

	rights in the sector, and hinder the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the Action			
Risks related to the external environment	Political interferences on Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC), and/or pressures to revisit CITES.	Medium	Low	<p>Fostering support to livelihoods in vulnerable areas ensuring benefits from wildlife are reaped by rural populations.</p> <p>Introducing or supporting Government's strategies on compensation of human losses caused by conflicts with wildlife.</p> <p>Political dialogue enhanced to avoid mixed arguments and misleading communications.</p>
Risks related to the external environment	Insufficient capacity of national institutions, which may also be related to distribution of competencies within the administration.	Low	Medium	The Action addresses this through substantial capacity building and support to local levels of the administration, where coordination between different government entities and stakeholders can be easier to materialize.

Lessons Learnt:

One of the main lessons learnt from the ending 11th EDF interventions is the need to coordinate interventions through a landscape approach and avoid isolated sectorial interventions that, despite of occurring in the same landscape, do not interact with each other and opportunities of collaboration were lost.

In this sense, a comprehensive analysis of landscapes and its ecological functionality and linking specialized implementing partners along the landscape will deliver into more coherent and solid interventions, along a gradient of intensification of land uses. Starting from purely conservation-biodiversity management, where human habitation is restricted (including tourism and/or safari industry in some cases) towards some more diversified interventions, based on other uses and different degrees of landscape transformation. This will contribute to long term sustainability and lesser dependency on livelihood-related interventions.

Law enforcement and combatting illegal trade of wildlife needs to come together with the support to the livelihood of rural inhabitants, which has not always been the case. Urgent is the need to avoid communities feeling detached from their wildlife populations due to unresolved human-wildlife conflict (HWC) disputes. Poorest rural areas should be the first to benefit from the existence of healthy wildlife populations and not bear the cost of preserving them, at the expense of their economies or even of individual's personal integrity. The support to government entities in the area of biodiversity conservation needs to cover both central and local level administrations, and has to be linked to the support to rural communities living in the wildlife areas

The support to resilience building of rural populations made use of a donor basket –ZRBF- which has proven to be an adequate vehicle to channel different funding and respond to development challenges in a holistic way. However, ZRBF was a very ambitious programme, encompassing eighteen districts and adding up financial resources amounting to nearly USD 100 million. The budget of this Action is much lower, so a downsizing is required to ensure adequate degree of impact. Moreover, is imperative to synergize interventions and ensure complementarity along the landscapes and between sectors.

The current situation in Zimbabwe justifies the support to local administration: the low level of devolution of funding arriving at local administration levels from estate entities results in shortages of funding and in difficulties to fulfil