

## CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	CESVI ONLUS
<b>Project Title:</b>	Decreased Local Human Pressure in the Usuthu-Tembe-Futi and the Lubombo Conservancy Goba Transfrontier Conservation Areas of Mozambique and Swaziland
<b>Date of Report:</b>	February 26 <sup>th</sup> 2015
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Patrizia Gattoni, patriziagattoni@cesvi.org Laura Morisio, lauramorisio@cesviverseas.org

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

**Strategic Direction:**

1. Strengthen protection and management in under- capacitated and emerging protected areas in 3 priority key biodiversity areas.
4. Create an enabling environment to improve conservation and management of Maputoland-Pondoland Albany priority sites

**Grant Amount:** 99,998 USD

**Project Dates:** 2014/3/1 – 2014/12/31

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

Several institutions and organization were involved throughout the implementation of the present project.

First of all, at **institutional level**, the government of Mozambique, through the Ministry of Tourism, the Maputo Special Reserve, the Matutuine District Administration and Goba authorities, were deeply committed in creating an enabling environment that allowed the smooth implementation of project activities. Their involvement in the decision making process related to the implementation was ensured through their participation in coordination meetings (one-to-one and open) and project activities.

On the other hand, several **international and national NGOs** had played different roles in the framework of the present project, in particular:

- Lupa, Oram e Kuwuka. Lupa and Oram, are partner of the informal Futi Consortium, and participated in all the coordination activities organized throughout the project implementation. Kuwuka, which was not a member of the Consortium, did participate as well in all the activities.
- Goba Ntava Yedzu Association (NY). Although many expectation towards NY capacity to play an active role in conservation work in the area remained unmet due to governance and representation issues of the association, some of the association's members and of the Goba community at large, showed during the project implementation a growing interest towards the conservation needs and development potential of their area and actively participated into the provided trainings.
- Lubombo Conservancy. The collaboration with this Swazi NGO allowed the creation of links between activities in Mozambique and in Swaziland. Although the original project proposal included a different set of activities, which then proved to be unrealistic given the actual situation of NY, the sincere and frank co-operation allowed to re-design the

proposal in a way that it could provide tangible results and pose the basis for further developments.

- COSPE. The collaboration with Cospe, was not included in the original project proposal, but we found their methodology appropriate for involving them in the implementation of the participatory mapping activity in the area of Goba Reserve and to identify possible trekking paths that could link Swaziland and Mozambique in a future plan for developing eco-tourism activities in the Lubombo TFCA.

Due to a change of focus on the trainings to be provided to Ntava Yedzu association, other agencies, like BirdLife/AACEM (they were supposed to provide birdwatching training to some of the NY members), were not involved as expected in the original project proposal.

Lastly, Cesvi has supported SANBI in the translation of MPAH newsletter in Portuguese until the end of August.

## **Conservation Impacts**

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

The present initiative has contributed to two strategic directions, namely:

*1. Strengthen protection and management in under- capacitated and emerging protected areas in 3 priority key biodiversity areas.*

The project aimed at strengthening the protection and management of the Futi corridor and the Goba area, through the engagement of the private sector and local relevant authorities.

*4. Create an enabling environment to improve conservation and management of Maputoland-Pondoland Albany priority sites.*

Specific environmental trainings were made available for local communities (organized in CBOs), and local organizations and institutions engaged in environmental conservation work.

More in general, the action aimed to further enhance the capability of the CEPF partners in the MPAH to deliver effective conservation work by providing the kind of technical assistance they needed to successfully apply for funds within the already existing funding opportunities and by liaising with more potential donors in an effort to attract more resources towards the work being done in the MPAH.

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

The project has contributed to draw the attention of Mozambican authorities and civil society at large on the strategic importance of both project areas, Matutuine and Goba, in terms of conservation of this biodiversity rich areas and of their potential for the development of eco-tourism activities in a long term perspective.

Even if the original proposal was, in some of its components, amended to better adapt it to the actual situation on the ground, it has to be said that the proposed changes (in particular with reference to the activities planned for Goba) have allowed initiating a fruitful discussion and debate among the different involved stakeholders (local authorities, community members, Mozambican and Swazi partners) that aimed at finding the most suitable solution to set solid basis for future developments. The existence of different views, opinions, contexts and plans and the willingness and availability of different partners have enriched all the participants and contributed to widen the impacts of the present project, and of those implemented in the MPAH by other partners, as each partner acknowledged to be part of a wider development context and join its efforts to increase the impacts of each and every intervention.

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

Decreased local human pressure on the biodiversity and natural resources in the Usuthu-Tembe-Futi and the Lubombo Conservancy Goba Transfrontier Conservation Areas of Mozambique and Swaziland.

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

Long-term impacts are unlikely measurable immediately after the project conclusion, as more time is actually needed for a project to show all its effects.

As per the present project, to ensure a decreased human pressure on the project areas, a joint effort from different stakeholders has to be put in place, as “human pressure” on the ecosystem is in general a result of different actions (i.e. sudden economic developments of the area, lack of sustainable alternative livelihoods, sudden increase of population, etc.) hardly carried out by a single actor.

Cesvi project worked hard in this direction, in order to ensure that all involved counterparts (Authorities, NGOs, CSOs, donors and private sector operators) could acknowledge their role and that of the others in the safeguard of biodiversity and natural resources, and to achieve long-lasting results.

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

1) The area of Goba, through the association Ntava Yedzu, will environmentally and economically benefit from an (eco) tourism-based economic activity within the communitarian conservation area

2) The conservation-oriented agencies currently working in the targeted area will have access to funds enabling them to carry on with the conservation work being implemented in the MPAH.

3) The conservation efforts carried out on both sides of the Mozambican - Swazi border in the MPAH will be coordinated and will actively interact at all levels

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

1) **Goba component.** The eco-tourism-based economic activity is still far from being established in Goba Community. The local association, Ntava Yezdu, lacked of the needed legitimacy and capacity to represent its community as a whole, there were unsolved contrasts between some of its members, and with some representative of the local authorities, and a widespread lack of commitment and agreement on the role that the association should play in the development context of Goba.

Said that, the basis for the development of such initiative were put by the present project, but in order to achieve the planned short term impact a more comprehensive intervention shall be planned. This intervention must take into consideration the solution of pending legal issues related to the establishment of NY, and of governance issues (i.e. election of new members according to the statute), the solution of the issue related to the land concession to a businessman, the elaboration of a capacity development plan for the association members (that should cover management aspects as well as environmental), and in general, it should ensure a wider involvement of Goba community in the development of initiatives in its area.

2) **Increased access to funds.** Despite several efforts were put in place during the implementation of the present project, to draw the attention of potential donors on the Matutine district and Goba, at the time of writing no new projects were funded to any of the organizations working in these areas.

However, this should not be considered as a failure, but as the beginning of a process that hopefully will bring new donors and funding in the areas. In order to reach this objective, several meetings were organized directly by Cesvi (other organizations present in the areas have, of course, lobbied on their own) with representatives of potential donor agencies (i.e. PAANE -

Programa de Apoio aos Actores Não Estatais, BioFund – Foundation for Biodiversity conservation, MozBio, German Cooperation - GIZ, MITUR, IUCN, Italian Cooperation)

3) **Coordination.** Several meetings and other events were organized to involve all the CEPF grantees in the MPAH.

All national concerned authorities were duly informed about the progress in the activities implementation. The Mozambican authorities at central and district level on the potential of cross-border tourism between Swaziland and Mozambique, and more broadly on the Usuthu-Tembe-Futi corridor have shown a growing support to the present initiative and to the others implemented in the area.

The following are the main meetings organized and attended during the project implementation:

- 1) Futi Consortium Steering Committee, March 31<sup>st</sup> 2014
- 2) Futi Consortium Steering Committee, April 28<sup>th</sup> 2014
- 3) Forum organized by TechnoServe in MSR, June 5<sup>th</sup> 2014
- 4) Goba meeting June 11<sup>th</sup> 2014
- 5) Goba meeting July 4<sup>th</sup> 2014
- 6) Goba meeting July 18<sup>th</sup> 2014
- 7) Futi Consortium Steering Committee, August 28<sup>st</sup> 2014
- 8) Goba steering committee, October 2<sup>nd</sup> 2014 (in the framework of the participatory mapping activity)
- 9) Matutuine development actors meeting, December 10<sup>th</sup> 2014.

Minutes and attendance sheet of the abovementioned meetings are available in Annexes 1 and 2.

At regional level, the forum organized by SANBI in October 2014, which was attended by several CEPF grantees, has provided the opportunity to improve the sharing of experiences and information about the activities being implemented in Mozambique, Swaziland and South Africa.

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

**Hectares Protected:** n/a

**Species Conserved:** n/a

**Corridors Created:** n/a

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

The actual implementation of the activities in Goba, represents an important success of this project. As mentioned before, and as it will be further explained, the unexpected developments of the situation in the project area during the months of June-August 2014 have jeopardized the implementation of the project to an extent that in August all appeared to be on the brink of a failure. The reasons of this success are to be found in the obstinacy of Cesvi staff in looking for a feasible and sustainable solution of all the problems arisen, the quality of the training provided and the interest of local authorities and of some members of NY to participate in the proposed trainings.

The activities which took place in Goba, in the revised and readapted form, paved the way to the short-term and long term impact objectives, though it became clear that a more comprehensive intervention would be needed to allow the achievement of the stated objectives.

In terms of challenges, the project has faced several major challenges towards achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.

As per components 1 and 3, the revised activities were implemented according to the plan, however some obstacles were encountered during the implementation, in particular:

A private company active in the sector of natural cosmetics, settled in NY educational centre right before the starting of the activities, and had a twofold impact on the smooth implementation of the activities: first of all, Cesvi field officer, who at the beginning was hosted for free in one of the rooms of the centre, was literally put out of the door when this company came in and offered NY some compensation for the rent of its premises, and secondly, they recruited some of the association members who were initially selected to attend the training. With reference to this last point, the selection of the training participants was done by NY and the Goba city council, which after a meeting held with Cesvi representative on September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014 decided that due to the internal and governance issues that NY was facing at the moment, it could have been more appropriate to have as well some members of the city council to attend the training.

The baseline level of knowledge of the selected participants that attended the activities influenced the mental mapping exercise results and the number and quality of the data collected in the field activities. The participants showed a low level of awareness and understanding of their own land than the expected one and a partial loss of the traditional knowledge, which has been considered lower than the expected one. However, since the trainings were not targeted to be at an advanced level, the consultant planned and organised the activities in such a way to tackle the expected obstacles and possible limitation, as the ones described.

Lastly, Ntava Yedzu no longer seemed to represent the interests of the whole community and also demonstrated some limited skills, unclear legal status and low power over land management.

With regard to the component 2 and in particular to the deliverable "At least three proposals, or 1 joint proposal, are prepared by Mozambican implementing agencies with the technical support of CESVI for donors different from CEPF", the different consortium partners submitted several proposals (4) to different donors (i.e. to EU, PPF, Italian MFA) but, even if assistance was repeatedly offered them, time constraints prevented the partners to ask Cesvi's support in developing the proposals and they preferred to directly submit their proposals.

However, Cesvi made every effort to get the partners involved in the development of other proposals both for Matutine district and for other provinces: one joint proposal was submitted by Cesvi and Oram, to CEPF for the East AfroMontane Hotspot, and another was submitted to the Italian MFA on Sofala (mainly on agriculture). An assessment was also started with Lupa for the development of another proposal in Matutine district in the field of eco-tourism.

Lastly, in terms of new risks emerged in the project area, it has to be highlighted that road and bridge development in Matutine district, coupled with the withdrawal of several NGOs (due to lack of funds), may jeopardize all the efforts made in recent years in terms of building the capacity of local communities in management of their natural resources in a sustainable way. Attracted by easy gains, communities - if not adequately supported - may decide to give away their land rights in exchange of monetary compensations or to reduce their vigilance on the conservation of biodiversity in their area.

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

N/A

## **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:** Increase in opportunities/access to economic benefits for the local communities engaged in natural resources-based economic activities

**Component 1 Actual at Completion:** this component underwent a significant review in the month of August 2014, when activities related to construction of latrines and other small

infrastructures, and Tourism/bird watching trainings were replaced by more basic training, designed to address the needs of NY members.

In particular, during the month of September 2014, together with Cospe (an Italian NGO working in Swaziland) a training on natural resources management and biodiversity conservation was designed.

The five days training were attended by three full-time members and other that attended only few sessions (See Annex 3a training attendance sheet, and annex 3b field visit attendance sheet). The course included indoor and outdoor activities aimed at enhancing the awareness and knowledge of local communities and creating the participatory map of Goba reserve. A mental mapping exercise was implemented to collect the perceptions about shared elements such as wild fruits, medicinal plants, timber and fuel wood, roofing material, opportunities for recreation & tourism, sacred places, sensitive areas. A first evaluation of perceived threats and biodiversity value was developed in order to mainly understand the baseline level of knowledge. Biodiversity related issues and some concepts about the natural resources sustainable management were introduced during the workshops and compared with Goba participants' experiences and with Mhlumeni representatives' knowledge.

During the field activities the participants collected information about the natural resources conditions and the current community land management, verifying some issues discussed during the previous workshops and gathering new material for the following workshops. Plants lists, charcoal production waypoints, some tourism attractions routes and places, ideas on a possible connection with Mhlumeni community were collected throughout three field surveys. Detailed information on these activities is available in Annex 5 participatory mapping report.

**Component 2 Planned:** Increase in funding and in technical and administrative capacity amongst the conservation- oriented agencies currently working in the targeted area

**Component 2 Actual at Completion:** despite many efforts were put in place at international level for the recognition of the Lubombo cross-border Conservation Area, on the Mozambican side the process appeared to have grind to a halt.

Due to an unexpected withdrawal of funds by the French government, the Mozbio program was revised in August and Goba area fell out of the priority list. Although recognized as an important area for eco-tourism development, the Lubombo-Goba, on the Mozambican side, could only be targeted as community conservation area. Despite this fact, it has to be noted that Mozambican authorities have subsequently endorsed the proposal submitted to the SADC for the development of Lubombo TFCA.

During the project implementation, Cesvi tried to get other potential donor involved in the Matutuine and Goba areas; meetings were held with PAANE (Programa de Apoio aos Actores Não Estatais funded by the European Union), BioFund (Foundation for Biodiversity conservation), MozBio Program Manager (World Bank/Mitur joint Program), German Cooperation (GIZ), Italian Cooperation, the French Development Agency, IUCN and Ministry of Tourism, to advocate the need of further intervention in the MPAH, and in particular in Matutuine District, and in Goba in order to extend the benefits of the present project.

The work done by Cesvi and its partners in MPAH was also presented at the Italian pavillon of the FACIM (Feira Internacional de Moçambique) in order to sensitize private investors on the need to include natural resources and biodiversity conservation in their Corporate Social Responsibility policies.

A pamphlet, in English and Portuguese, describing the intervention of CEPF grantees in the MPAH (see annex 6a and 6b) was designed and then distributed to EU, Italian Cooperation, French Development Agency, IUCN, WB, private investors. Copies of the pamphlet were also distributed to project partners for further dissemination.

In terms of new proposals developed for the project areas, the partners submitted on their own several proposals on the Matutuine District: for example, Lupa and Kuwuka submitted proposals to the PAANE (EU Non-State-Actors Thematic Program), while Cesvi and Lupa started drafting a 3 years project to be submitted to the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the sector of eco-tourism development. At the end, this last project proposal was not submitted for funding, since it became clear that a similar intervention was about to be started by PPF (Peace Parks Foundation) in the same areas and no full information was yet available to assess possible complementarity. However, the need assessment carried out will be used as a base to develop a new proposal for other potential donors when the actual scenario will be clearer. PPF was previously identified as an opportunity for the consortium partners for funding projects aimed at raising conservation and bio-diversity awareness, in fact both Lupa and Cesvi submitted their projects in 2013-14. However, in August 2014, PPF informed the partners that their proposals were not approved. Lastly, Cesvi and Oram submitted a joint proposal to CEPF for Manica province and to the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Sofala province.

**Component 3 Planned: Establishment of links between conservation initiatives carried out in the Mozambican and Swazi sides of the MPAH.**

**Component 3 Actual at Completion:** Due to the need of more information sharing among agencies operating in the Mozambican and Swazi sides of the MPAH, and the absence of any structured discussion among them, an informal committee of the main national and international stakeholders (LTFCA, Lubombo Conservancy, CESVI, COSPE, Lupa, Oram, Kuwuka, Vida, Mitur) was created during the implementation of this project (and those implemented by other CEPF implementers) with the aim of enhancing responsible management and conservation of natural resources of the Lubombo Transfrontiers Conservation Areas of Mozambique and Swaziland. This informal committee helped to put the basis for future developments in the area, in particular thanks to the commitment of Lubombo Conservancy and the inputs of all involved stakeholders, the interest of LTFCA and of Mozambican and Swazi authorities, a concept note was submitted to the SADC for the funding of a more comprehensive intervention on the Lubombo TransFrontier Area. Such informal committee has proved to be of outmost importance for the development of cross-country initiatives involving Mozambique, Swaziland and South Africa, since it can support in creating synergies among different partners in different countries and thus in leveraging investments from other donors interested to finance programs in the MPAH.

As per the others deliverable included in this component:

One **exchange visit** between the communities of Goba and Mhlumeni, was organized on October 2nd 2014, when two people from the Mhlumeni Community took part to the last training session on biodiversity conservation and natural resource management. The two communities were asked to share their view on the areas that actually belongs to both, and to describe availability, use and condition of natural resources on the two sides of the border.

As result of the activity, Goba community acknowledged that they do still have a long way to go before reaching the level of Mhlumeni with regard to conservation issues and eco-tourism development. Lack of awareness on the importance of biodiversity and, natural resources at large, was identified as the main risk for conservation of Goba reserve and surrounding area. Goba community members also stressed the fact that government should commit in a more comprehensive way to enforce rules and regulations.

One **steering committee** meeting was held on October 2nd 2014, in the framework of the training on natural resources and biodiversity conservation and was attended by representatives of: Mhlumeni community (2), Goba community (4) and Lubombo Conservancy (1), plus Cesvi and Cospe representatives. Invitations were sent as well to the major stakeholders involved in the LTFCA (LTFCA, MITUR, GIZ), but unfortunately, due to other commitments, they were not able to attend it.

However, the participation of some of the involved stakeholders to the Forum organized by SANBI allowed having a discussion on the future proposal to be submitted for the LTFCA.

A **participatory map** was produced during the five days training carried out by the selected Swazi counterpart. The participatory process aimed at promoting bottom-up decision-making processes that allowed the local community and local players to express their views and defining the development course for their own area. During the training activities two different mapping modalities were implemented: an indoor mapping (mental mapping) that enabled to collect participants' knowledge and perceptions, and an outdoor mapping (GPS surveys) that enabled to confirm or deny the information gathered through the mental mapping exercise. Throughout the mapping activities it was possible to collect information, then elaborated with GIS software, and therefore to create maps that simplified the reality allowing a clear and immediate "reading" of the natural resources condition. Out of the five routes covered during the field activities, only four may be used for tourism activities, because one encircles part of a sacred area, where access is limited to those authorized by the traditional leader:

- One route covers a cross-border trekking path: this route although connecting the two countries, did not appear to be of interest for tourism activities because of monotonous landscape
- The remaining three routes cover the Goba area, and proved to be rich of natural attractions and amazing viewpoints.

#### **Component 4 Planned: Coordination of the consortium "Consortio ambiental do Futi" and of the other CEPF partners in the Mozambican MPAH.**

**Component 4 Actual at Completion:** with reference to the Consorcio Ambiental do Futi, steering committees were held averagely every two months. The meetings offered the opportunity to share information and plans in the project area.

Moreover, representatives of these NGOs attended the forum organized by SANBI in Mpkweni and had the chance to discuss further development of MPAH with the main conservation-oriented agencies active in the area.

With reference to the other deliverable of this component, a basic matrix was developed during the months of October and November 2014 (See annex 7). Although Cesvi National Coordinator throughout explained to the different stakeholders (NGOs and private operators) the objective of the interview, the contacted private operators did never respond to our requests (basically because they feared that by sharing the information required they could result in a damage to their business), thus the data collected represent only the NGO sector.

As result of this interviews, it emerged that very few NGOs will keep on working in Matutuine district in 2015 due to lack of funding. This is the case especially in sectors like environment and natural resources, where needs are still great and several changes are undergoing; in particular, the bridge and road (Maputo-Ponta do Ouro) construction will pose new threats to the biodiversity of the area (i.e. increase of traffic, pollution, destruction of pristine environment) but may also bring some positive developments for the eco-tourism sector.

With reference to the coordination meeting to be held in the MSR, a preparatory meeting was held on October 22nd with the district Administrator, the director of SDAE and SDPI in order to organize the meeting in the MSR. During this meeting, the Administrator suggested to shift the venue of the meeting at the premises of the District Administration, in order to give more legitimacy to the event and ensure the participation of a wider audience (last meeting in the MSR was attended only by few NGOs representatives, and private sector was practically absent), also considering that in December the access to the MSR could have been hindered by the road conditions. The meeting was held on December 10th with the presence of 20 different stakeholders: the agenda, drafted together with the Matutuine Administration, included a presentation of the progress status of road and bridge construction, a discussion about the challenges/opportunities for the tourism sector and the role of the different stakeholders in



ensuring a sustainable development for the area. Although the attendance was higher than in the previous meeting held on June 5<sup>th</sup> 2014, the limited presence of NGOs and CSOs was considered as an alarming issue, taking into consideration the developments (positive and negatives) that are underway in the District; their absence was mainly due to the fact that, as per today, very few have concrete perspectives of intervention in Matutuine district for 2015.

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

All the components included in the original and in the revised proposal were realized, although some of them, as was previously explained, suffered from several limitations which have limited the impact of the project in the long term.

This is particularly true for the first component (Increase in opportunities/access to economic benefits for the local communities engaged in natural resources-based economic activities), where the activities implemented will not bring to, in the short-term any direct increase in opportunities/access to economic benefits for the local communities. In the long term, the new knowledge gained in the training sessions may bring to some relevant changes, in Cesvi opinion, only if duly supported for a longer time.

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

During the project implementation several methodologies and approaches were applied.

**Capacity building.** The training of NY members and other relevant stakeholders in Goba community were developed in such a way that, the trained beneficiaries will be able to transfer the newly acquired knowledge to other community members and therefore increase the number of project beneficiaries.

**Exchange visits.** The exchange visit of Mhlumeni and Goba community members proved to be a valuable tool for drawing the attention of Goba participants on the actual situation of their territory in terms of natural resource management and biodiversity conservation, in comparison with the level reached in the neighbouring area.

The **participatory mapping** methodology is usually applied to the different phases of the land planning process, generally consisting in an assessment phase (data collection, land mapping and analysis), a proposal phase (ideas/proposals collection and evaluation) and a implementation phase (proposals realization and monitoring). The project activities fell within the first step of the assessment phase and have contributed to engage stakeholder and motivate them to a new way of thinking about their community resources.

Similarly, the exercises introduced during the training activities (**learning by doing**) allowed to break the conventional educational model (frontal training) and ensure the participants' direct involvement. The theoretical phases were alternated with exercises and creative activities, simplifying when possible the working tools (for example using markers, coloured cards, clipboard rather than only projector and computer). Some outdoor activities were also carried out and enabled the participants to verify personally the discussed issues and understand them in depth.

**G.I.S. (Geographic Information System) and mapping activities.** The understanding of the natural resources health conditions, the identification of the land values and critical elements, the assessment of the different land use inclination often require specific and technical knowledge. Numerous factors and relations, often hidden or hardly recognizable, may affect the natural resources distribution, quantity and quality. Throughout the mapping activities it was possible to collect information later elaborated with GIS software in order to create maps that can simplify the reality complexity allowing a clear and immediate "reading" of the natural resources condition. During the project activities two different mapping modalities were implemented: an indoor mapping (mental mapping) that enable to collect participants' knowledge and perceptions, and an outdoor mapping (gps surveys) that enable to confirm or deny some information gathered through the mental mapping exercise. These two kind of mapping activities are complementary and represent together the base map of the training process.

List of annex attached to the present report:

- Annex 1 – Meetings\_attendance sheets
- Annex 2 – Meetings\_minutes
- Annex 3a – Training\_attendance sheets (indoor)
- Annex 3b – Training\_attendance sheets (outdoor)
- Annex 4 – Training\_minutes
- Annex 5a – Report\_participatory mapping and trainings
- Annex 5b - Map
- Annex 6a – Pamphlet\_en
- Annex 6b – Pamphlet\_pt
- Annex 7 – 3W Matrix
- Annex 8 – Car ownership transfer to MSR

## **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)***

A more structured and in depth assessment of organizational structure, capacity and representativeness should be carried out when engaging with local CSOs; the mere existence of a CSO in the project area cannot be taken as a warranty of its actual capacity to operate and to be recognized and accepted by the community at large. More in depth investigations should be carried out, although project speed and time not always allow it.

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

The Goba component of the project contributed to highlight some critical factors:

NY association was identified as possible counterpart after several meetings held with some of its member in the months preceding the project start; unfortunately, only after the beginning of the activities, it became clear that those interlocutors were not fully recognized by the community and by the local authorities and that their views on the development of Goba reserve were not shared by other community and association members (in particular, there was a widespread feeling that some of NY members were managing the association to their own benefit rather than to the benefit of Goba community)

Similarly, the fact that two communities share the same geographical area cannot be considered per se as an assurance that they share the same view on development, the same approaches, and even the same level of knowledge and awareness. Historical, political and even tribal differences should be more carefully assessed. During the exchange of experiences between the two communities (Goba and Mhlumeni) it appeared evident that the two had different levels of awareness on biodiversity and natural resources and as well different views on how eco-tourism can contribute to the development of their own area; Mhlumeni participants showed a more comprehensive understanding of which changes, positive and negative, can be brought in by tourism development, and in general they appeared more aware of the importance of ensure an adequate management of natural resources for the benefit of their community. On the other hand, Goba participants demonstrated the need of more structured interventions by the local authorities to enforce existing regulations and of a wider involvement of their community in awareness raising activities.

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

A wider involvement of local authorities is necessary to ensure that they take ownership of the interventions and to provide long-term sustainability to the interventions made in the area; this involvement should be pursued not only by the implementing agencies, but also by the donor community. In fact, to some extent, it appeared that local authorities (namely at district level) in Mozambique were not fully aware of the impact of the “big picture” of the CEPF investments in the Matutuine area and in the LTFCA. The consortium approach contributed to tackle this issue, in fact project partners were able to engage in productive discussions with local authorities with a single and stronger voice.

### 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

*\*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.*

The challenges described in relation with the achievement of short and long-term impact objectives, deeply affected the sustainability of the action as well.

In terms of replicability, the experience gained with this project could be useful for any other agency willing to start a transfrontier project, in particular with reference to the importance of carefully analysing the actual situation and the view on development, which different communities sharing a same geographical area may have. The fact that two different communities share the same geographical area cannot be considered per se as an assurance that their view on development, their approaches, their level of knowledge and awareness are the same. To replicate initiatives in different contexts, it is important to carefully assess historical, political and even tribal differences that may suggest the adoption of an approach or another.

For example, thanks to the participation of Cesvi staff in a training session organized in Mhulmeni community on participatory mapping by the Swazi partners, the risk to design a training adopting the same material and approaches used in Swaziland was avoided; although the two communities are actually bordering and there are different kind of exchanges (commercial, socials, and even families) between them, their level of understanding on natural resources and conservation issues were extremely different, as well as their approaches to community-based tourism.

*Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.*

N/A

### Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

N/A

### **Additional Comments/Recommendations**

The car purchased within the previous CEPF grant (61510) was donated, in agreement with CEPF Grant Director, on December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2014 to the Maputo Special Reserve Administrator, Mr. Armando Guenha (see annex 8)

### **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: Patrizia Gattoni  
Organization name: CESVI ONLUS  
Mailing address: via Broseta 68/A, Bergamo - Italia  
Tel: +39 035 2058058  
Fax: +39 035 260958  
E-mail: [patriziagattoni@cesvi.org](mailto:patriziagattoni@cesvi.org)

**\*\*\*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 March 1, 2014 to December 31, 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.	No			
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No			
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	9,000 Ha (Goba) 68,800 Ha (Futi corridor)	9,000 Ha (Goba) 68,800 Ha (Futi corridor)	The project contributes to the strengthening of biodiversity conservation and Natural resources management in the Goba reserve and Futi corridor, both part of the MPAH.
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	No			The promotion of sustainable use of natural resources in Goba community did not translate yet into accrued tangible socio-economic benefits.

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



