

Small Grants – Project Completion and Impact Report

Instructions to grantees: please complete all fields, and respond to all questions listed below.

Organization Legal Name	<i>Wildlife and Environmental Conservation Society of Zambia</i>
Project Title	Interim conservation and forest management in Mafinga Hills priority KBA of Zambia
Grant Number	S19-10-ZAM
Date of Report	30 th November 2019

CEPF Hotspot: Mafinga hills KBA 144, Zambia

Strategic Direction: 1 Mainstream biodiversity into wider development policies, plans and projects to deliver the co-benefits of biodiversity conservation, improved local livelihoods and economic development in priority corridors.

Grant Amount: 16,214

Project Dates: 1st February 2019 – 30th October 2019

PART I: Overview

1. Implementation Partners for this Project (*list each partner and explain how they were involved in the project*)

Name of Stakeholder/Partner	Type of stakeholder	Involvement in project proposal development	Proposed involvement in project implementation
1. Chief Mwenichifungwe and Chief Mweniwisi	Traditional Leadership	Provided information about villages living astride the Mafinga hills and granted authority to meet those directly affected by the project	Helped to mobilize community members
2. Senior Headman Damasca, Headman Mariko and Kayisoleli and community tree nursery group members	Local community members	Provided input into the best management activities to protect the reforested riparian buffer zone	Participated in making fire breaks, weeding, managing the apiary and installing markers at Mafinga Hills National Forest Reserve nr. 296
3. Mafinga Forestry Department	Government agency	Provided input into the best management practice for improved honey yields	Guided community members on fire breaks, weeding, apiary management and forest marking. The department's involvement was largely technical support.
4. Mafinga Agriculture Department	Government Agency	Provided information on community approaches for engaging the farming community	Helped in making fire breaks, weeding, managing the apiary and installing markers at the forest reserve. The department also monitored the implementation of the process framework.

2. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

Three (3) beacons were marked in May 2019 to make a total of 6 beacons marked: 3 in 2018 and 3 in May 2019. The reserve has 10 beacon points in total. WECSZ in July 2019 requested CEPF to extend the project so that it would be able to complete marking all the 10 beacons. An addendum to extend the project was approved. The team did their best to reach all the beacons but it became clear that the scope (about 14,500 hectares) and the rugged terrain of the mountain posed a challenge for the team to cover the envisaged area in the 6 days that they were in the field. A total of 7 beacons have so far been established with concrete beacons and 132 markers installed in-between the beacons.

A fire break was established around the 14 hectares of reforested area in Damasca Village. The fire occurrence baseline study that we conducted in 2018 revealed that the fires in both the montane area and the riparian buffer were not caused by natural factors. The fires were mainly caused by local people setting fire to the grass for different reasons. Some of these reasons included a need for green flush for grazing cattle, clearing the areas close to their homes to drive away reptiles (snakes) and mammals (genets) that would harm their livestock (mainly chickens). Interestingly, the fires occurring at over 1500m ASL were evidently not coming from the ones lit at the foot of the mountain. These fires were lit right on top. It was not very clear why the people would lit fire in that area, but it would seem likely that they did so to flush out mammals for hunting. In the reconnaissance report that Timberlake et al (2018:21) authored, it was observed that "frequent fires seem to have reduced available standing plant biomass across the grasslands which may have caused, especially in the quartzite areas, a loss of humus and soil leading to more exposed rock and much more rapid runoff." This scenario was also true of the area flanking the Luangwa river as it flows down from the mountain. This evidently reduced the integrity and value of the area as a catchment for the upper Luangwa River, as there is more rapid run-off and lesser storage capacity. We (Gift, Kunda and group leaders of the nursery groups) did conduct a post firebreak establishment fire occurrence survey on 29 and 30 October 2019. The surveys were concentrated in Damasca and Mweniwisi areas where the trees had been planted. Although we did not have any technological tools to measure the extent of the fires, we did observe that the 14 hectares in Damasca village were less affected by fires. On the other hand, the trees in Mweniwisi, where no firebreaks were done in 2019, had been scorched. Fanshawe (1971) observed that there will always be fires in the montane grasslands and the forest is rapidly being degraded and encroached upon. Our observations in 2019 agree with this earlier work. Fires seem to be increasing around the landscape but firebreaks and weeding the native trees that were replanted contributes greatly to their survival.

Further, 10 new beehives (wooden) were established by 30 April 2019. This brought the number to 15 wooden KTB hives, that is five (5) which were built in 2018 to establish whether the metallic hives were the reason for bees absconding the hives plus the ten (10) that were established in April 2019. By 30 October 2019, all the 15 hives were colonized. As reported in the May 2019 report, 5 beehives would be harvested between May and June.

A contract was signed with the Zambia governance foundation in August 2019 for a community mobilization grant. The grant is aimed at sensitization communities living around the Luangwa river headwaters on the value, threats and solutions to threats to the Luangwa river. WECSZ had also requested the Department of Agriculture to fund an upscaling of the livelihood and community sensitization components of WECSZ's conservation and forest management project.

The department signed an agreement to pledge their intention of adopting the said components amounting to over US\$55,000. The components would be embedded in a project called Strengthening climate resilience of agricultural livelihoods in Agro-Ecological Regions I and II in Zambia (SCRALA). However, it became clear, after the project was launched in March 2019, that the department had changed their position. They informed WECSZ that the project approach had changed to focus more on small livestock for livelihood. The community sensitizations were also deferred to a later time that was not disclosed to WECSZ.

3. Briefly describe actual progress towards each planned long-term and short-term impact (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each long-term impact from your proposal

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

Impact Description	Impact Summary
Improved management of the Mafinga Hills Forest Reserve, an area of 15,500 hectares	WECSZ has extensively been engaging the Forestry Department (FD) in ensuring that there is an improved management of the Mafinga Hills national forest reserve. WECSZ, with support from CEPF has been able to provide resources (fuel and transportation) which have enabled the forestry department to conduct patrols around the Mafinga hills NFR. In 2019 the FD demonstrated its interest in managing the Mafinga hills NFR: Kennedy Banda, the District Forestry Officer at the time led an expedition to identify and mark 3 boundary beacons of the NFR in June. Using the authority accorded to him at the District Forest Officer (DFO), Kennedy also appointed 5 local community members who would act as community Forestry Volunteers. The work of the volunteers is to monitor activities at the NFR and report them to the department. In October 2019, the new Forest Ranger/Forest Range Guard, Ephraim Chimfwembe was part of another expedition to completing forestry marking in October.

4. Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal/logical framework)

List each Short-term impact and indicator from your logical framework, and describe what was achieved (also attach all means of verification to this report)

b.

Impact Description	Indicator	What was achieved (using indicator)
The Mafinga National Forest Reserve and its immediate surrounding areas are more sustainably managed for biodiversity conservation (compared to 2014)	Change in management practices within the area; changes in biodiversity status of the area (species, site); changes in management capacity of stakeholders (government, communities, civil society including WECSZ)	report: WECSZ has extensively been engaging the forestry department in ensuring that there is an improved management of the Mafinga Hills NFR. WECSZ with support from CEPF has been able to provide resources (fuel and transportation) which have enabled the forestry department to conduct patrols around the Mafinga hills NFR. The Mafinga district Forestry Department has in 2019 demonstrated its interest in managing the Mafinga hills NFR: Kennedy Banda, the District Forestry Officer led an expedition to identify and mark 3 boundary beacons of the NFR in June. Kennedy also appointed 5 local community members who would act as community Forestry Volunteers. The work of the volunteers is to monitor activities at the NFR and report them to the department. However, these Volunteers cannot perform all the forest duties such as apprehending offenders and issuing permits. The forest Act nr. 4 of 2015 section 6 provides for the

		appointment of any local person as an 'Honorary Forest Officer'. Such officers are given the same powers as the forest officers employed under civil service. However, the appointment follows a long process. WECSZ will, beyond this project, see to it that the volunteers at the Mafinga NFR are appointed as honorary forest officers. In October, the new Forest Ranger/Forest Range Guard, Epraim Chimfwembe was part of another expedition to completing forestry marking in October.

5. Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impacts

WECSZ worked in close collaboration with local communities, government agencies and CEPF’s Regional Implementation Team (RIT). The collaborations with RIT helped the project team to make needed adjustments for the project to remain practical and relevant to both biodiversity conservation and the developmental needs of the local people. A case in point is the number of trees that were to be earlier in the large grant project. Originally, the project had intended to plant 144,000 trees. When the RIT paid a monitoring visit to the project area, they advised that the number of trees be reduced. The project team decided to reduce number to 8,000 trees. This number was more practical given the project lifespan and available resources. Works hopes to continue consulting CEPF on future projects even with other conservation partners.

The endorsement of the Conservation and Mafinga Hills conservation programme by government ministries and agencies also provided a strong backing towards the implementation of the project activities. The project policy awareness activities had reached out the over 600 community members by October 2019. This impact from the policy awareness could be observed in the reduced farming activity along sensitive riparian zones and the community’s commitment towards the implementation of project activities that included rehabilitation of degraded portions of the riparian buffer areas that were previously farms for the local community, which were later offered for this purpose.

WECSZ collaborated with the Muchinga Provincial Forestry Office and the Mafinga District Forestry Office and the local community to identify and mark 7 beacons covering an area of about 13,000 hectares of the Mafinga hills National Forest Reserve No. 296. About 132 standard Forestry Markers had been installed along the boundary of the reserve. This action is meant to reduce encroachment thereby contributing to improved management of the reserve over time.

This project was building on the successful training of 16 local farmer in beekeeping and the establishment of an apiary in Damasca village of Nachisitu area; the planting of the 7,600 tree seedlings on 28 Ha of the riparian buffers zone of the Luangwa and Ntonga Rivers and the successful development of the Mafinga Hills Biodiversity Conservation Funding Strategy. WECSZ worked closely with the RIT and other partners to ensure that the project, to some extent, act as a bridge between the expired large grant and the next funding that WECSZ would secure from other conservation partners.

Some challenges that were faced in the project included the remoteness of the project area. The Mafinga Mountain area is in one of the remotest parts of Zambia laden with rugged terrain and few access roads; this posed a challenge in accessing the beneficiaries especially in the rain season.

6. Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

The RIT organized a lessons learned sharing event that was held in Uganda in 2019. At this event, Gift (WECSZ Mafinga Project Officer) inadvertently met Ruben, an Officer from an international organisation called WeForest, which also had an office in Zambia. A conversation was started about possible collaboration in forest management at the Mafinga Hills and surrounding areas. This conversation has reached an advanced stage and may likely result in a long-term collaboration between WECSZ and WeForest.

PART II: Project Outputs/Results

7. Outputs/results (as stated in the approved proposal/logical framework)

List each Output/Result and indicator from your logical framework, and describe what was achieved (also attach all means of verification to this report)

#	Output/Result	Indicator	What was achieved (using indicator)
1	3 additional Mafinga Hills National Forest Reserve No. 296 beacons marked	Additional area being marked, as part of overall size of the Reserve(in hectares)	3 beacons were marked in May 2019 to make a total of 6 beacons marked: 3 in 2018 and 3 in May 2019. The reserve has 10 beacon points in total. WECSZ in July 2019 requested CEPF to extend the project so that it would be able to complete marking all the 10 beacons. An addendum to extend the project was approved. The team did their best to reach all the beacons but it became clear that the scope (about 14,500 hectares) and the rugged terrain of the mountain posed a challenge for the team to cover the envisaged area in the 6 days that they were in the field. A total of 7 beacons have so far been established with concrete beacons and 132 markers installed in-between the beacons.
2	Firebreaks established around 14 hectares of reforested riparian plots	Reduction in fire occurrence since baseline of 2018	The fire break was established around the 14 hectares in Damasca Village. The fire occurrence baseline study that we conducted in 2018 revealed that the fires in both the montane area and the riparian buffer were not caused by natural factors. The fires were mainly caused by local people setting fire to the grass for different reasons. Some of these reasons included a need for green flush for grazing cattle, clearing the areas close to their homes to drive away reptiles (snakes) and mammals (genets) that would harm their livestock (mainly chickens). Interestingly, the fires occurring at over 1500m ASL were evidently not coming from the ones lit at the foot of the mountain. These fires were lit right on top. It was not very clear why the people would lit fire in that area, but it would seem likely that they did so to flush out mammals for hunting. In the reconnaissance report that Timberlake et al (2018, p.21) authored, it was observed that "frequent fires seem to have reduced available standing plant biomass across the grasslands which may have caused, especially in the quartzite areas, a loss of humus and soil leading to more exposed rock and much more rapid runoff." This scenario was also true of the area flanking the Luangwa river as it flows down from the mountain. This evidently reduced the integrity and value of the area as a catchment for

			the upper Luangwa River, as there is more rapid run-off and lesser storage capacity. We (Gift, Kunda and group leaders of the nursery groups) did conduct a post firebreak establishment fire occurrence survey on 29 and 30 October 2019. The surveys were concentrated in Damasca and Mweniwisi areas where the trees had been planted. Although we did not have any technological tools to measure the extent of the fires, we did observe that the 14 hectares in Damasca village were less affected by fires. On the other hand, the trees in Mweniwisi, where no firebreaks were done in 2019, had been scorched. Fanshawe (1971) observed that there will always be fires in the montane grasslands and the forest... is rapidly being degraded and encroached upon. Our observations in 2019 agrees with this earlier work. Fires seem to be increasing around the landscape but firebreaks and weeding the native trees that were replanted contributes greatly to their survival.
3	New beehives established by June 2019	Nr of beehives that have been colonized ; beekeeping process finalized	10 new beehives (wooden) were established by 30 April 2019. This brought the number to 15 wooden KTB hives, that is five (5) which were built in 2018 to establish whether the metallic hives were the reason for bees absconding the hives plus the ten (10) that were established in April 2019. By 30 October 2019, all the 15 hives were colonized. As reported in the May 2019 report, 5 beehives would be harvested between May and June.
4	At least 2 Partnerships with conservation partners secured for the KBA, through the funding strategy	Level of leveraged funding (in USD)	A contract was signed with the Zambia governance foundation in August 2019 for a community mobilization grant. The grant is aimed at sensitization communities living around the Luangwa river headwaters on the value, threats and solutions to threats to the Luangwa river. WECSZ had also requested the Department of Agriculture to fund an upscaling of the livelihood and community sensitization components of WECSZ's conservation and forest management project. The department signed an agreement to pledge their intention of adopting the said components amounting to over US\$55,000. The components would be embedded in a project called Strengthening climate resilience of agricultural livelihoods in Agro-Ecological Regions I and II in Zambia (SCRALA). However, it became clear, after the project was launched in March 2019, that the department had changed their position. They informed WECSZ that the project approach had changed to focus more on small livestock for livelihood. The community sensitizations were also deferred to a later time that was not disclosed to WECSZ.

8. Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

The Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) was one tool that the project employed. FPIC is a tool that accorded the affected communities the opportunity to learn about the project and to appreciate fully its implications for both the people and the environment. The project implementation took a participatory approach. Different partners were engaged at district and national levels. The participatory nature of the project ensured that only people with interest in the project among the affected communities would take part in the project activities. This approach guided the selection criteria for beneficiaries of beekeeping and the nursery establishment groups.

PART III: Lessons, Sustainability, Safeguards and Financing

Lessons Learned

9. 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:

- Project Design Process (*aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Project Implementation (*aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community

For a project to be successful, it's important that the local community understands what you believe you will be able to provide for them—and what you can't.

The Wildlife and Environmental Conservation Society of Zambia (WECSZ) thought they were on the same page as volunteers in Mafinga Hills who had agreed to raise seedlings in the new local tree nursery and then plant them in the forest. However, the organization found out that some of these volunteers expected to be paid for their work. WECSZ reiterated that learning to manage local resources was the benefit of volunteering and that volunteers wouldn't be paid money. The two groups reached a compromise, with WECSZ providing gum boots that the volunteers requested to help them plant the trees.

I suggest that future grantees should develop a project with the help of the affected persons or beneficiaries and generate a written agreement of what the inputs and benefits will be for both of you.

Sustainability / Replication

10. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.

Working closely with government agencies sharing project reports with stakeholders at different levels is one of the success scored tin the project. We have managed to draw attention of government agencies such as the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Environmental Protection through the Water Resources Management Authority. These agencies are already consulting with WECSZ on how they can upscale activities in this project. The Ministry of Agriculture for example has adopted three components of the project namely forest management/rehabilitation, natural resource policy awareness and livelihood promotion which they have pledged to scale-up.

The successful development of the Mafinga Hills Biodiversity Funding Strategy (2019 - 2025) has set a clear road map on the investment priorities for the area and so far, there is increased awareness and interest on the need to conserve the biodiversity of the Mafingas. We remain confident that the said strategy will result in sustainability and replicability of the project.

Safeguards

11. If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social or environmental safeguards that your project may have triggered.

In this project, two issues triggered the safeguards: Riparian Forest Maintenance and Forest Reserve marking. The maintenance of the riparian buffer, which involved measures to protect the reforested areas, had the potential to disturb farmers who had been farming in these areas in Damasca and Mweniwisi villages. The activity was restricting some local people's access to the land which was perceived to be more fertile and preferred for cultivation. Additionally, the forest marking activity could be conceived as a way of prohibiting local people from accessing the forest resources. WECSZ was cognizant of the social dynamics of the rightsholders in the project area and had put in place measures to mitigate the potential negative impacts of the project.

WECSZ worked with the traditional leadership and Senior Headman Damasca to identify degraded riparian zones that had been abandoned. Some degraded riparian areas needing attention were however still being cultivated. Sixteen (16) farmers were identified to be directly affected by the riparian maintenance activity. These people are impoverished and were dependent on subsistence agriculture, which they unfortunately practiced along sensitive riparian areas and cleared out riparian forests. These actions proved to be detrimental to the ecosystem. After consultations, the affected persons agreed to release land up to an average distance of 40m from the river. This area would be reforested while the farmers could continue farming from the 40m distance upland. The 16 farmers also agreed to take up beekeeping as a livelihood activity. Traditional small-scale beekeeping was already being practiced by some farmers. An apiary was established in the large grant and WECSZ will help the group of 16 farmers in this project to improve honey yields through providing efficient modern beehives.

It was anticipated that identifying and marking forest boundaries may steer different claims especially from villagers who depended on the forest resources within the forest reserve. Thus, the boundary marking had the potential to restrict the local people's access to the forest resources. WECSZ recognized the fact that the local people had a right to access forest resources. WECSZ also recognized that these people had a right to give or withhold consent to any activities affecting their way of life thus the need for Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC). WECSZ therefore prioritized the local peoples' response to the project. Using the rights-based approach (RBA) to integrating human rights in conservation projects, WECSZ held another community consultation meeting in December 2018 with the villages close to the forest boundary area as part of the proposal development. The meeting advised where the boundary of the reserve passed (also confirmed on the map following the gazette boundary description). The affected persons further agreed to release some community members who would help with the forest marking.

Additional Funding

12. 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 CEPF investment

- a. **Total additional funding (US\$) 65,082.92**

b. Type of funding

Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source, categorizing each contribution into one of the following categories:

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
WECSZ	Project Co-financing	US\$585	WECSZ received a total amount of \$USD 585 in individual donations from the WECSZ membership towards the tree nursery management and planting for the rehabilitation of the riparian buffer zones.
Elephant Charge Zambia	Grantee and Partner Leveraging	US\$3,315	WECSZ received a total amount of \$USD 3,315 from the Elephant Charge Zambia to finance the biodiversity photography training of children and community members and for the commemoration of the first ever World Environment Day in Mafinga on 5th June 2018.
Zambian Governance Foundation	Grantee and Partner Leveraging	US\$6,109.44	We signed a contract of USD 6,109.44 under the Community Mobilization Grant of Zambian Governance Foundation. The grant was for the Purpose of Strengthening awareness of local people on the importance of the Mafinga Hills landscape.
Agriculture Department of Mafinga	Regional/Portfolio	US\$55,072.49	In 2018 the Agriculture Department of Mafinga District committed US\$ 55,072.49 to implementing activities in Mafinga, commencing June 2019 to 2025 with funding from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

* Categorize the type of funding as:

- 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)*

Additional Comments/Recommendations

13. Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF.

CEPF should be considered re-surveying the boundary of the Mafinga Hills priority KBA and possibly revise it to include other sensitive regions below 1500m. Both surveys conducted by Timberlake et al (2018) and Birdwatch Zambia (2018) revealed that the description of the CEPF priority KBA was not tallying with the information on the ground. It was discovered that the area of the Mafinga mountain that exceeds 1500m above sea level only covered around 12,000 hectares (calculated from Google Earth). The CEPF description of the KBA (CEPF 2012a, KBA no.144) shows the area as being 18,720 hectares in extent. It is not clear whether this size is including the Malawian side of the mountain (which in itself is not included on CEPF's map of priority KBAs). According to Timberlake and others (2018: 5) the KBA "boundary appears to be rather simplistically defined, possibly incorporating just the Forest Reserves in Zambia and Malawi. For

unknown reasons, the actual Eastern Afromontane Hotspot boundary (CEPF 2012b) differs significantly from that of the KBA.”

We would also like to strongly recommend that more surveys be conducted to ascertain the species of global conservation concern the Mafinga Hills KBA. Timberlake et al (2018) are of the view that “Given the frequency of quartzite outcrops at high altitude, and the nutrient-deficient soils that result, it is possible there are more endemics to be found. A similar quartzite crag and grassland environment on the Chimanimani Mountains on the Zimbabwe–Mozambique border, for example, has 74 known endemic plant species (Wursten et al. 2017), although from a significantly larger area (53,000 hectares).” A survey report on vertebrates that was conducted by BirdWatch Zambia (2018) adds some detail that support the need for further research at the Mafinga Hills KBA. BirdWatch Zambia recorded around 19 Afromontane endemic bird species and around 13 near-endemic bird species, all of which are not included in the ecosystem profile.

PART IV: Impact at Global Level

CEPF requires that each grantee report on impact at the end of the project. The purpose of this report is to collect data that will contribute to CEPF’s portfolio and global indicators. CEPF will aggregate the data that you submit with data from other grantees, to determine the overall impact of CEPF investment. CEPF’s aggregated results will be reported on in our annual report and other communications materials.

Ensure that the information provided pertains to the entire project, from start date to project end date.

Contribution to Global Indicators

Please report on all Global Indicators (sections 13 to 23 below) that pertain to your project.

14. Key Biodiversity Area Management

Number of hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) with improved management

Please report on the number of hectares in KBAs with improved management, as a result of CEPF investment. Examples of improved management include, but are not restricted to: increased patrolling, reduced intensity of snaring, invasive species eradication, reduced incidence of fire, and introduction of sustainable agricultural/fisheries practices. Do not record the entire area covered by the project - only record the number of hectares that have improved management.

If you have recorded part or all of a KBA as newly protected for the indicator entitled “protected areas” (section 17 below), and you have also improved its management, you should record the relevant number of hectares for both this indicator and the “protected areas” indicator.

Name of KBA	# of Hectares with strengthened management *	Is the KBA Not protected, Partially protected or Fully protected? Please select one: NP/PP/FP
Mafinga hills KBA 144, Zambia	13,028	PP

--	--	--

** Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were improved due to implementation of a fire management regime in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were improved due to invasive species removal in the second year, the total number of hectares with improved management would be 500.*

15. Protected Areas

15a. Number of hectares of protected areas created and/or expanded

Report on the number of hectares of protected areas that have been created or expanded as a result of CEPF investment.

Name of PA*	Country(s)	# of Hectares	Year of legal declaration or expansion	Longitude**	Latitude**
N/A					

** If possible please provide a shape file of the protected area to CEPF.*

*** Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).*

15b. Protected area management

If you have been requested to submit a Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), please follow the instructions below. If you have not been requested to submit a METT, please go directly to section 16.

Should you want to know more about the monitoring of protected area management effectiveness and the tracking tool, please click [here](#).

Download the METT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with the protected area authorities to fill it out. Please go to the Protected Planet website [here](#) and search for your protected area in their database to record its associated WDPA ID. Then please fill in the following table:

WDPA ID	PA Official Name	Date of METT*	METT Total Score

** Please indicate when the METT was filled by the authorities of the park or provide a best estimate if the exact date is unknown. And please only provide METTs less than 12 months old.*

Please do not forget to submit the completed METT together with this report.

16. Production landscape

Please report on the number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity, as a result of CEPF investment. A production landscape is defined as a landscape where agriculture, forestry or natural product exploitation occurs. Production landscapes may include KBAs, and therefore hectares counted under the indicator entitled “KBA Management” may also be counted here. Examples of interventions include: best practices and guidelines implemented, incentive schemes introduced, sites/products certified and sustainable harvesting regulations introduced.

Number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity.

Name of Production Landscape*	# of Hectares**	Latitude***	Longitude***	Description of Intervention
Riparian zone in Damasca	15	9.893	33.342	Riparian zone in Damasca
Riparian Zone in Mweniwisi village	8	10.342	33.342	Riparian Zone in Mweniwisi village
Riparian Zone in Mulekatembo	5	10.130	33.317	Riparian Zone in Mulekatembo

* If the production landscape does not have a name, provide a brief descriptive name for the landscape.

**Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were strengthened due to certification in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were strengthened due to new harvesting regulations in the second year, the total number of hectares strengthened to date would be 500.

*** Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).

17. Beneficiaries

CEPF wants to record two types of benefits that are likely to be received by individuals: structured training and increased income. Please report on the number of men and women that have benefited from structured training (such as financial management, beekeeping, horticulture) and/or increased income (such as from tourism, agriculture, medicinal plant harvest/production, fisheries, handicraft production) as a result of CEPF investment. Please provide results since the start of your project to project completion.

17a. Number of men and women receiving structured training.

# of men receiving structured training *	# of women receiving structured training *
43	37

**Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received structured training in beekeeping, and 3 of these also received structured training in project management, the total number of men who benefited from structured training should be 5.*

17b. Number of men and women receiving cash benefits.

# of men receiving cash benefits*	# of women receiving cash benefits*
31	27

**Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received cash benefits due to tourism, and 3 of these also received cash benefits from increased income due to handicrafts, the total number of men who received cash benefits should be 5.*

18. Benefits to Communities

CEPF wants to record the benefits received by communities, which can differ to those received by individuals because the benefits are available to a group. CEPF also wants to record, to the extent possible, the number of people within each community who are benefiting. Please report on the characteristics of the communities, the type of benefits that have been received during the project, and the number of men/boys and women/girls from these communities that have benefited, as a result of CEPF investment. If exact numbers are not known, please provide an estimate.

18a. Please provide information for all communities that have benefited from project start to project completion.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics (mark with x)							Type of Benefit (mark with x)								# of Beneficiaries		
	Subsistence economy	Small landowners	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Other*	Increased access to clean water	Increased food security	Increased access to energy	Increased access to public services (e.g. health care, education)	Increased resilience to climate change	Improved land tenure	Improved recognition of traditional knowledge	Improved representation and decision-making in governance forums/structures	Improved access to ecosystem services	# of men and boys benefiting	# of women and girls benefiting
Damasca	X	x	X						x							x	55	30
Nachisitu	X	x	X						x							x	30	35
Mulekatembo	X	x	X						x							x	15	12
Mweniwisi	X	x	X						x							x	21	27

*If you marked "Other" to describe the community characteristic, please explain:

2																			
...																			

19b. For each law, policy or regulation listed above, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

No.	Country(s)	Date enacted/ amended MM/DD/YYYY	Expected impact	Action that you performed to achieve this change
1				
2				
3				

20. Sustainable Financing Mechanism

Sustainable financing mechanisms generate financial resources for the long-term (generally five or more years). Examples of sustainable financial mechanisms include conservation trust funds, debt-for-nature swaps, payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes, and other revenue, fee or tax schemes that generate long-term funding for conservation.

All CEPF grantees (or sub-grantees) with project activities that pertain to the creation and/or the implementation of a sustainable financing mechanism are requested to provide information on the mechanism and the funds it delivered to conservation projects during the project timeframe, unless another grantee involved with the same mechanism has already been or is expected to be tasked with this.

CEPF requires that all sustainable financing mechanism projects to provide the necessary information at their completion.

20a. Details about the mechanism

Fill in this table for as many mechanisms you worked on during your project implementation as needed.

NO.	Name of financing mechanism	Purpose of the mechanism*	Date of Establishment**	Description***	Countries
1					
2					
3					

*Please provide a succinct description of the mission of the mechanism.

**Please indicate when the sustainable financing mechanism was officially created. If you do not know the exact date, provide a best estimate.

***Description, such as trust fund, endowment, PES scheme, incentive scheme, etc.

20b. Performance of the mechanism

For each Financing Mechanism listed previously, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

NO.	Project intervention*	\$ Amount disbursed to conservation projects**	Period under Review (MM/YYYY -MM/YYYY)***
1			
2			
3			

*List whether the CEPF grant has helped to create a new mechanism (Created a mechanism) or helped to support an existing mechanism (Supported an existing mechanism) or helped to create and then support a new mechanism (Created and supported a new mechanism).

**Please only indicate the USD amount disbursed to conservation projects during the period of implementation of your project and using, when needed, the exchange rate on the day of your report.

***Please indicate the period of implementation of your project or the period considered for the amount you indicated.

Please do not forget to submit any relevant document which could provide justification for the amount you stated above.

21. Biodiversity-friendly Practices

Please describe any biodiversity-friendly practices that companies have adopted as a result of CEPF investment. A company is defined as a legal entity made up of an association of people, be they natural, legal, or a mixture of both, for carrying on a commercial or industrial enterprise. While companies take various forms, for the purposes of CEPF, a company is defined as a for-profit business entity. A biodiversity-friendly practice is one that conserves or uses biodiversity sustainably.

Number of companies that adopt biodiversity-friendly practices

No.	Name of company	Description of biodiversity-friendly practice adopted during the project
1	There was no company operating in the project area	
2		
...		

22. Networks & Partnerships

Please report on any new networks or partnerships between civil society groups and across to other sectors that you have established or strengthened as a result of CEPF investment. Networks/partnerships should have some lasting benefit beyond immediate project implementation. Informal networks/partnerships are acceptable even if they do not have a Memorandum of Understanding or other type of validation. Examples of networks/partnerships include: an alliance of fisherfolk to promote sustainable fisheries practices, a network of environmental journalists, a partnership between one or more NGOs with one or more private sector partners to improve biodiversity management on private lands, a working group focusing on reptile conservation. Please do not use this tab to list the partners in your project, unless some or all of them are part of such a network / partnership described above.

Number of networks and/or partnerships created and/or strengthened

No.	Name of Network	Name of Partnership	Year established	Did your project establish this Network/ Partnership? Y/N	Country(s) covered	Purpose
1	Civil Society Organization Environment Hub		2017	N	Zambia	Promote synergies and knowledge sharing among civil societies in Zambia.
2		Alliance with a registered Village Group	2018	Y	Zambia	To promote conservation among local people within Mafinga District.

...						
-----	--	--	--	--	--	--

23. Gender

If you have been requested to submit a Gender Tracking Tool (GTT), please follow the instructions provided in the Excel GTT template. If you have not been requested to submit a GTT, please go directly to Part V.

Should you want to know more about CEPF Gender Policy, please click [here](#).

Download the GTT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with your team to fill it out. Please do not forget to submit the completed GTT together with this report.

Part V. 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, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Gift C. Mwandila

Organization: Wildlife and Environmental Conservation Society of Zambia

Mailing address: P.o box 30255, Lusaka

Telephone number: +260 977 292217

E-mail address: wecsz@mcrolink.zm