

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	God for People Relief and Development Organization (GPRDO)
Project Title:	Scaling up Alternative Livelihoods Income Sources Focused Forest Development and Protection Approaches in Bechi Peasant Association, Yeki Woreda, Sheka Zone, SNNPR, Ethiopia
Date of Report:	27 th November 2014
Report Author and Contact Information	Seralegin Abera, gprdo@ethionet.et/seraleginabera@yahoo.com, +251-911-379640

CEPF Region:

Western part of Kaffa and Yayu Biosphere Reserves Corridors with the specific focus on the site indicated as ETH 69: Sheka Forest (Metu-Gore-Tepi) and (KBA nr 224)

Strategic Direction:

Strategic Direction 1 (one) which stated as “Mainstreaming 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:

USD 20,000.00

Project Dates:

From December 2014 to November 2015 (One year)

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

GPRDO is the only grass root implementing partner of this project. Though there were no other funding partners except CEPF, GPRDO has been implementing the project through making collaborations with concerned stakeholders like local people and beneficiary minority ethnic community groups who have provided local materials and free labor; local level concerned government offices involved in providing technical support and small plot of farmland including forested land; research institutions provided agricultural technologies; and individuals and private companies who have participated in different ways during the course of the project implementation.

Conservation Impacts

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

The implementation of the project has significantly contributed to the conservation of Sheka Biosphere Reserve as the implementation process has been carried out among Peasant Associations (PAs) residing in low conservation corridors of Bechi forest of Sheka zone (Emich, Gagani, Merki and Bechi Daget) which are found in the CEPF ecosystem profile. The poor people of the targeted areas who were largely dependent on the forest resource for their subsistence

life directly participated on participatory forest conservation and protection system i.e. community based Joint Forest Management (JFM) practices, public awareness and skill capacity building packages, replanting of forest trees in endangered areas, soil and water conservation works, and promotion of alternative livelihoods income sources that developed under the shade of forest trees. The project has established four Community Forest Protection Groups (CFPGs) at four PAs that report and fight illegal forest devastation, and undertake environment and natural resource management in Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) on a sustainable basis by promoting forest development focused products.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project against the expected results detailed in the approved proposal.

The overall result/impact of the project is to contribute towards the well conserved and developed Sheka Forest buffer zone through scaling up alternative means of livelihoods to targeted poor forest dependent community of Bechi Peasant Associations (PAs) to jointly manage its local area forest resources whereas the expected results are the following:

- 1) Well conserved and developed remnant indigenous tree forests located within Bechi Peasant Association through implementing participatory forest management principles;
- 2) Secured alternative livelihoods income from sources of Non-Timber-Forest-Products (NTFPs)- beekeeping, spice species, high value crops (rice, sesame, amaranth, coffee), fruits and vegetables for 325 target forest dependant beneficiary households (1,950 populations) reside in Bechi Peasant;
- 3) Enhanced awareness and initiation of target community within four Peasant Associations (PAs) of Bechi kebele towards remnant forest protection and development practices; and
- 4) Enhanced and promoted collaboration, knowledge sharing and networking with likeminded development practitioners working within and outside the target areas.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected:

24 hectares

Species Conserved:

Due to protection of forests within the targeted corridors, the lists of conserved species include indigenous trees that previously cleared for charcoal production (Wanza, Butuji, Kerero, Sassa, Kuri, Bisana, Birbirra, Beseka, Goshber, Gonji, and etc in local name); wild animals in the forest (antelope, ape, tiger, rabbit, pig, monkey, Jaguar, hyena, fox); and different variety of birds. The species existing in the forest estimated to more than 170.

Corridors Created:

The project has divided the Bechi natural forest into four forest pocket of Emich, Gagani, Merki and Bechi Daget, and protected by the respective PAs residents.

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

Success

- ❖ **Increased community awareness and participation on Joint Forest Management (JFM) practices**

To change the attitude and behavioral process of local people on community based joint forest conservation, and on the ecological and economic value of the forests in their lives, Community

Conversation Sessions (CCS)- awareness creation meetings that created greater community response in forest conservation activities have been organized for 2,730 local community members (female 1,146 and 1,584 male). The community groups residing within four villages realized that the principle of joint forest management aims to encourage people's participation in forest conservation activities (natural forests must be protected through the local people and for the local people).

Before implementation of the project planned activities, there was no regular discussion held among the local communities regarding participatory forest conservation works, but following awareness raising activities on the importance of community participation on joint forest resource management, more members of the community became concerned about the fast rate of disappearance of their forest resources and recognized the need to participate in decision-making on how the resources should be managed and used.



Village communities making discussion on community based joint forest management

After engaged in Community Conversation Session on participatory forest management principles and practices, communities residing in all four villages became active in the conservation of forest resources. They demarcated their own forest boundaries in the presence of all concerned stakeholders, and collaborated with alternative income-generating Community Forest Protection Groups (CFPGs) established at four demonstration development centers in reporting and fighting illegal forest devastation.



Illegal forest devastation reduced and the suspects were brought before law and action was taken to conserve and replace the devastated forest trees

❖ **Developed skill and knowledge capacity of project beneficiaries**

The greater work has been conducted with regard to skill capacity development of selected members of local community groups and project beneficiaries on the importance of community based joint forest management, high value crops development and management on commonly owned centers, and value supply chain principles and strategies. Particularly, 325 poor forest dependant community groups organized into Community Forest Protection Groups (CFPGs)

have acquired new technical skill due to their involvement in practical promotion of NTFPs on their respective development centers. Representatives of CFPGs have also developed their technical skills by participating in extensive capacity building trainings, learning/sharing experience among CFPGs, and visit to research centers (Tepi National Spices Research Center) that promote forest shade loving income sources of NTFPs. These efforts along with the collaboration of concerned government office have contributed significantly to save Bechi forest from devastations.



Experience sharing among CFPGs



Selected model beneficiary on practical training

❖ **Enhanced income diversification opportunities**

The project has resulted in the formation of four community groups focused on promoting alternative income-generating activities, which are helping to reduce pressure inflicted on the forest. The four Community Forest Protection Groups (CFPGs) organized at four forest corridor PAs with members drawn from vulnerable forest dependant groups including women (accounts 50%), landless and unemployed youth, disables and elders, minority ethnic groups, and other immigrant ethnicities seeking cultivable land. Each CFPG has established nursery sites for cultivating seeds of indigenous trees, spices, coffee, fruits, amaranthus, bee flower and beekeeping on more than a hectare of land and additionally secured two hectares of farm plot either from government or from individual farmer for the production of high value crops such as vegetables, rice and sesame, which introduced to the targeted villages through this project. More than 70,000 coffee seeds sprouted on nursery sites. Out of this, about 35,000 seedlings sold to local community at 1Birr/piece while the remaining transplanted by members of CFPGs on commonly managed land and within protected forest.



Rice on farm



Sesame farm



Produced potato on seed table



Potato on farm

Amaranthus is one of the diversified optional sources of income promoted and introduced into project targeted areas. This crop has been taken as a miracle crop among local community groups since it bears fruit within short period of time (within a month). It was understood that there is wild amaranthus species, weed amaranthus in Ethiopia while there is a widely developed species of amaranthus which has been used for food in other African countries such as Tanzania and elsewhere in the world. As it was experienced from the fieldwork, 2.5 kilogram of amaranthus seed is enough for a hectare of land while the yield is estimated at 7-8 quintals/hectare. As practiced on the nursery stations, most of the centers are able to produce 5-10 kilogram of amaranthus from one seedbed of size 1m x 10m. Though the sale of the

harvested seed is Birr 4000 per quintal, based on the export market price situation, the centers are sold at Birr 85/kg. Hence, it was considering these advantages and gaps that GPRDO initiated to introduce and promote the mentioned crops as component part of the NTFPs. Hence, the action has been taken to purchase the improved variety of amaranths seed from Tanzania and try it in all CFPGs Development Centers. As shown in the photos displayed below, black pepper which grown forest tree is also promoted by all project groups.



Black pepper Established nursery site Amaranthus farm Amaranthus seed

The income-raising activities have empowered vulnerable groups economically. All CFPGs started producing pure honey in their respective villages in a modernized ways using constructed beekeeping shelters and improved hives. But, before project implementation, traditional beehives made from thick trees were placed on top of long tree and this can only possible for those who can climb the tree while others refused to engage in the activity. Beekeeping in traditional way also reduce the production and productivity of honey while loading and unloading hives from and to the top of the trees using rope that resulted in the falling of hives which in turn resulted in the damage of the lives of many bee colonies. Comparatively, only 2 to 3kg of honey was produced using traditional beehive and sold at Birr 35/kg whereas 20 to 25kg of pure honey is produced per hive, on average using improved beekeeping method which is then sold for 65 Birr per kg at local market though the price of the same is 120Birr in big cities like Addis Ababa.



Before (Placing hives on the tree) After (Placing hives in the shelter)

To change chanting of traditional knowledge, extensive practical training has been provided to the representatives of each CFPG Development Centers on honey extraction techniques, processing of by products and marketing system. The attitudinal change focus was, among the others, on the following.

- ✓ Introducing types of honey harvesting materials and their relative importance,
- ✓ Introducing honey harvesting methods and their relative importance,
- ✓ Introducing types of bee products: honey, wax, propolies and their relative importance,
- ✓ Introducing honey extraction and by products: honey, wax, propolies and their relative importance,

- ✓ Production of moulds from local material (bamboo) for making candle, tuwaf and others,
- ✓ Packing and labeling extracted honey for marketing purpose,
- ✓ Arranging produced candle, tuwaf, etc for marketing purpose or home use, and
- ✓ Making Birz (local drink made from residue of honey extraction).



Beekeepers wearing protections Pure honey and Birz (drink) Pure honey harvesting machines

The practical oriented training has enabled project beneficiaries how to undertake modern beekeeping, pure honey production and how to use honey harvesting materials such as tuta, boots, vails, gloves, presser/mould, scrapers, bee brush, forks, water sprayers, different plastic dishes, honey extractors, honey packing jar with lids, labels, etc. The use of modern accessories has enabled them to harvest twenty to twenty five kilograms of honey per beehive two times a year. The support given in this regard has enhanced income at household level. The training was provided practically considering the market and value addition aspects of honey and its by products with a focus on knowledge and skill transfer. Hence, it has a significant contribution towards sustaining the project results within the targeted areas.

❖ **Protected forest resources and rehabilitated endangered areas**

Implementation of the project has resulted in the recovery of forest that had been cleared by local cultivators. The recovery could be partly attributed to the influence of the CFPGs, who replanted endangered forest areas using trees raised at their nursery sites. In addition, local community groups' involvement in creating by-laws to conserve their adjacent forest by producing alternative livelihoods income sources instead of depending on the forest for charcoal making, and in convincing their fellow villagers to stop farming in the forested land also had a significant role. The project supplied CFPGs of each village with 1 kg of Grevillea and 1kg of wanza seeds, and watering cans, racks and shovels, with which they established tree nurseries, raising about 110,000 seedlings in total. The seedlings were distributed to the village communities and planted in the affected part of forest and on the endangered farm land.



Emech village forest



Bechi Daget village forest

❖ **Local community groups developed by-laws to jointly manage local forest**

To convince forest-adjacent communities to abide by the joint forest management rules and regulations, the four villages made by-laws in relation to the management, access and equitable sharing of natural resources. The by laws developed were taken to the representatives community groups from each four villages for discussion and then to the woreda Agriculture and Rural Development Office for approval.



Village communities discussing on and approving bylaws

❖ **Enhanced collaboration and dissemination of experiences and lessons learnt**

GPRDO has ensured the participation and developed a fruitful close working relationship with the concerned local government offices, and other organizations and research institutions working in the areas of biodiversity conservation, rural technology and rural livelihoods. For instance, with Holeta Beekeeping Research Institute, the only beekeeping research center in the country for the production and promotion of improved beehives, bee flowers, animal fodder and improved potato seeds; with Tepi National Spices Research Center for the promotion of improved spices, fruits and coffee seeds; and with Sassakawa Global for the production of improved rice and sesame seeds.

Furthermore, GPRDO has involved the representatives of such organizations in the project activities implementation and benefited from their technical and agricultural inputs support provided to CFPGs. The following photos show the practical technical training and inputs support provided to members of CFPGs on promotion and production of alternative livelihoods including fruits (banana) and spices using qualified trainers and resource persons from Tepi National Spice Research Center.



Collaboration for technical support



Collaboration for NTFPs input support

The initiated works convinced the concerned government offices and other stakeholders to take the project sites as a demonstration centers and project beneficiary groups as a model to teach

other area farmers, on one hand and on the other, to scale up and promote alternative livelihood income sources inputs. As a result, the Research Center has granted legal recognition for CFPGs to promote and distribute improved variety of banana, coffee, black pepper, mango and avocado to the rest of local communities. Apart from this, the networking/partnership made with concerned stakeholders created platform for sharing of rich experience to fostering participatory project implementation strategies of promoting alternative livelihoods forest protection systems and practices as a viable strategy to ensure financial and skill capacity of local community groups.

Challenges

❖ Shortage of funds

While the implementation of community based forest conservation is vitally important to achieve the desired overall objective of conserved biodiversity, it was difficult to implement various alternative income generating schemes and to generate public awareness for the whole residents within the targeted villages and beyond due to limited resources. There were no other funders; the project has been implemented with financial support secured small grant from CEPF, in addition to some contributions from GPRDO and in kind contribution from local community groups in terms of free labor and local materials, the estimated amount is greater than 50% of total budget allocated by donor partner. Though, GPRDO has committed to scale up the project results and submitted grant application based on the request of key stakeholders, due attention for continuation of the project implementation was not given by CEPF.

❖ Water problem

Most of the established tree nurseries sites lack water in nearby, as a result members of project beneficiary groups fetch water by travelling long distance to raise different seedlings of indigenous trees and other seeds of high value crops cultivated on seedbeds. Hence, they were repeatedly requesting for spring development at nursery sites which might serve for small scale irrigation.

❖ Fly of bee colonies

Fly of bees in the targeted beekeeping centers were attributed to migration due to unfavorable climate condition, influence of insects (ant) and death of bees while sucking flowers caused by chemical spray carried out by local communities engaged in crop production in the project areas and nearby to control weeds. To overcome the problem, the areas surrounding beekeeping shelters were made clean to manage bee enemies (like ant), flowers were planted around shelter and water made available using container to avoid bees travel long distance, and local community members advised to carry out hand pulling of weeds and to use other weed management.



Bee fodder



Amaranths flower serving as bee fodder

❖ **Absence of market access facilitation**

Though project beneficiary groups and few local farmers engaged in the production of cash crops like amaranthus, coffee, spices, fruits, honey, they were not connected with potential buyers from big town and cities. The project area, which is not less than 650km from Addis Ababa, lacks infrastructure development like roads. Project groups have no preservation warehouse to keep their produce incase of market distortion occurred or until favorable price offered, hence they experienced a market system of on harvest selling of their produces.

❖ **Forest Devastation caused by farmland expansion**

Minority ethnic groups residing surrounding targeted villages set fire to the local forest in search of farm land expansion, as a result wildlife in the forest became shelterless, however, this had been later on changed as project implementation showed promising results.



Setting fire to the forest



Wildlife taken out of the forest fire

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Unexpected positive impacts

- ❖ The community groups and beneficiary members have showed immediate willingness in the acceptance of new technologies introduced to the target areas like amaranthus, rice, sesame, black pepper, Indian cardamom, and etc.
- ❖ Food and nutritious security created for local community, for instance they prepared preventive nutritious food from amaranthus leaf and by mixing amaranthus seeds with other crops grown locally.

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.

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

GPRDO, being with concerned local government offices and PA level leaders, designed this project and submitted to the donor partner. The collaboration of the concerned stakeholders during the proposal design was later on significantly contributed for the smooth implementation of planned activities since important processes such as selection of targeted PAs, identification of appropriate project sites, project beneficiary members who were suffering from inadequate food and made their subsistence life on clearing natural forest, problem identification and measures anticipated were done through participatory manner in the presence of these concerned stakeholders. The minute of understanding was taken among concerned government

structures, GPRDO, PA and clan leaders of targeted communities, and project beneficiary members as a means to sustain the consensus even taking into account the situations after phase out like who own the project results; kind of support required for project beneficiaries and who discharge this; how to incorporate non-project targeted forest dependant households around the targeted PAs into the project beneficiary groups; rights and responsibilities of project beneficiaries with regard to accessing natural forest in their locality without imposing any damage and conservation systems; and etc. After signing of grant contract with funding agency, GPRDO has submitted project proposal for the signing of the project agreement with the concerned government stakeholders to start the implementation of the project. After necessary appraisal, the project agreement was signed between signatory government offices and GPRDO, as a result these processes contributed to project success.

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

Among aspects of project implementation that has contributed to the success was in relation to official handover of all project sites which has been conducted in the presence of all project members of beneficiaries, figured people such as religious and clan leaders, and in the presence of concerned government officials and minutes of site handover were taken. During the site handover there was meeting of all stakeholders from relevant government offices, representatives of communities and staffs of GPRDO. Discussion about the implementation of the project was undertaken, Project Group Management Committee (PGMC) consisting of five members was elected for each project beneficiary groups, with female members one to two on average, which organize and lead members of project beneficiaries of four targeted centers. Each established management committee has chair person and secretary. Instruction and orientation was given to each management committee to effectively undertake their functions. Apart from these, site level staff that stationed in the community and work for the success of the project was assigned.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

❖ Enhanced Gender Balance in the Project Implementation

It is clear that the conservation of biodiversity in the project target areas and elsewhere relies on the involvement of the full community of both women and men who have different interests and perspectives regarding natural resources. For instance, in the target areas men cut forest trees in search of cultivable land where as women for the purpose of producing charcoal and fuel wood. The project interventions have been implemented in a manner that has enabled both women and men to work together on small plot of farm land and on integrated nursery stations by carrying out conservation activities. Hence, the project has addressed the different roles of women and men in livelihood activities by giving equal chances to manage the available resources through enhancing the development of alternative income-generating opportunities. This gender mainstreaming approach helped to promote equitable benefit-sharing of forest resources, small plot of farm land secured from government and facilities established by project support like beekeeping shelters, bee accessories and equipment, and others both for men and women, particularly for widow women and for households headed by females who are landless and unemployed. Though women participation is low in the project targeted areas due to local cultural practices that limit the roles of women into providing in home services, a system of quota was provided to encourage their engagement in the project implementation including their involvement in trainings, awareness creation, production of alternative income generation on commonly managed centers, and other activities that paved opportunity for women to work

outside their home equally with men. It was proved from the course of project implementation women are good producers of alternative livelihoods income sources and other NTFPs even in their garden.

❖ Enhanced social support and social responsibility for the biodiversity conservation

After a series of awareness raising, the targeted community groups who are out of the project beneficiary groups understood the opportunity within alternative livelihoods based joint forest management and concerned of the problems of forest dependant vulnerable groups, as a result they became voluntary members in contributing their free labor, land and local materials for construction of beekeeping shelters at their respective villages. Through working with/for poor community members organized into Community Forest Protection Groups (CFPGs), they learnt the technology of alternative livelihoods introduced at each integrated nursery stations. A kind of cost sharing system for the project implementation was created among Project Implementing Partner-PIP (provided fund and project expertise); local government (provided land appropriate for nursery site and beekeeping management, allowed project groups access forest, and provide technical support); community residing in the target village (provided local materials and free labor on voluntary basis as well collaborate with project beneficiaries and PIP to conserve forest); and project beneficiaries (work regularly on the nursery site, twice a week and beekeeping center, promote production of high value crops, indigenous trees, and other NTFPs).

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Though few development partners showed future opportunity, the project has been implemented with grant funding secured only from CEPF.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

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

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF 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 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.

Five factors have been taken as important factors which significantly evidenced for long-term sustainability and scalability of the project components in the targeted kebele/woreda and into

the zone or other areas. First, project deliverables including alternative income generating inputs that adapts to local microenvironment and that can easily be run by the targeted community groups have been introduced and promoted on commonly managed development centers, with special focus on meeting the needs and concern of forest dependant groups. Second, marginalized poorer community groups have got the alternative opportunity for their livelihoods due the introduction of NTFPs which has greater advantage as compared to their previous occupation. Third, development centers established by the project have been taken by local government and other research institutes as demonstration sites, so the project beneficiaries organized into groups will still secure technical and agricultural inputs support even after project exit. Accordingly, the model development center can bring knowledge transfer not only for targeted communities but also for other districts and villages not targeted by the project. Fourth, local farmers from neighboring villages have engaged in the promotion of alternative livelihoods packages introduced into the targeted areas by copying technologies within the project. Fifth, the estimated cost contribution from local government, project beneficiaries and local community members which is more than 50% of the total project budget in terms of farm land, forested land, free labor and local material contribution for the production of income generating activities on commonly managed centers such as sprouting of different high value seeds; beekeeping shelter; and etc have built self confidence and ownership feeling of the project by the targeted communities. Therefore the project sustainability and scalability has been ensured since alternative thinking, alternative resources, alternative occupation and alternative method of producing agricultural products have been created for the local communities.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

Though it was not initially planned in the project document, all members of each CFPG were requesting the project implementing partner to facilitate ways to receive legal license for their operation at beekeeping and nursery management station following the regional and federal primary cooperative regulations. GPRDO has been closely working with woreda Marketing and Cooperative Department work process officers to grant legal entity for each CFPG. In this connection, the process of granting legal entity to the groups assures the sustainability of the project results in the target areas after the project close out. According to Regional Cooperative Guideline, any legally registered primary association (cooperative group) has the right to get different support such as to borrow money from financial institutions and access to land, especially forestland in their locality. Hence, this will encourage the rest of communities to protect natural forest and regarded as an opportunity to solve the problem associated with shortage of land on which they later plant NTFPs cultivated on nursery site station. Currently members of some CFPGs signed their own code of conducts among themselves as well they are also on the process to enter into agreement with woreda level Marketing and Cooperative Department to carry out their duties properly.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

The implementation of the project has been linked to Green Economic Policy, and Environment and Natural Management of the country. As a result some of the joint forest conservation initiatives such as soil and water conservation works have been carried out using the community mobilized by government for such purpose. Using this as a platform GPRDO has been advising local community members to replace chemical fertilizers by organic fertilizers since some

dealers of agricultural produces are interested in organic NTFPs. The communities were also consulted to use hand pulling system of weeds management or other mechanisms control pests instead of using pesticides which might result in the loss of other habitats.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Although some of the alternative livelihoods inputs supplied to each CFPG were new to the targeted areas, acceptance on the part of community was positive, because selected model farmers from each groups obtained sufficient capacity development while engaging in the project activity implementation. Project beneficiary groups and stakeholders received the project wholeheartedly from very beginning during stakeholder consultation meeting and project proposal design which was participatory; they were eager to learn and cooperated to the fullest during the entire period of project implementation. The support and follow up of local government offices helped us to achieve the intended outcomes. Therefore, GPRDO will continue its effort to work on biodiversity conservation through making partnership with likeminded local and international organizations to scale up the project achievements into unreached areas and to fulfill the observed gaps in the current project. The following recommendations are necessary to promoting Community Based Biodiversity Conservation Strategy (CBBCS) within the project area and elsewhere.

- ❖ Establishing local people, particularly forest dependant groups into Community Forest Protection Groups (CFPGs) by allocating unprotected forest, and community tree nurseries to encourage farmers develop their own forest farm;
- ❖ Implementing land-use planning system for community;
- ❖ Ensuring access to micro-credits for project beneficiary farmers;
- ❖ Introducing improved dairy livestock production system that supports feedlots to reduce grazing pressure in the forested areas;
- ❖ Creating by-laws that allow community to access forest and forest products without imposing danger by convincing local government;
- ❖ Mainstreaming joint forest management issues and discussions in village meetings;
- ❖ Granting legal entity for CFPGs engaged in promoting and developing NTFPs, so it serve as a guarantee if conflict of interest is to arise and helps build up ethics between and among the members of the group;
- ❖ The diversifications of alternative income generating schemes within the targeted areas still need to look any other possible ones, which could be adaptable to the local area with high economic value such as raising chickens, fuel saving biotechnology, alternative energy, ecotourism, watershed management, and etc;
- ❖ Organizing experience sharing visits for the selected members of the CFPGs engaged in integrated alternative income generating activities among themselves and to other areas where such a development practice is obtained;
- ❖ Supporting each CFPG engaged in modern beekeeping and pure honey production with bee accessories and honey harvesting machines;
- ❖ Adopting and practicing organic farming development options instead of using fertilizer;
- ❖ Strengthening the assessments of all possible Value Supply Chain (VSC) for all of the alternative livelihoods harvests as well as linking the producers to a potential buyer in strengthened manner as it encourages the groundwork to be promoted well;
- ❖ Establishing all alternative income sources (NTFPs) producers groups into a Union in central area by joining different CFPGs;
- ❖ Establishing preservation warehouse for alternative livelihoods and NTFPs;

- ❖ Undertaking spring capping and water point development for tree nursery site and for small scale irrigation scheme;
- ❖ Strengthening mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and Community Based Forest Development and Protection Approaches into other projects and into the plan of other development partners;
- ❖ Taking a leading role in strengthening and formalizing networking, collaboration and partnership with other development partners involved in the areas of environment and biodiversity conservation and
- ❖ Disseminating good practices in biodiversity conservation using ICT, free air mass media, donor website, leaflets, and etc.

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: Seralegin Abera

Organization name: God for People Relief and Development Organization (GPRDO)

Mailing address: 17381, Addis Ababa

Tel: +251-911-379640

Fax: +251-116-621835

E-mail: gprdo@ethionet.et/seraleginabera@yahoo.com

*****please complete the tables on the following pages*****

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved for project from inception of CEPF support to date	Describe the principal results achieved during project period (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	Yes	9	<p>Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.</p> <p>By lobbying government nine hectares of forest at Bechi Daget transferred to local community groups. Previously communities were excluded from accessing this forest by government but it exacerbated illegal forest devastation for charcoal and farmland expansion. The project strengthened social fencing to protect natural forest in this protected area.</p>
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	Yes	15	<p>Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.</p> <p>Representatives target community groups reached on consensus by developing by laws to jointly manage and protect their local areas remnant forest which was previously not under conservation. The name of protected areas are Emech (7 hectares), Gagani (5 hectares), and Merki (4 hectares)</p>
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.	Yes	24	Community Forest Protection Groups (CFPGs) established at four PAs are conserving not only natural forest but also other resources including wild animals, birds, other life inside the Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) found in the above mentioned protected forests.
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Yes	49	Joint Forest Management (JFM) practices for biodiversity conservation has been mainstreamed into other projects implemented outside the target

			areas (in four kebeles found in Sheka Biosphere Reserves, estimated to 42 hectares, and in three kebeles found in Awi zone priority area estimated to 5 hectares).
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	Yes	325	325 local community members from ten ethnic community groups accumulated assets and got access to natural forests to promote NTFPs on commonly managed centers.

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										
Sheko		X	X				X	X	X					X					X	X	X	
Menja		X	X				X	X	X					X					X	X	X	
Mejengir		X	X				X	X	X					X					X	X	X	
Shekicho	X	X	X				X	X	X					X					X	X	X	
Keficho	X	X	X		X		X	X	X					X					X	X	X	
Amhara	X	X			X		X	X	X					X					X	X	X	
Bench	X	X			X		X	X	X					X					X	X	X	
Oromo	X	X			X		X	X	X					X					X	X	X	
Tigre	X	X			X		X	X	X					X					X	X	X	
Guraghe	X	X			X		X	X	X					X					X	X	X	
Total	7	10	5	0	6	0	10	10	10	0	0			10	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit:
 Community characteristic included under category "other" includes widow women, disabled and aged people, bedridden patients, and "Other" category under nature of socio economic benefit implies "access to natural forest" which was previously under government control to grow forest shade loving NTFPs by community.



CONSERVING FOREST IS SAVING THE LIFE OF LARGER COMMUNITY
(Message from local people which attached to nursery site compound)