

## CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Lubombo Conservancy
<b>Project Title:</b>	Program for the Ecosystem Management of the Swaziland Lubombo
<b>Date of Report:</b>	November 17, 2015
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Rod de Vletter, ecolubombo@gmail.com

**CEPF Region:** Maputaland – Pondoland - Albany

**Strategic Direction:** 1. Strengthen protection in 3 priority KBAs

**Grant Amount:** \$269,960.00

**Project Dates:** July 2012 – September 2015

**Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):**

**COSPE (Development Cooperation for Emerging Economies –Italy).**

COSPE is an NGO with a long history in Swaziland, especially in the Lubombo Region, and has supported Shewula Mountain Camp and Nature Reserve (a member of the Lubombo Conservancy). COSPE became a formal partner for the implementation of the Eco Lubombo Program (ELP), which is the work program for the Lubombo Conservancy (LC). The main source of funding for the ELP was through the CEPF PEMSL. An MOU was signed between the LC and COSPE for a subgrant agreement whereby COSPE undertook to implement certain activities on behalf of the LC. COSPE also provided invaluable assistance through logistical and administrative support. The Eco Tourism officer for the ELP, was jointly funded by COSPE and the LC. A more detailed description of COSPE's participation and support to the project is given in the section dealing with Component 4.

**Swaziland National Trust Commission (SNTC)**

SNTC provided support through the engagement of the Lubombo Transfrontier Conservation Areas (LTFCA) coordinator. The LTFCA coordinator provided exceptional support to the engagement of local communities, especially in the face of numerous problems and issues related to local governance. He also provided excellent support in expanding the project into a regional one, through promoting the project to the LTFCA Trilateral Commission. The PM for the CEPF project, together with the LTFCA coordinator, represented the SNTC on all discussions relating to the development of the Lubombo Eco Trails initiative at the LTFCA level.

**GIZ**

GIZ provided support to the ELP in its first phase of the Transboundary Use and Protection of Natural Resources (TUPNR) program. The initial funding of Euro 50,000 supported a crossborder community tourism and conservation initiative between Mhlumeni and Goba (in Swaziland and Mozambique respectively), with the objective of developing the Eco Trails program at a transboundary level. This transborder approach was integrated into the Eco Lubombo Program and was instrumental in steering the project towards its formal approval as the formal tourism strategy for the LTFCA. Funding for TUPNR 2 (ZAR 5 million) has been granted to further develop the Lubombo Eco Trails (LET).

**Netherlands Government**

The Netherlands Government made a contribution of Euro 130,000 to help establish ecotourism accommodation in two communities in Swaziland, as well as to support smallholder agricultural activities in communities in Swaziland and Mozambique in the context of the LTFCA.

#### **Steve Hall Development Consultants**

This company did the detailed architectural designs for the Ecodge at Mhlumeni at about 25% cost as part of a partnership agreement with the Lubombo Conservancy to implement the ELP

#### **Space for Elephants Foundation (SEF)**

SEF provided logistical support and community liaison to the Lubombo Conservancy for expanding the Eco Trails into South Africa

#### **Kingsley Holgate Foundation (KHF)**

KHF was instrumental in publicizing the values of the Lubombo Mountains through an organized and well promoted expedition covering the Lubombo Landscape. This resulted in the validation of the Lubombo Eco Trails as an ecotourism destination of international value, through the participation of professional and world renowned mountain bikers and off-road specialists.

#### **Linda Loffler Biodiversity Specialist**

Linda Loffler is Swaziland's leading biodiversity specialist who participated in the biodiversity assessments and contributed substantially from her own resources.

#### **RMI Agrobusiness Consultants**

RMI was responsible for the community based Eco Business Plans (EBP), which they undertook at a substantial discount, as well as leveraging Euro 11,000 as a contribution to small holder agriculture projects for the Tikhuba community

#### **'Non Financial' Implementing Partners**

##### **'Lubombo Corridor' NGO Consortium**

A consortium of NGOs was formed to help implement the Eco Lubombo Program, with specific emphasis on the Lubombo Eco Trails. These NGOs are LUPA, VIDA, KUWUKA and CESVI in Mozambique, Space for Elephants Foundation in South Africa, and the Lubombo Conservancy and COSPE in Swaziland. The presence of this consortium was an important factor in gaining funding through GIZ, as it demonstrated the success of the project in initiating an improved level of stakeholder collaboration at the regional level. A workshop of the consortium was supported by SANBI through the CEPF.

#### **Peace Parks Foundation (PPF)**

PPF gave valuable support to the development of the Lubombo Eco Trails concept in terms of advocacy and project design

## **Conservation Impacts**

### ***Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.***

The ELP has a primary focus on establishing a participatory, community based landscape approach to the conservation and sustainable management of the Eastern Swaziland Lubombo (ESL) while developing economic opportunities through ecotourism. The methodology for this approach was defined in two approaches – Eco Business Planning and Eco Trails. These are two mutually reinforcing strategies, which integrate conservation management and tourism development.

The MPAH Ecosystem Profile identified the low level of investment in conservation in Swaziland in comparison to the rest of the region. To succeed in achieving any significant conservation success in the ESL, the development of partnerships and leveraging of additional funding was essential.

The implementation approach of the ELP to the conservation of the Eastern Swaziland Lubombo, as identified in the MPAH is being done through a systematic and participatory landscape and ecosystem approach at a broad scale, involving numerous stakeholders and partners, but with an emphasis on local communities. The ELP therefore supports the CEPF approach in the MPAH by focusing on a biological area – the Lubombo Landscape – and addresses conservation threats by implementing a partnership based landscape approach and ecotourism strategy.

The ELP further contributes to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile by initiating and promoting a transboundary approach to the Lubombo Landscape. The Lubombo Eco Trails (LET) has been adopted by

the Lubombo TFCA Trilateral Commission as its primary ecotourism strategy, and the LET has received GIZ-SADC funding for further implementation.

The Eco Business Planning process which is integral to the ELP, and forms the basis for sustainability of the LET, involves communities in a participatory process leading to a community owned approach to the identification of threats to biodiversity and to their ecosystems, leading to a strategic plan for improved natural resource management and the unlocking of investment opportunities based on natural assets.

The ELP has led to the strengthening of civil society groups within the MPAH through support to the Lubombo Conservancy, the formation of community trusts, the development of LET partnerships, the strengthening of collaboration within the LTFCAs structures, and the formation of the Mozambique NGO forum for the advancement of the LET in Mozambique.

***Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.***

The major impact of the project is the initiation of a long-term program for the Lubombo Transfrontier Conservation Area (LTFCAs), which represents a substantial part of the MPAH. Furthermore, it establishes a process for linking communities, private sector and civil society organisations to work in a transboundary framework. The driving principles of the long-term program, named Lubombo Eco Trails, are consistent with the objectives of the original CEPF project and the MPAH ecosystem profile.

At the local level, the engagement of communities through the participatory Eco Business Planning process has resulted in greatly improved relations between the Mhlumeni community and the neighboring Mlawula Nature Reserve. At the beginning of the project, Mhlumeni Community clearly conveyed to the project team its hostility towards SNTC and the neighboring Mlawula Nature Reserve. The poor relations between the park and the community were long standing and apparently irresolvable. The ELP process resulted in a remarkable change in attitude by the community. This was expressed in a recent meeting between the community representatives and the GIZ-SADC mission, which helped cement recognition of the EBP process as an appropriate methodology for community participation both for Swaziland and potentially at the regional level.

The EBP in Mhlumeni has resulted in a much deeper community wide commitment to the sustainable use of the natural resources, to the understanding and management of the ecosystems, and to the allocation of land for conservation and ecotourism. The detailed and participatory biodiversity surveys led to a much greater understanding of the biodiversity values of Mhlumeni and were instrumental in improving ownership and protection of the biodiversity by the community.

The initiation of the EBP in Tikhuba, which focused on ecosystem mapping and zonation, together with the detailed biodiversity survey has also had positive results indicated by the community's willingness to engage in conservation, ecotourism and ecosystem management activities. Two small-scale eco agricultural activities have been initiated with Tikhuba as part of the ELP.

In Mambane, engagement with the community has been problematical due to serious internal conflicts in the community. However, persistence on the part of the project team has resulted in the appointment of a new tourism committee, which has made rapid progress resulting in the allocation of land for ecotourism and the first steps towards the construction of a homestead stay.

The ELP has therefore not resulted in substantial conservation gains in the short term but has laid the foundation for a long term program with the potential to contribute significantly to the conservation of the Lubombo TFCA through community development, including improved decision-making processes for ecosystem management and commitment to the development of a landscape wide ecotourism product.

Other significant impacts are the establishment of partnerships around the development of the Eco Trails, the leveraging of substantial funding and commitment from governments, donors, private sector and NGOs.

**Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal):**

The project is designed to initiate an ecosystem management planning and implementation program for the Swaziland Lubombo. The long term perspective for achieving this goal is 10-15 years. The design uses the concept, principles and methodology advocated by the CBD and known as the Ecosystem Approach. The overall impact is that as a result of this program, the area presently known as Key Biodiversity Area 6 or the Eastern Swaziland Lubombo, will have been further defined and researched, mapped and zoned, and

various types of land management will be practiced according to a balance of conservation and developmental needs. The objective of strengthening ecosystem resilience through broad participation of civil society will have been met.

Specifically, the following long term impacts are expected:

1. A widely accepted and stakeholder owned participatory planning process for ecosystem management within a scientifically defined area.
2. An effective and self-sustaining institutional mechanism in place to implement and guide the formulation and implementation of IMPs.
3. Expansion of conservation area network including a mosaic of different types of protected areas in keeping with the new SNTC legislation.
4. Increased connectivity between key protected areas through conservation corridors.
5. A balance between conservation needs and sustainable use of biodiversity including sustainable land use in the production land.
6. Restoration of degraded land.
7. Improved livelihoods and benefits for local communities through increased benefits to communities through improved land use, and sustainable development activities.
8. Greatly reduced risk from disasters such as floods, drought and uncontrolled fires because of improved ecological infrastructure.
9. Improved governance for ecosystem management, including increased collaboration and coordination among natural resource agencies, and an improved policy environment for ecosystem management in the country.
10. Replication of the model in other important biodiversity areas in the country.
11. Increased funding for conservation and sustainable use enterprises.
12. The Swaziland Lubombo becomes an internationally recognized tourism destination.
13. The approximate area that will be added to the Conservancy in terms of improved management and production landscapes is 50,000 ha. This is a long term approach based on the objective of gazetted parts of the Lubombo Plateau as a Protected Landscape and Multiple Resource Management Area under the new SNTC legislation

### Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:

Planned Impact	Actual Progress
<p><b>1. A widely accepted and stakeholder owned participatory planning process for ecosystem management within a scientifically defined area</b></p>	<p>The Eco Business Planning (EBP) process has been piloted with relative success and will continue to be improved with further implementation. The planning process is recognized as having a strong participatory orientation, and has been recognized and accepted by the communities as well as a number of donors and NGOs. The success of the EBP at Mhlumeni was demonstrated during a meeting with the Mhlumeni Community and the GIZ-SADC mission recently, leading to the incorporation of the EBP into the formal LTFCA planning process.</p>
<p><b>2. An effective and self-sustaining institutional mechanism in place to implement and guide the formulation and implementation of IMPs.</b></p>	<p>This has not yet been achieved. The sustainability of the program will depend on the success of the Lubombo Eco Trails, which has been identified as potentially providing sufficient financial resources to sustain the Lubombo Conservancy and participating communities in Swaziland, and to support the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) of the Lubombo TFCA. The feasibility of the Eco Trails will be further investigated with GIZ funding. The sustainability of the Lubombo Conservancy is</p>

	<p>directly tied to the improvement of its tourism and conservation product and its ability to attract more visitors as well as donor interest.</p> <p>Only by visibly increasing its revenues, will the LC members be prepared to invest more in the implementation of an expansion program, rather than focusing on internal and individual management priorities.</p> <p>By benefiting local communities and integrating them into the conservancy, while promoting sustainable livelihoods, the LC will position itself for increased donor funding</p>
<p><b>3. Expansion of conservation area network including a mosaic of different types of protected areas in keeping with the new SNTC legislation</b></p>	<p>The landscape approach espoused by the ELP has been adopted by the SNTC in its USD 5 million Strengthening the National Protected Area System of Swaziland (SNPAS). The ELP has resulted in the formal expansion and consolidation of the sub-TFCAs within the LTFCA, so that the complete Eastern Swaziland Lubombo (ESP) has been incorporated into the LTFCA.</p>
<p><b>4. Increased connectivity between key protected areas through conservation corridors.</b></p>	<p>A conservation corridor has been created along the ESL as a result of the consolidation of the Mhlumeni-Goba sub TFCA and the Usuthu-Tembe-Futi sub TFCA. This now formally links Mhlumeni through to the Maputo Special Reserve and to the Ponta do Ouro Marine Reserve. The consolidated TFCA has been approved by the LTFCA Trilateral Commission, but further work is required to attain formal gazettelement under the new legislation of the SNTC (Protected Landscape and Multiple Resource Management Area)</p>
<p><b>5. A balance between conservation needs and sustainable use of biodiversity including sustainable land use in the production land.</b></p>	<p>The landscape approach espoused by the ELP promotes a diversity of sustainable livelihoods by identifying their viability in the context of the Eco Business Plan (EBP). The EBP primarily focuses on identifying and sustaining ecosystem services, and provides potential economic opportunities for sustaining them through conservation, tourism and agriculture.</p>
<p><b>6. Restoration of degraded land.</b></p>	<p>The zoning process as implemented by the EBP identifies and prioritizes areas for rehabilitation in the context of ecosystem services and economic opportunities through conservation or improved livestock management. As the zonation plans still need to go through formal approval processes, it is not possible to state the actual hectareage of land, which will be restored. This will happen in the second phase of the project. However, communities have committed to improved management and protection of important ecosystems within the community, relating to biodiversity and wetlands in particular, and to improved rangeland management</p>
<p><b>7. Improved livelihoods and benefits for local communities through increased benefits to communities through improved land use, and sustainable development activities.</b></p>	<p>The EBP process provides the initial platform for achievement of this output. Formal land zonation with management guidelines, definition of sustainable livelihood activities, and the presentation of the EBP to financing agencies, will lead to increased benefits for communities. The EBP will present specific projects prepared in the context of the specific criteria for identified donor funding, e.g. World Bank support Catalytic Fund, national</p>

	microfinance agencies, EU micro projects.
<b>8. Greatly reduced risk from disasters such as floods, drought and uncontrolled fires.</b>	The zonation plan as identified in the EBP identifies ecosystem services related to flood management, improved resilience to drought and fire management. The plan is developed in participation with the community and identifies means of community based implementation
<b>9. Improved governance for ecosystem management, including increased collaboration and coordination among natural resource agencies, and an improved policy environment for ecosystem management in the country.</b>	<p>Through the EBP steps are taken to ensure that the appropriate governance conditions are in place for an ecosystem management and community development process to take place. A community board of trustees is established in a transparent and democratic manner with the approval of the local authorities. As the business planning process continues, the governance structures continue to be reinforced and empowered through workshops and meetings focused on ecosystem management and sustainable use of natural resources.</p> <p>The EBP has also brought together a number of NRM agencies, at the government and non-government level, which have become partners and participants in the planning process.</p> <p>The EBP is still at a relatively nascent stage, and lessons learned at the pilot stage will be applied in the second phase of the project that will be supported through the GIZ-SADC TUPNR 2.</p> <p>Linkages will be made to the Chiefdom Development Plans (CDP) process that has been successfully applied in IFAD supported projects in the sugar belt. The CDPs and the EBPs are very similar in objectives and methodology. The CDPs have had a strong influence on the policy environment in Swaziland, and the integration of EBP and CDP will allow for a stronger ecosystem orientation</p>
<b>10. Replication of the model in other important biodiversity areas in the country or countries within the TFCA.</b>	The EBP model has been approved by the Lubombo Trilateral Commission, which means that it may be tested with modifications in the three countries within the LTFCA area
<b>11. Increased funding for conservation and sustainable use enterprises.</b>	The PEMSL quickly evolved into the Eco Lubombo Program (ELP), which attracted a number of partners and donors. Specifically, COSPE, GIZ and the Netherlands Government have made strong contributions. Further support may be forthcoming from UNDP-GEF and WB funds. A follow-up project using social grant funding through the WB is anticipated, as well as the GIZ second phase. Donor interest was stimulated by the marketability of the Eco Trails concept, its broad level landscape approach incorporating community level planning for improved ecosystem management, and the business planning process which develops a community owned sustainable platform for investment
<b>12. The Swaziland Lubombo becomes an internationally recognized tourism destination.</b>	The concept and initial marketing of the Lubombo Eco Trails has done much to enhance the awareness of the potential of the Lubombo Region as an adventure destination
<b>13. The approximate area that will be added to</b>	The ELP has provided a strong foundation for this

<p><b>the Conservancy in terms of improved management and production landscapes is 50,000 ha.</b></p>	<p>target to be achieved in the longer term, by providing the appropriate strategy, interest and commitment to the protection of the Eastern Swaziland Lubombo as a Protected Landscape. However, much will depend on the follow up phase supported by GIZ. The risk related to achieving this objective is the relative fragility of the LC as an NGO without long term financing, and its dependency on the GIZ project to successfully design a longer term and eminently bankable program</p>
---	---

**Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal):**

1. The establishment of the Lubombo Conservancy as a functioning NGO capable of leading the ecosystem management planning process and the development of community based Eco Business Plans
2. Awareness raising and capacity building in the communities of Mhlumeni and Tikhuba
3. A well-structured and participatory approach defined for the formulation of the Eco Business Plans, including phases and timeframes
4. Increased collaboration and coordination among natural resource managers, including government agencies, NGOs, private sector and local communities
5. Increased funding for the program
6. The approximate area that will be added to the Conservancy in terms of improved management and production landscapes is 2500 ha.
7. The initiation of an Eco Trails network in the Lubombo Mountains, including preliminary trail design and overnight facility in Mhlumeni community
8. Initial marketing of the Eco Trail project through social media and brochures
9. Integration of Eco Trails concept into the Lubombo TFCA as a cross border tourism product

**Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:**

Planned Impact	Actual Progress
<p><b>1. The establishment of the Lubombo Conservancy as a functioning NGO capable of leading the ecosystem management planning process and the development of community based Eco Business Plans</b></p>	<p>The Lubombo Conservancy has been formally established and has provided leadership in defining a practical Swazi based approach to ecosystem management and community based business planning. Although funding has been leveraged for implementation activities, there is still a shortfall for staff funding and this affects the LC as an effective agency in the longer term</p>
<p><b>2. Awareness raising and capacity building in the communities of Mhlumeni and Tikhuba</b></p>	<p>This basis of this has been successfully achieved through the business planning and will continue with further support from GIZ and UNDP-GEF</p>
<p><b>3. A well-structured and participatory approach defined for the formulation of the Eco Business Plans, including phases and timeframes</b></p>	<p>The EBP process has been defined through an operational manual, although this is still in draft form (attached).</p>
<p><b>4. Increased collaboration and coordination among natural resource managers, including government agencies, NGOs, private</b></p>	<p>A good level of collaboration has been achieved with all stakeholders and this will continue to be improved under the GIZ project, which supports transboundary</p>

<b>sector and local communities</b>	collaboration as a project component. A list of stakeholders is presented in the LET proposal submitted to GIZ SADC and is attached.
<b>5. Increased funding for the program</b>	Considerable funding has been leveraged but implementation will be affected by shortfalls in direct funding to the Lubombo Conservancy for administrative costs and staff salaries
<b>6. The approximate area that will be added to the Conservancy in terms of improved management and production landscapes is 2500 ha.</b>	The Mhlumeni and Tikhuba communities have identified potential conservation and ecotourism zones. Although these areas exceed the 2500 ha, there has been no formal conservation status given to these areas. This is expected to take place through the SNPAS project
<b>7. The initiation of an Eco Trails network in the Lubombo Mountains, including preliminary trail design and and overnight facility in Mhlumeni community</b>	The eco trail network has been initiated in Mhlumeni and Tikhuba though at a rudimentary stage in Tikhuba. The detailed designs will be done with GIZ funding under TUPNR 2. The design for the Mhlumeni Ec lodge, including site selection, site preparation and access road has been completed but the whole process unexpectedly delayed by the Land Management Board, which is required to give approval to the ec lodge construction. In the interim, a tented camp will be constructed which will not necessitate Land Management Board approval
<b>8. Initial marketing of the Eco Trail project through social media and brochures</b>	The Eco Trails has been marketed through brochures and through Swaziland’s official tourism magazine “Swaziland Discovery”, and through brochures for the Lubombo Eco Trails and separately for the Mhlumeni Eco Trails
<b>9. Integration of Eco Trails concept into the Lubombo TFCA as a cross border tourism product</b>	The Lubombo TFCA Trilateral Commission has approved the Eco Trails as the primary tourism strategy for the LTFCA. An Eco Trails proposal was submitted to SADC and GIZ and approved.

**Please provide the following information where relevant:**

**Hectares Protected:**

No area has been formally protected, but a significant area has been placed under the new consolidated Mhlumeni-Goba-Usuthu-Tembe-Futi TFCA, as well as commitments from communities for improved ecosystem management, and identification of recreational areas for ecotourism. The potential area for future protection under the new SNTC legislation is about 50 000 ha. This area is outlined in the attached map of the consolidated TFCA.

While community commitments are only given in terms of draft zonation, which are yet to be formalized, the draft zonation has nonetheless resulted in expressed commitments by the communities to the protection of areas of high biodiversity, water catchments and wetlands. In some cases specific biodiversity areas that have long been identified by government for protection, but which were continuing to be degraded by communities, have been now zoned for protection by the communities themselves (e.g. Jilobi Forest).

Formal conservation is anticipated under the second phase of the project

**Species Conserved:**

Improved protection of the threatened cycad species *Encephalartos Lebomboensis*. The detailed biodiversity surveys and ecosystem assessments have resulted in voluntary community measures to protect cycads which were being removed from their areas for sale. For example, cycad poachers have been identified and made to replant the stolen cycads. More formal measures of protection will be introduced as conservation areas are agreed within the zonation plans

**Corridors Created:**

See Map of Consolidated Mhlumeni-Goba sub TFCA and Usuthu-Tembe-Futi sub TFCA for an extension of the TFCA along the Lubombo Plateau, creating a potential conservation corridor. TAs previously stated the total area of the expanded TFCA is roughly 50,000 ha. Further studies will determine the conservation status of this area under the new Swaziland legislation, and how the conservation corridor will be implemented.

***Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.***

The main challenge for the project at the start was to establish credibility for the project concept. The context in which the project started needs to be understood to better grasp the challenges facing the project from its inception. The objectives of the PEMSL project (now known as ELP) were very ambitious, while capacity and resources in Swaziland for conservation were very constrained. In regard to the existing conservation paradigm, most of the major conservation stakeholders are very conservative and protectionist in approach with little interest or faith in community involvement. The exception to this at the institutional level is the Swaziland National Trust Commission (SNTC), which is more representative of mainstream global thinking in conservation. The project adopted a 'big picture' regional approach, as well as a progressive, inclusive and community-oriented orientation. This was generally received with considerable skepticism, but with the support from the donors –CEPF, GIZ and Netherlands Government, as well as COSPE, the project concept gained credibility. The engagement of influential players, such as Kingsley Holgate, was also a key factor.

***Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?***

The extent to which the project became adopted at the LTFCA level and by the LTFCA Trilateral Commission was unexpected, and led to the expansion of potential positive impacts. Much greater collaboration by TFCA stakeholders around a specific conservation and tourism strategy, with a much greater focus on local communities was an unexpected and positive impact of this project.

The Eco Business Planning process, which evolved by integrating aspects of the integrated management planning in Component 2, with aspects of enterprise development in Component 3, led to different impacts than originally anticipated. The EBP process takes longer and requires more resources to achieve the project objectives than anticipated under the original components. However, it is likely to be much more sustainable and has proven to achieve community buy-in and commitment. It is also proving to be a model that can be replicated at the TFCA level.

## **Project Components**

**Project Components:** *Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

**Component 1 Planned (as stated in the approved proposal):**

**Institutional Strengthening of the Lubombo Conservancy**

**PLANNED**

- Institutionalization of the LC as a Section 21 Company with new members etc. The LC will be transformed into an effective and well-resourced NGO that will act as a primary driver for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem management and sustainable tourism in the Swaziland Lubombo. The completion of the LC Business Plan will assist in determining the capacity requirements of the Conservancy and contribute to a modest
- Recruitment of PM; Creation and Training of Project Steering Committee (PSC) and Implementation Support Team (IST)

**Component 1 Actual at Completion:**

The Lubombo Conservancy (LC) was legally gazetted as a not for profit company and as an NGO. The Lubombo Conservancy has been transformed from a non-performing informal organization to a formal NGO driving an innovative and integrated community focused, conservation and tourism initiative in the Lubombo TFCA.

From the start the LC has taken a Lubombo wide landscape approach, developing appropriate partnerships and strategies. It has surpassed its target in terms of spatial influence by being the primary driver for this approach at the regional level. The LC was pivotal in shaping the Integrated Development Planning (IDP) of the Usuthu-Tembe-Futi (UTF) sub TFCA, resulting in the consolidation of the Mhlumeni-Goba sub TFCA and the UTF sub TFCA into a single unit, greatly expanding the formal area of the LTFCA in Swaziland.

The strategies of the LC under the Eco Lubombo Program (ELP) were expanded to cover the entire LTFCA and consolidated into a project proposal by the LC and submitted to GIZ-SADC on behalf of the SNTC. This proposal, under the name of Lubombo Eco Trails (LET), was approved (only 3 out of 18 TFCAs were selected), which has resulted in the adoption of the LET as the primary ecotourism strategy for the LTFCA. The LC has been tasked with the elaboration of the LET for GIZ funding – the new proposal due in January 2016 for SADC approval.

The PSC was formed with the LC Directors, as well as the implementing partner, COSPE. The IST was substituted with a partnership framework, which supported project implementation, and drew on various forms of expertise from donors, NGOs and private sector (see implementation partners section)

### **Component 2 Planned (as stated in the approved proposal):**

#### **Integrated Management Planning**

This component was originally designed to formulate an IMP for the Lubombo Landscape with an accompanying Business Plan in two phases. The first phase would concentrate on the Lubombo Conservancy including Mambane Community (which had been targeted for incorporation into the Conservancy) and potential linking corridors and buffer zones; and the second the larger Lubombo Landscape. The IMP would be based on zonation and the accompanying business plans would look at sustainable business opportunities based on existing natural assets.

As the project progressed, the project component was redesigned as **Community Based Eco Business Plans (EBPs)** to allow for much greater community participation in the planning process. This focuses on developing a practical and participatory approach to improved decision making and balancing conservation and development on community land based on participatory ecosystem services mapping and assessment and business planning. The target areas for the Plans were Mhlumeni and Tikhuba. The process would be piloted at Mhlumeni and the methodology developed into an Operational Manual. The process would then be replicated at Tikhuba

### **Component 2 Actual at Completion:**

#### **Integrated Management Planning revised to Community Based Eco Business Planning**

The EBP was piloted at Mhlumeni and a series of well-defined steps were outlined in a draft Operational Manual. The EBP process as defined in the draft Operational Manual focused on 1) establishing the appropriate governance framework in the community 2) a series of interactive educational seminars to raise awareness of natural resources and ecosystem assets and functions within the community; 3) participatory mapping to identify the key resources and management guidelines; 4) zonation plan; 5) detailed business plan outlining potential investment opportunities for the community based on natural resource potential (agricultural, touristic, etc.). The final step will be the identification of potential funding available through donors, banks and other sources and linking the investments to these sources. A very detailed and participatory process up to the final step has been completed for Mhlumeni and is in progress for Tikhuba. Mambane has been identified as the next beneficiary of this process.

The EBP was evaluated twice by GIZ; once during the evaluation of the TUPNR phase one and secondly during the preparation mission of TUPNR phase two. On both occasions the process was considered appropriate and valuable. The first formal evaluation described it as best practice. On the last occasion, the Mhlumeni community made it clear that they had moved from a community that was very negative about conservation and in conflict with the neighboring nature reserve, to a community that was positive about conservation and now working in partnership with the neighboring nature reserve.

In Mhlumeni community a building was refurbished and equipped for the Eco Business Planning exercise and will be used as an information center. Panels and posters are being prepared to detail the EBP process, and the facility will be used to host neighbouring communities to brief them on the EBP process and how it developed in Mhlumeni.

### **Component 3 Planned (as stated in the approved proposal):**

### **Community Based Enterprise Development**

This Component was originally formulated to focus on increasing the participation of local communities through the development of natural resource based projects and enterprises. The component was designed to build on existing initiatives, such as the GIZ supported Cross Border Community and Tourism Initiative between Mhlumeni in Swaziland and Goba in Mozambique. The component also had the objective of supporting community business plans.

As a result of considerable inputs from partners, particularly during the Kingsley Holgate Lubombo Expedition, this component was reformulated to focus on a clear enterprise strategy for all the Lubombo communities based on the concept of a Lubombo Eco Trails (LET) network. The rationale for this was that the Lubombo landscape held the potential to create a significant and comprehensive tourism product that would attract a wider market of tourists looking for a fully packaged product, and benefit all communities to a much larger degree than fragmented products at the individual community level. The LET was to provide the overall 'brand' for the Lubombo, create economies of scale as well as the product that would bring the stakeholders together under one vision. The development of the LET would strengthen the product by taking a regional perspective, leading to a product of international significance.

The project component was therefore restructured so that community enterprises would be focused on the LET, and that this would allow further opportunities for spin-offs and multiplier effects. The business planning process was integrated into Component 2, IMP, so that ecosystem and business planning would form one integrated process.

The concepts of the Lubombo Eco Trails (LET) was quickly accepted by the Lubombo stakeholders, including communities. The planning for this component then shifted to a Lubombo TFCA wide community based network of Eco Trails, beginning with accommodation and trails in the Lubombo Communities of Mhlumeni, Tikhuba and Mambane.

Marketing of the LET was also envisaged under this component.

### **Component 3 Actual at Completion:**

#### **Community Enterprise Development revised to Lubombo Eco Trails**

The LET was adopted by the Lubombo TFCA Integrated Development Plan (IDP) and presented to the Lubombo TFCA Trilateral Commission in December 2014, where it was approved as the primary ecotourism strategy for the LTFCA. It was subsequently presented as a concept to GIZ-SADC for funding under the second phase of the Transboundary Use and Protection of Natural Resources (TUPNR). Under this RFP all TFCAS (18 in number) in Southern Africa were requested to present proposals. The LET proposal was shortlisted and a more detailed project proposal was submitted and was approved. A mission comprised of GIZ, LTFCA and SADC officials visited Swaziland, Mozambique and South Africa in November 2015 to develop the next steps for project design. The task was given to the Project Manager, Lubombo Conservancy, to further define the scope of work, approach and TORs for the project for submission to SADC in January 2016 for approval.

In terms of physical achievements, the Mhlumeni Community has allocated land for an Ecolodge, which has been designed by a leading architect. The site and approach road has been prepared by the local community. A trail network has been designed and mapped, and an Mhlumeni Eco Trails brochure designed and printed. Four guides have been trained and equipped. The map and the brochure will be hosted on the Lubombo Conservancy and SNTC websites and trail activities are expected to start in January 2016.

The marketing of the Lubombo Eco Trails has commenced through brochure development, and advertising in the national tourism magazine, Discovery Swaziland.

### **Component 4 Planned (as stated in the approved proposal): Management of Sub-Grant to COSPE.**

#### **Administration:**

PLANNED strengthening and supervising the ELP administration office.

Training of the new LC administrator that will be shortly selected.

The capacity building foresees specific focus on both current administrations (accounting, cash and bank reconciliation; petty - cash administration; contracts, etc.) and national, CEPF and UE regulations and procedures.

### **Participatory mapping and spatial planning (1):**

- 1) Data collection and analysis.
- 2) Definition and elaboration of the participatory mapping methodology, the activities and the timeframe. ELP team training on appropriate procedures with regard to the surveys and participatory mapping activities.
- 3) DATABASE organization and implementation and creation of hard copies, electronic quality stock and catalogue.
- 4) Digitalization of the participatory maps elaborated by the communities
- 5) Support the experts providing them with GIS data and maps

**PLANNED**

Web research of geo-referenced data and check of their reliability and usefulness at community scale, existing projects collection and study, national and international stakeholder contacts (in coordination with PSC) to get spatial information about the project areas and to share and improve the participatory mapping methodology. Implementation of desktop studies to determine the field activities areas. Design, development, improvement of the field activities tools (maps, forms ...) and the participatory process materials (questionnaires for ES assessment, presentations, tables, maps, etc.). Revision of the meeting minutes. Photographic documentation of the activities. Creation of well-structured folders for both field and communities activities to keep all the materials collected and/or prepared during the participatory mapping process (hard copies and electronic catalogue). Organization and participation in field activities and during the agriculture assessment, rangeland assessment, biodiversity assessment, eco-trail design, support the experts providing them with GIS data and maps. Ongoing monitoring of the sub-results of the participatory mapping activities in order to improve the used tools and methodology.

During IMP and EBP design, support the experts supplying them with GIS data and maps. Support in the communication and dissemination of the participatory mapping results

**Participatory mapping and spatial planning (2)**

**PLANNED**

Replication of Mhlumeni Participatory Mapping (PM) process at Tikhuba.

Preliminary activities in Mambane & Shewula: environment and participatory mapping introduction

**Eco-business Plan implementation**

1) Implementation of the Eco-Trails in three target communities

2) Business Management, Marketing, and Production capacities will be improved for community groups (story teller, theatre, etc.) and farmers associations (Non Timber Forestry Producers; local varieties, etc.)

3) Support the realization and the implementation of the Eco-business Plan

**PLANNED**

Strengthen and support the community groups and farmers associations of the target areas on local and traditional resources management (local varieties of crops, harvesting, etc.), and on tourism activities (craft, theatre groups, etc.). Identification and selection of a Tourism expert

**Project Evaluation and Adaptation:**

Support the PSC and the PM in the elaboration of indicators, methodology and tools for the overall evaluation of the participatory mapping, field activities, GIS database, and communication/visibility components of the programme.

**PLANNED**

Improvement of the review reports related to the participatory mapping, field activities, GIS database, and communication/visibility. Support to local office running costs.

**Component 4 Actual at Completion:**

**Administration**

After the selection of the LC administrator, the COSPE country admin put in place a training on the job programme. The LC admin has been trained on current administration, donors regulations and procedures. COSPE also supported the LC administrator, providing an office space.

**Participatory mapping and spatial planning (1)**

- 1) Data collection and analysis.
- 2) Definition and elaboration of the participatory mapping methodology, the activities and the timeframe. ELP team training on appropriate procedures with regard to the surveys and participatory mapping activities.
- 3) DATABASE organization and implementation and creation of hard copies, electronic quality stock and catalogue.
- 4) Digitalization of the participatory maps elaborated by the communities
- 5) Support the experts providing them with GIS data and maps

#### **ACTUAL AT COMPLETION**

Data and geographical analysis have been collected and desktop studies made to prepare the work on the ground. The team has prepared the material for the different exercises and it is accessible in hard copies and in an electronic catalogue. The maps worked out by the community have been digitalized by the GIS expert and shared with the partners, as well with the EBP Consultant. The GIS specialist supported the field work of the LC Consultants (biodiversity assessment, rangeland assessment, agricultural assessment) An assessment of the sub-results of the participatory mapping activities has been recorded as well.

#### **Participatory mapping and spatial planning (2)**

##### **ACTUAL AT COMPLETION**

The PM process has been replicated in Tikhuba, the zoning of the different community areas is being discussed. A socioeconomic assessment and a stakeholder mapping were developed. The community has been involved in the PM, through community meetings, field visits and workshops. In Mambane and Shewula a total of 5 community meetings have been hold, in order to raise awareness about the PM process and to strengthen the capacities of the two new created Community Trustees.

#### **Eco-business Plan implementation**

##### **ACTUAL AT COMPLETION**

A Tourism Expert has been identified and contracted by COSPE. The Eco-Trails have been implemented in two communities with the local guides (Mhlumeni and Tikhuba). The trails were mapped, cleaned and signed. Business Management, Marketing and Production improved for farmers associations in the Lubombo Plateaux, with specific attention to the promotion of local varieties of legumes. A storage facilities centre has been constructed in Tikhuba, with the objective of collecting, processing and marketing local products. The staff supported the Consultant into the production of the EBP The eco-tourism component and the community enterprises are functioning.

#### **Project Evaluation and Adaptation:**

##### **ACTUAL AT COMPLETION**

The methodology and the activities related to the Participatory Mapping in Mhlumeni have been recorded into a final document/manual. This has also to be considered as an assessment of the process' stages, the challenges and the lessons learnt. A first brochure of the EcoTrails in Mhlumeni has been printed and distributed, as well as a first brochure on the whole network of the EcoTrails, connecting conservation areas and communities of the Lubombo Plateaux. The EcoTrails have been advertised on Swaziland Discovery 2015 and 2016, the Swaziland's official tourist guide.

#### **Component 5 Planned (as stated in the approved proposal):**

Compliance with World Bank safeguards on environmental impact and procedures on health and safety

#### **Component 5 Actual at Completion:**

No construction was implemented during project implementation, so safeguard issues were not required. During project implementation, draft safeguard guidelines for community tourism and small holder agriculture were submitted to Swaziland government for review and approved for further stakeholder discussion. The guidelines were also submitted to GIZ for use under the second phase of the Transboundary Use and Protection of Natural Resources program, TUPNR 2.

[Empty box]

***Were any components unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?***

The original component 4 was focused on a partnership based research, monitoring and evaluation process. The partner NGO did not participate as expected as the focus of the project shifted away from direct conservation inputs to more participatory planning at community level, together with the emphasis on the Lubombo Eco Trails. The project therefore took a longer term perspective, with less tangible and immediate conservation goals that would lend itself to focused species based research, monitoring and evaluation. The responsibility for the M and E was shifted more towards the new NGO partner COSPE, which has detailed M&E reporting based on the participatory planning with communities.

Mid way through the project, GIZ did a detailed evaluation of the EBP process in Mhlumeni and this made a valuable contribution to the future design of the project, as well as to establish the EBP as a best practice in terms of participatory planning

***Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.***

The following submissions are attached to this document: 1) the draft Operational Manual for Eco Business Planning, PPT presentation on the Mhlumeni Participatory Mapping of Ecosystem Services, which summarizes the methodology used for this process and the detailed (but still incomplete) COSPE report of the process; 2) the map of the Lubombo Transfrontier Conservation Area, specifically detailing the consolidation of the Mhlumeni-Goba and Usuthu-Tembe-Futi sub TFCAs and the formal definition of the potential conservation corridor along the Lubombo Plateau; 3) maps of Eco Trails and related communities in Mozambique; 4) marketing brochures for the Lubombo Eco Trails and the Mhlumeni Eco Trails.

**Lessons Learned**

***Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.***

The lessons learned from the project will be categorized according to the project components

1. Institutional strengthening of the Lubombo Conservancy. Swaziland may be in a unique situation because of its small size. There is no apparent interest in the donor community to support a conservation NGO in Swaziland. A number of donors and NGOs were approached, and the lack of support apparently relates to the perception that the country does not support significantly large areas of global conservation value. From the partner NGO perspective, this means that Swaziland has very little leveraging power, making initial investments risky. The funding from the CEPF, as it was related to a regional (MPAH) initiative, allowed for a different perspective to come into play, which opened up funding for the Lubombo Conservancy. The lesson learned here was that for the Conservancy to survive in future, it needed to continue to be a presence at the regional level, and the Lubombo TFCA was the appropriate space for it to operate. The LC strategy of developing a regional Lubombo Eco Trails, based on the assets of the Lubombo TFCA, rather than just the Swaziland assets, gives the Conservancy some chance of leveraging future funding and surviving into the future. Under the GIZ project, the LC is also proposing to become the first Transborder Conservancy, and to twin with Peace Parks Foundation, to support this objective. Without raising its profile from a national level NGO to a regional level NGO, the Lubombo Conservancy will likely not achieve the level of interest required from the international donor community. Furthermore, the LC adopts a landscape approach, which integrates many aspects of rural development into a more formal ecosystem management process. The small-scale nature of Swaziland conservation is likely to continue to constrain the development of new conservation NGOs in the country: a strong orientation towards rural development and eco-agriculture within a landscape approach is potentially the best option for overcoming this challenge.

2. Community Based Eco Business Plans. This process was very time consuming, but it was decided from the start to take the necessary time. A similar process in Swaziland in the sugar belt was also being simultaneously implemented (Chiefdom Development Plans, CDP) under IFAD funding and implemented by a strong organization (SWADE – or Swaziland Water and Agriculture Development Enterprise). Discussions

with the SWADE team underlined the importance of the participatory planning process as the basis for any form of community development in Swaziland. The CDPs sometimes took years to develop at great expense, but it was still felt that without this process no sustainable progress could be made in the communities. The ELP was carefully designed to develop community ownership taking into consideration the local and national governance structures. The step-by-step process has proven successful, and the main lessons learned from this process are: 1) The importance of being able to approach the communities with a clearly defined process which explains roles and responsibilities and intended outcomes; 2) Ensuring adequate buy-in, understanding and support from the community at the start of the process; 3) Ensuring that the community structures participating and implementing the process are democratically defined and supported by the majority; 4) Sticking to the criteria for completion of each defined step; 5) Fully engaging the community facilitators and community members throughout the process and ensuring their full understanding through questionnaires and other means. A list of technical recommendations relating to the Participatory Mapping and Planning Process can be found in the attached report by COSPE of the process.

3. **Lubombo Eco Trails.** This process was educational in that lessons were learned and absorbed from a number of different role players and stakeholders who became involved as the product was developed. While the concept of consolidating the conservation and tourism assets of the Lubombo to create an international destination was part of the project concept, not enough consideration was given to the actual product in itself, its brand and its marketability. Fortunately, a number of different 'adventure specialists' become involved and the overall concept of the Lubombo Eco Trails took root. The potential of the Lubombo as a whole was investigated and the strength of the product was felt to be adequate to provide sustainability for a significant number of communities in the Lubombo. The lessons from a number of community tourism ventures in the region were incorporated into the new project concept specifically those relating to business planning, including access to markets, economies of scale, ownership and capacity development. The LET provides a good mechanism for addressing these issues in a comprehensive way. Without the broad regional approach underpinning the LET, the component could easily have failed in its original form.

***Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)***

The project took an adaptive management approach and applied it throughout. The CEPF was very flexible in accepting project design changes in the components, as it understood that the adaptation was made to better achieve the project objectives. The major changes were in components 2 and 3, which are described in detail in the components 'planned and actual at completion' section. The ability to adapt to new findings forms the basis of the projects success. The project preparation process is often based on speculation and subject to time constraints. Reality sets in during project implementation. Rigidity in project implementation, especially in the complex and dynamic world of community conservation and ecotourism, creates a greater possibility of failure. This is a lesson that conservation donors need to better understand.

***Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)***

Critical to the success of the project was the partnership with an experienced NGO, COSPE, the development of partnerships, and the buy-in of the governments participating in the Lubombo TFCA. Of concern is the continued weakness of the Lubombo Conservancy as an NGO. It is the only true conservation NGO in Swaziland and represents an ideal way forward for Swaziland conservation, bringing together conservation stakeholders from the private sector, government, communities and NGOs. As such it needs to be recognized and supported. However, as the project comes to an end, its future existence remains uncertain, despite the obvious successes of the Conservancy during the duration of the CEPF project. It has to be considered a major shortcoming that no significant funding has been granted directly to the Conservancy to ensure its continuity, despite the grant funding that is available for conservation in the country. This situation still needs to be analysed and investigated.

***Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:***

Lessons learned have been described in the above sections

## Additional Funding

**Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of the CEPF investment in this project.**

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
GIZ Phase 1	Grant (B)	Euro 50,000	Funding for a transborder community conservation and tourism initiative; only Euro 25,000 spent and remaining 25,000 shifted to second phase
GIZ Phase 2	Grant (C)	ZAR 5 million	Funding allocated for LTFCA and leveraged through ELP; preparation of second phase project responsibility of ELP project manager, for submission in mid January 2016
COSPE	Grant (A)	USD 62,000	COSPE contribution to the sub-agreements supporting the ELP
Netherlands Government	Grant (B)	Euro 130,000	Funding leveraged through ELP and implemented with support of COSPE; covers community tourism and small holder agriculture
RMI	Grant (B)	Euro 11,000	Funding for small holder agriculture
UNDP GEF	Grant (B)	USD 1.4 million (tentative)	Presently being negotiated through MOU;

**\*Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project.)*
- C** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

## Sustainability/Replicability

**Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.**

In the original project concept, sustainability was to be achieved through the implementation of the landscape or ecosystem approach, and developing an integrated conservation and tourism product that would enhance the long-term sustainability of the Lubombo Conservancy by becoming part of an international destination. While the objectives of both these strategies are still far from being achieved, significant progress has been made to improving the overall sustainability of the Lubombo Conservancy, the ecosystems and biodiversity of the Lubombo landscape and the communities residing in it.

**Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.**

The expansion of the project to encompass the Lubombo TFCA further increases the possibility of sustainability by strengthening the product and opening the project to new sources of financing. The success of the EBP process gives it credibility for replication not only within the Lubombo, but also as the basis for community planning and participation in the Lubombo TFCA, which in turn can be replicated in other TFCAs.

## Safeguard Policy Assessment

*Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.*

**No safeguard issues were raised in this project**

## Additional Comments/Recommendations

The project manager was involved in the design of the World Bank funded Swaziland Private Sector Competitiveness Project (SPSCP) which has allocated a \$6 million grant facility (Catalytic Fund) with specific focus on community tourism and small holder agriculture. The funding criteria is consistent with the projects emanating from the Eco Business Plans and it is anticipated that a significant amount of this funding can be accessed for the Eco Trails, and associated multiplier activities in agriculture and other natural resource based activities. Furthermore, the positive response that the ELP received from the WB team, may result in the preparation of a new WB project using social grant funding, and focused on community ecotourism.

The project manager would like to commend the CEPF for the enlightened approach to funding conservation projects, which allowed for a high level of flexibility while maintaining project objectives and without losing high standards of accountability.

The CEPF and the Wildlands Conservation Trust, together with SANBI, were extremely supportive and responsive throughout the implementation process. From the perspective of the Lubombo Conservancy, the program was a great success, initiating an innovative and long-term process for conservation and community based tourism in the Lubombo TFCA.

## Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

**Please include your full contact details below:**

Name: Rod de Vletter  
Organization name: The Lubombo Conservancy  
Mailing address: P/Bag Mhlume  
Tel: +268 7602 3670  
Fax:  
E-mail: [ecolubombo@gmail.com](mailto:ecolubombo@gmail.com)

**\*\*\*If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages\*\*\***

**Performance Tracking Report Addendum**

**CEPF Global Targets**

**(Enter Grant Term)**

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.  
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

<b>Project Results</b>	<b>Is this question relevant?</b>	<b>If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.</b>	<b>Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.</b>	<b>Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2013 to May 30, 2014. (Attach annexes if necessary)</b>
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	x			Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	x			Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.			50,000	
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.				

**If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table**

**Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities**

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics							Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit													
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased Income due to:				Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance.	Other
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services									
Mhlumeni	X	X					X						X	X						X	
Tikhuba	X	X					X						X	X						X	
<b>Total</b>																					
If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit:																					

