation stakeholders attend Tsavo-based knowledge exchange workshop with community participation by Y2Q4.</p> <p>4.5 Impact report presented key findings disseminated at high profile conferences in Kenya and the region by Y2Q4 (Africa Protected Area Congress, Annual Kenyan Wildlife Conservation Congress, CITES and CBD Convention).</p> <p>4.6 Impact report submitted to IUCN HWC Task Force and Universal Ranger Support Alliance (URSA) by Y2Q4.</p>	<p>4.1 Knowledge exchange workshop minutes.</p> <p>4.2 Impact report.</p> <p>4.3 Impact report dissemination summary (with feedback if received).</p>	<p>KWS 2030 Wildlife Strategy's commitments on equitable human wildlife coexistence (Strategic Objective 2, Initiative 6 in particular) provide a basis on which the package developed under this project can be recommended. KWS have already welcomed support from ZSL to achieve these objectives.</p> <p>CAK's involvement as a partner will lay the groundwork for adoption by Kenyan conservation stakeholders, and for alignment in working practices.</p>
<p><b>Activities</b></p> <p>0.1 Project initiation phase</p> <p>1.1 Hold an inception meeting with KWS to set objectives and plan.</p> <p>1.2 Set up of project processes including FPIC, stakeholder mapping, socialising the feedback mechanisms etc.</p> <p>1.3 Use IIED SAGE governance tool to understand and assess equity in protected area conservation.</p> <p>1.4 Review KWS community training materials with IUCN HWC task force guidelines.</p> <p>1.5 Conduct a capacity needs assessment to identify knowledge gaps among KWS officers on community centred HWC mitigation.</p> <p>1.6 Hold a community consultation and conduct community attitude surveys towards KWS and wildlife.</p> <p>1.7 Hold a consultative meeting and present findings of the needs assessment and draft of the best practice standards to get input and buy-in from KWS.</p> <p>1.8 Design training plan and materials and assessment for learning.</p> <p>1.9 Develop and propose Best Practice Standards for piloting based on the capacity assessment and gap analysis.</p>			

- 2.1 Conduct training sessions targeting different capacity building aspects identified in the gap assessment including 20 people to be trained as trainers.
- 2.2 Design and implementation of trust building workshops between KWS, community reps and other relevant stakeholders to improve relationships.
- 2.3 ZSL to deliver training in situation analysis and de-escalation; facilitation; poverty and biodiversity conservation, personal safety and gender equity and social inclusion training.
- 2.4 Equip KWS with participatory learning and action research skills as well as integrate citizen science to develop effective approaches for HWC Prevention and mitigation resulting in better sensitivities to community challenges in regard to HWC.
- 2.5 KWS to lead and facilitate two quarterly stakeholder meetings that include community members, relevant NGOs and private sector putting into practice the skills learnt in the Project.
- 2.6 A Joint KWS-Community mentorship and advisory group formalised consisting of a senior member of KWS Community Wildlife Service staff, Ministry of Wildlife, CAK and a respected community member with support from ZSL's international best practice network, the group provides ongoing advice to KWS staff.
- 2.7 Conduct an exchange visit to learn from promising practice in community centred HWC mitigation strategies.
- 2.8 Incorporate learnings into Best Practice Standards developed and promote to KWS for integration into KWS ranger training.
- 3.1 CAK and Project staff lead quarterly stakeholder meetings to formalise consortium with key stakeholders, agree good governance principles and synergise activities.
- 3.2 Support KWS to lead quarterly stakeholder meetings (consortium) to build partnerships and plan conservation and HWC mitigation activities.
- 3.3 HWC governance plans to be developed, led by KWS with multi-stakeholder consortium and community input.
- 4.1 Knowledge exchange exposure visit to Tsavo with HQ KWS staff and conservation actors.
- 4.2 Impact report detailing key findings and policy recommendations developed and presented at key conferences (African Park Congress convened by IUCN/ Annual Wildlife conservation congress convened by the MOTW and CAK, CITES and CBD convention).
- 4.3 Impact report disseminated to IUCN HWC Task Force and URSA.

### **Important Assumptions**

1. Improved governance decreases conflict around negative human-wildlife interactions and improves people-PA relations, benefitting biodiversity conservation.
2. KWS and local communities are willing and able to work together to improve HWC governance and management.
3. Communities and stakeholders are willing and able to engage together to discuss matters. Community representation is representative of all affected and marginalised groups.
4. Capacity to implement equitable HWCx practices is the key gap in KWS current practice. Providing this capacity, the project will see improvements in outcomes.
5. CAKs involvement will lay groundwork for adoption by Kenyan conservation stakeholders, and alignment in working practices.

## Annex 3: Standard Indicators

**Table 1 Project Standard Indicators**

As this was an existing project that started before the Standard Indicators were developed, we have only included relevant indicators in the table below. However, we will review our indicators against the Standard Indicators going forward and hope to report against more by the end of Year 2.

DI Indicator number	Name of indicator using original wording	Name of Indicator after adjusting wording to align with DI Standard Indicators	Units	Disaggregation	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
D1-A01	Number of people from key national and local stakeholders completing structured and relevant training	Number of officials from KWS who received training on Trust Building	People	6 Female and 27 male	33	n/q	n/a	33	TBC
D1-A01	Number of best practice guides and knowledge products published and endorsed	Best practice guidelines produced on HWC	Guides	n/a	0	1	n/a	n/a	n/a

**Table 2 Publications**

N/A



## Checklist for submission

	Check
Different reporting templates have different questions, and it is important you use the correct one. Have you checked you have used the <b>correct template</b> (checking fund, type of report (i.e. Annual or Final), and year) and <b>deleted the blue guidance text</b> before submission?	
<b>Is the report less than 10MB?</b> If so, please email to <a href="mailto:BCF-Reports@niras.com">BCF-Reports@niras.com</a> putting the project number in the Subject line.	
<b>Is your report more than 10MB?</b> If so, please discuss with <a href="mailto:BCF-Reports@niras.com">BCF-Reports@niras.com</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 should not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	
<b>Do you have hard copies of material you need to submit with the report?</b> If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number. However, we would expect that most material will now be electronic.	
If you are submitting photos for publicity purposes, do these meet the outlined requirements (see section 15)?	
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	Y
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	