
DIR29IN\1114

A new tool for advancing locally led conservation

To combat the biodiversity crisis, governments, NGOs and donors are advocating a stronger role for communities, requiring, at scale, a shift in the balance of authority/power towards “locally-led” conservation (LLC). But there is no tool to assess the balance of authority/power at site level and guide necessary changes. The project, with partners in the Philippines and Kenya (marine) and Nepal and Uganda (terrestrial), will develop and demonstrate such a tool, and its potential contribution to national and global conservation objectives.

Section 1 - Contact Details

PRIMARY APPLICANT DETAILS

Name Phil
Surname Franks
Tel (Work) [REDACTED]
Email (Work) [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

GMS ORGANISATION

Type	Charity/ trusts
Name	International Institute for Environment and Development
Phone (Work)	[REDACTED]
Email (Work)	[REDACTED]
Website (Work)	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Section 2 - Project Summary, Ecosystems, Approaches and Threats

Q3. Title





A new tool for advancing locally led conservation

Q4a. Is this a resubmission of a previously unsuccessful application?

No

Please attach a cover letter.

Please include a response to any previous feedback in your cover letter.

 [Cover letter](#)
 07/11/2022
 16:02:41
 pdf 135.54 KB

Q5. Key Ecosystems, Approaches and Threats

Please select up to 3 biomes that are of focus, up to 3 conservation actions that characterise your approach, and up to 3 threats to biodiversity you intend to address, from dropdown lists.

Biome 1

Tropical-subtropical forests

Biome 2

Marine shelves (seagrass, reefs, subtidal)

Biome 3

Savannas and grasslands

Conservation Action 1

Land/water protection (area/resource/habitat)

Conservation Action 2

Land/water management (area, invasive control, restoration)

Conservation Action 3

Law & policy (legislation, regulations, standards, codes, enforcement)

Threat 1

Agriculture & aquaculture (incl. plantations)

Threat 2

Biological resource use (hunting, gathering, logging, fishing)

Threat 3

Other threats

Q6. Summary of project

Please provide a brief summary of your project: the problem/need it is trying to address, its aims, and the key activities you plan on undertaking. Please note that if you are successful, this wording may be used by Defra in communications e.g. as a short description of the project on the website.

Please write this summary for a non-technical audience.

To combat the biodiversity crisis, governments, NGOs and donors are advocating a stronger role for communities, requiring, at scale, a shift in the balance of authority/power towards "locally-led" conservation (LLC). But there is no tool to assess the balance of authority/power at site level and guide necessary changes. The project, with partners in the Philippines and Kenya (marine) and Nepal and Uganda (terrestrial), will develop and demonstrate such a tool, and its potential contribution to national and global conservation objectives.

Section 3 - Dates & Budget Summary

Q7. Project Country(ies)

Which eligible country(ies) will your project be working in? Where there are more than 4 countries that your project will be working in, please add more boxes using the selection option below.

Country 1 Philippines

Country 2 Kenya

Country 3 Uganda

Country 4 Nepal

Do you require more fields?

No

Q8. Project dates

Start date:

01 April 2023

End date:

31 March 2025

Duration (e.g. 1 year, 8 months):

24 months

Q9. Budget Summary

Darwin Funding Request	2023/24	2024/25	Total request
------------------------	---------	---------	---------------

(Apr - Mar) £

██████████

██████████

██████████

Q10. Proportion of Darwin Initiative budget expected to be expended in eligible countries: %

████

Q11a. Do you have proposed matched funding arrangements?

Yes

What matched funding arrangements are proposed?

A preparatory phase for this project - November 2022-March 2023 - to revise and further elaborate the current IUCN framework on PCA governance type is currently being funded by the German Agency for International Cooperation GmbH (GIZ), the UNEP-World Conservation monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), and the IUCN Commission for Economic, Environmental and Social Policy (CEESP).

GIZ has indicated interest in providing further support to this initiative, notably for activities 3.3-3.7 of this project which will boost the impact of this project beyond the 4 focal countries. Funding for this addition to the project is highly likely but not yet confirmed.

The staff time of each of the in-country partners - estimated 25 days over two years - will be a contribution in kind.

Q11b. Total confirmed & unconfirmed matched funding (£)

██████████

Q11c. If you have a significant amount of unconfirmed matched funding, please clarify how you will fund the project if you don't manage to secure this?

Activities 3.3-3.7, though contributing to the overall impact goal, are not required for delivering the project outcome which is focused on the four focal countries. These activities are shown in grey rather than black in the logframe and workplan.

While funding from GIZ for activities 3.3-3.7 presents a major opportunity to deliver substantial additional impact at a global level, the lack of it will not affect the project outcome.

Section 4 - Darwin Objectives and Conventions

Q12. Problem the project is trying to address

Please describe the evidence of the problem your project is trying to address in terms of biodiversity and its relationship with poverty. What is the need, challenge or opportunity?

For example, what are the drivers of loss of biodiversity that the project will attempt to address? Why are they relevant, for whom? How did you identify these problems? Please cite the evidence you are using to support your assessment of the problem (references can be listed in a separate attached PDF document).

Other than where protected areas (PAs) rely on military-style law enforcement, it is widely recognised that stronger engagement of communities that live within and around PAs is essential for effective biodiversity conservation, and for impact on poverty through reducing the negative impacts of protection measures on livelihoods, enhancing conservation's positive impacts, and respecting human rights.

From a macro-level global perspective, progress in fostering stronger community engagement in conservation has been limited, as noted in the review of progress on Aichi Target 11 of the last strategic plan of the CBD, and in the recent IPBES Global Assessment. Another recent review notes that conservation initiatives where communities have full management authority are often more successful in conservation terms. In response, governments, NGOs and donors are calling for more emphasis on conservation approaches led by Indigenous Peoples (IPs) and local communities (LCs) where finance goes direct to IPLC organisations and authority/power lies largely or wholly with IPLCs.

The parameter that indicates the balance of authority/power in area-based conservation is "governance type". This is defined in IUCN guidance, but the IUCN framework of PCA governance types which has remained unchanged for more than 25 years, defines just four types: governance by government, governance by communities, governance by private sector, and co-management/shared governance - where two or more stakeholders share authority/power. In preparation for this project, a task force of the IUCN WCPA and CEESP commissions is currently reviewing and further elaborating this framework to include 3 sub-types under each main governance type.

Conservation agencies often design their policy and projects to empower communities but then undermine this by imposing conditions (eg resources harvested from a PA should be used only for subsistence purposes) and may be unaware of local elites over-riding the interests of other community members. Scratch the surface of what looks like locally led conservation (LLC) and you often find governments and NGOs and/or local elites largely in control, in other words a major disconnect - implementation gap - between policy and practice.

This project covers four countries. We have selected Uganda (comanaged forest PAs) and Kenya (community-managed inshore fisheries) as examples of a major implementation gap while the gap is much smaller with comanaged PAs in Nepal and community managed fisheries in the Philippines.

To resolve the implementation gap we need a credible method of assessing the balance of authority/power between the different actors that have interest and influence in a PCA - in other words the governance type. Furthermore, since power balance plays out in several different domains of governance - decision-making, access to information, accountability and rights, the assessment must cover these different domains. At the moment there is no such tool, but since the concept of governance type was first developed 25 years ago, conservation practitioners and researchers have gained a great deal of knowledge and experience that makes it possible to now develop and apply this tool - the purpose of this project.

Q13. Biodiversity Conventions, Treaties and Agreements

Q13a. Your project must support the commitments of one or more of the agreements listed below.

Please indicate which agreement(s) will be supported.

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

Q13b. National and International Policy Alignment

Using evidence where available, please detail how your project will contribute to national policy (including NBSAPs, NDCs, NAPs etc.) and in turn international biodiversity and development conventions, treaties and agreements that the country is a signatory of.

This project should make a significant contribution to the CBD Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) and in turn NBSAPs that will be aligned with the GBF as follows.

GBF target 3 (30*30 target) includes the condition that protected and other types of conserved area (PCAs) should be equitably governed. The indicator for this target that governments must report on is coverage in km² of different types of PCAs. An early draft of the GBF specified that PCA coverage should be disaggregated by PCA governance type. The CBD Secretariat then dropped this, but the proposal has since been revived through the efforts of Forest Peoples Programme and IIED (See annex 1). Assuming that it is reinstated, using the tool developed by this project it will be possible to determine, for a given country, the proportion of the total area of PCAs having more equitable forms of governance, and genuinely locally led governance in particular, and trends over time. Civil society actors could also use the tool to verify (or otherwise) the reporting of their government.

In order for an indicator to be adopted by the GBF and then in NBSAPs, it must fulfil certain criteria – notably there must be a robust method for data collection that has been peer-reviewed. At present there is no such method for PCA governance type but by the end of year 1 our project aims to demonstrate this method sufficiently for disaggregation of PCA coverage by governance type to be accepted as an addition to the GBF monitoring framework.

More broadly, the framework of governance types and subtypes on which the tool is based, and assessment results, will enable national level policy-makers engaged in NBSAPs to better understand the important but neglected concept of PCA governance type.

Section 5 - Method, Innovation, Capability & Capacity

Q14. Methodology

Describe the methods and approach you will use to achieve your intended Outcome and contribute towards your Impact. Provide information on:

- How you have reflected on and incorporated **evidence and lessons learnt** from past and present similar activities and projects in the design of this project.
- The specific approach you are using, supported by **evidence that it will be effective, and justifying why you expect it will be successful** in this context.
- How you will undertake the work (activities, materials and methods).
- What the **main activities** will be and where will these take place.
- How you will **manage the work** (governance, roles and responsibilities, project management tools, risks etc.).

Please make sure you read the guidance documents, before answering this question.

IIED is a global leader on PCA governance. We have developed two tools (GAPA and SAGE) for stakeholder-led assessment of governance quality - the extent to which governance of a PCA of any governance type meets principles of good governance - which have now been used at 60 sites across 25 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe.

In developing GAPA and SAGE, IIED and our partners have generated a great deal of new knowledge about the process of governance assessment and indicators of governance quality and governance type. This gives us real confidence that we can develop a simple tool to characterise PCA governance type.

The outcome of the project will be proof of concept in terms of a) that the tool works as intended, b) interest from other

sites appears to be sufficient to drive scaling up with resources they can themselves access and c) needs for external technical support are minimal and can be provided virtually. To deliver this the project has three components/outputs:

1. A prototype tool created, tested at one site in each country, and improved
2. A further improved tool developed through testing, learning and adapting in two more sites in each country, plus a strategy for roll out and supporting materials.
3. Evidence of the tools' potential for enhancing conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting locally-led conservation co-produced and effectively communicated at national and global levels

For this tool to be successful it will need to be universal yet adaptable to the context where it is used and have broad ownership. Our experience suggests the best way to achieve this is a tool development process led by a task force with a wide spectrum of different interests and perspectives ranging from mainstream conservation agencies to groups focused on IPs and human rights. The Task Force will be a joint initiative of the Specialist Groups on Governance, Equity and Rights of the WCPA and CEESP commissions of IUCN (see their supporting letters), convened by IIED.

This Task Force is currently being established with support from GIZ and will have developed an expanded governance typology and draft indicators of power balance by the start of this project (April 2023) which will form the analytical framework for the assessment tool. Members of the Task Force will then develop the multi-stakeholder assessment process and, drawing on SAGE, a questionnaire template including indicators relevant to all sites plus some tailored to the context of the site. Following each cycle of field-testing the task force will review the experience and assessment results and recommend improvements, as far as possible building and maintaining a consensus that will help ensure wide-ranging buy-in for the tool.

As well as convening and facilitating the work of the Task Force, the role of IIED will be management and technical support for the tool development and testing process in the four focal countries, designing and coordinating the action research agenda and project monitoring and evaluation, and communications including 3 blogs and a limited number of publications.

Q15. Innovation

Please specifically outline how your approach or project is innovative.

Is it the application of a proven approach in a distinctly different geography/issue/stakeholder (novel to the area), or in a different sector (novel to the sector), or an unproven approach in any sector (novel to the world)?

A recent systemic mapping exercise of literature on PA governance type and its correlation with conservation outcomes found no study that classified governance type beyond the basic four types – by government, by private sector, by community, and shared. Furthermore, recent work by IIED and others reveals that many sites where the approach is described as community-based (NR management, forest management, conservation) and thus assumed to be community governance are in reality some form of shared governance because government agencies and/or private investors retain substantial control. With growing political and financial support for a major expansion of “locally-led conservation”, there is a serious concern that existing shared governance approaches will be rebranded as locally led.

Clearly there is a real need for a tool that can determine governance type (power balance) in reality. IIED is a leader in this field and we have not yet come across any such tool, let alone a tool that can distinguish the difference between different forms of shared governance (sub-types). This project directly addresses this gap. As far as we know this will be the first tool designed to assess the reality of power balance in conservation, to do this from the perspective of community men and women as well as with conventional governance indicators, and with a level of precision that will detect incremental change in power balance over time as a PCA moves from one governance sub-type to another.

Q16. Capability and Capacity

How will you support the strengthening of capability and capacity in the project countries at organisational or individual levels? Please provide details of what form this will take, who will benefit, and the post-project value to the country.





The project will engage partners in four countries in the Global South with one staff member from each becoming a member of the WCPA/CEESP Task Force that will be guiding this project. This will give them un-paralleled exposure to the growing community of conservation practitioners and social scientists working on the topic of equitable governance of PCAs with the tool development process of this project being at the cutting edge of this work.

In the four countries the tool testing process will build the capacity of all those engaged in the process (around 30 per site) to have a much better, more nuanced understanding the concept of PCA governance type, including not only decision-making but also other domains of governance where power balance is clearly expressed (information access, accountability, rights).

Following this project there will be a roll out phase in each of the four countries which will extend use of the tool to a substantial portion of all PCAs in the country sufficient to stimulate a national scale progress towards more locally led conservation. This project will position our national partners at the forefront of this process in their country, building their individual capacity and the capacity of their organisations on this important and increasingly relevant and high-profile topic.

More broadly this project will spearhead efforts of WCPA and CEESP commissions of IUCN to build their members capacity on PCA governance type and using the tool developed by this project to distinguish the rhetoric and reality of locally led conservation and identify policy to practice implementation gaps.

If necessary, please provide supporting documentation e.g. maps, diagrams, references etc., as a PDF using the File Upload below:

 [Annex 1](#)
 07/11/2022
 17:46:54
 pdf 224.99 KB

Section 6 - Gender, Awareness, Change Expected & Exit Strategy

Q17. Gender equality

All applicants must consider whether and how their project will contribute to reducing inequality between persons of different gender. Explain your understanding of gender equality within the context your project, and how is it reflected in your plans. Please summarise how your project will contribute to reducing gender inequality. Applicants should, at a minimum, ensure proposals will not increase inequality and are encouraged to design interventions that proactively contribute to increased gender equality.

This project aims to be gender transformative – the highest level of gender ambition – meaning that it addresses structural constraints to gender equality rooted in power imbalance in society.

The framing of locally led approaches was first elaborated by IIED and others in the context of climate change adaptation - see <https://www.iied.org/principles-for-locally-led-adaptation>. Central to locally led approaches is addressing structural inequalities faced by women, youth, children, disabled, displaced, Indigenous Peoples. As with the IIED's SAGE tool, the power balance assessment tool developed and validated by this project will use a process where community women and men conduct the assessment in separate groups and then share their findings with other stakeholder groups, giving them a voice that they may not normally have – see <https://www.iied.org/site-level-assessment-governance-equity-sage>. With SAGE we now have a growing number of examples of how such a process generates a consensus that women should be better represented in decision-making processes and have better access to information in appropriate forms, and action to bring this about.

As an initiative that explicitly addresses gender-based inequality rooted in power imbalance, this project will provide a great example of gender-transformative assessment and action in the context of conservation, providing case study material for capacity building on this topic by other initiatives at national and international levels. At country level the project partners will engage In the international arena the project will engage the Women's Caucus of the CBD called Women4Biodiversity.

Q18. Awareness and understanding

How will you raise awareness and understanding of biodiversity-poverty issues in your stakeholders, including who your stakeholders are, what approaches/formats/products will you use, how you will ensure open and free access to all data, and how will you know that the messages are understood?

Poverty and vulnerability are fundamentally a symptom of weak, inequitable governance which in turn reflects structural power imbalances in society. Poverty caused by conservation action (e.g. lost access to resources) and the often disappointing performance of conservation action in contributing to poverty reduction are no exception.

The growing political and financial support for locally-led conservation that we are now seeing has the potential to enable a genuine paradigm shift, particularly with respect to conservation beyond existing protected area systems (ie achieving the 30*30 target) – albeit a last-ditch attempt to combat the biodiversity crisis where conventional approaches are failing.

There is much talk of transformative change in conservation, and many actors interpret this as ramping up ambition. IPBES in its recent Global Assessment says that transformative change will require transformative governance. In essence, this means changing the balance of power in conservation, and the way to do this with the management and governance of PCAs is changing the PCA governance type.

Using concepts and frameworks already well known in conservation and our simple tool, this project will enable conservation practitioners in the focal countries to much better understand the concept of PCA governance type, its roots in the balance of power, and how to transition PCA governance to a model that is genuinely locally led.

Assuming we secure the additional funding for activities 3.3-3.7, the project will launch a similar process at the global level at the World Parks Congress in 2024 which will extend this understanding to a much wider audience.

Q19. Change expected

Detail the expected changes to both biodiversity and poverty reduction, and links between them, this work will deliver. You should identify what will change and who will benefit a) in the short-term (i.e. during the life of the project) and b) in the long-term (after the project has ended) and the potential to scale the approach.

When talking about how people will benefit, please remember to give details of who will benefit, differences in benefits by gender or other layers of diversity within stakeholders, and the number of beneficiaries expected. The number of communities is insufficient detail – number of households should be the largest unit used.

By the end of the project our tool for assessing governance type/power balance in conservation will have been used at a total of at least 12 PCA across four countries, 50% marine (Kenya and Philippines) and 50% terrestrial (Nepal and Uganda).

We expect that the assessments will, particularly at sites in Kenya and Uganda, reveal that communities have less authority/power in terms of rights, decision-making, access to information and/or holding those with responsibilities to account than national policy and law enables, ie a sizeable “implementation gap”. Although this small project cannot support implementation of actions to narrow this gap, we know that actors at some sites will, as we see with our SAGE tool, take action of their own accord on some aspects of the implementation gap. Specifically, we expect improvements in women’s participation in decision making and access to information - in both cases at least 600 indirect beneficiaries over 12 sites.

In terms of biodiversity conservation there is no chance of changes in governance leading to detectable change in ecological indicators in just two years, but the growing evidence that governance arrangements that are more genuinely locally-led can reduce levels of illegal activities leads us to expect some evidence of this from some sites (indicator 0.3 - reduction in unauthorised resource use that should improve conservation outcomes).

More significant than change at these 12 sites is expected to be impact of this over the medium to longer term (5-10 years) as the tool becomes more widely used in each country, evidence grows of implementation gaps that cannot be written off as isolated exceptions, and government agencies and NGOs respond with gap closure measures that deliver more

equitable governance, and genuine locally led conservation.

A much larger impact of this project - though less certain - will be if proof of concept of the governance type assessment tool does indeed lead to governance type being added to the Headline Indicator for GBF Target 3 as discussed earlier. This would require that every country uses the tool with at least a sample of their PCAs to calibrate their own classification of governance type and then report to CBD on the % of PCA coverage of each type and trends over time. Perhaps more likely is that major donors will require their grantees to use the tool to help identify the extent to which their investments are genuinely meeting their commitments to locally led conservation. Either way by leveraging impact through WCPA and CEESP commissions of IUCN and the UK government and other major donors promoting locally led conservation, this project could prove to be a catalyst for change at a scale far larger than might seem realistic for such a small project. As indicated in the top right on of the theory of change, this could be as many as 5000 PCA sites across 50 countries sites by 2030.

Q20. Pathway to change

Please outline your project's expected pathway to change, including how your outcome can be scaled. This should be an overview of the overall project logic and outline why and how you expect your Outputs to contribute towards your overall Outcome and, longer term, your expected Impact.

This should directly relate to your overall project's Theory of Change which must be uploaded alongside your application. See the separate [Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Guidance](#) for further information on your Theory of Change.

Over the last 25 years efforts to promote more equitable governance types have mainly been to change from one main type to another. For example, in 2003 Madagascar committed to transform all PCAs to shared governance. However, such major changes of governance type have been rare and have frequently run into trouble when supporting NGO projects came to an end.

Using our new tool, this project promotes a different approach – incremental change where an existing PCA transitions through governance sub-types towards more locally-led conservation, starting with closing any existing implementation gap between authority actually devolved to local communities and the intent of policy.

At least one of the three sites in each country will be one not yet recognised as a PCA. Here the tool will be used to design a governance arrangement that is locally led from the start based on what already exists, and then check the balance of authority/power a year after establishment.

If the evidence from this project helps to convince CBD parties to disaggregate reporting of PCA coverage by governance type then the rate of scaling up of the tool is likely to be much faster as indicated in the previous section.

Q21. Exit strategy

How will the project reach a sustainable point and continue to deliver benefits post-funding?

Will the innovation be mainstreamed into “business as usual” to continue to deliver the benefits? How will the required capability and capacity remain available to sustain the benefits? How will your approach, if proven, be scaled? Are there any barriers to scaling and if so, how will these be addressed?

In each of the four focal countries there should, by the end of the project, be sufficient evidence of the benefits of the tool and in-country capacity to use the tool for gradual scaling up to other sites in country to continue without further support.

At some, but not all, PCAs we expect there will be a need for some follow-up actions to close implementation gaps and there is no reason to assume any such progress will be lost as soon as the project ends. But this whole process of promoting locally-led conservation will be challenging certain vested interests in maintaining the status quo. Especially where revenues from resource use are significant, political support and other enabling conditions for using the tool and

follow-through may evaporate.

While impact can be sustained without a follow-on project, such a project could be very beneficial in at least four ways:

1. Providing virtual technical support for new users where needed
2. Developing a facilitating a community if practice for peer-to-peer learning and mutual encouragement.
3. Support applied research to gather evidence of the benefits of LLC in terms of conservation outcomes
4. Engaging with ongoing work on the GBF monitoring framework for Target 3 (30*30 target) to try to ensure inclusion of governance type and assist with the interpretation of results if/when data on coverage by governance type staett to be reported by some countries.

Activity 2.3 is about designing and securing funding for a “Technical Support Unit” which could be hosted by IUCN, IIED or another agency on behalf of the Task Force. We see this as being a relatively small scaling up project with a budget of £300k over 3 years.

Section 7 - Risk Management

Q22. Risk Management

Please outline the 6 key risks to achievement of your Project Outcome and how these risks will be managed and mitigated, referring to the [Risk Guidance](#). This should include at least one Fiduciary, one Safeguarding Risk, and one Delivery Chain Risk.

Projects should also draft their initial risk register, using the [Risk Assessment template](#), and be prepared to submit this when requested if they are recommended for funding. Do not attach this to your application.

Risk Description	Impact	Prob.	Gross Risk	Mitigation	Residual Risk
Fiduciary (financial) Corruption and fraud carried out by staff or partners.	Major	Possible	Major	Review of project management process to clarify roles and responsibilities for assessing risk of corruption on IIED projects. Training for all staff (Finance completed March 2020), online training to be identified and rolled out. Anti-fraud & Bribery policy to be updated to Anti-Corruption Policy, due by end June 2020	Moderate
Safeguarding The use of assessment tools brings to the fore underlying conflict between groups of actors (eg communities vs government bodies), which could lead to open conflict (eg protest, damage to infrastructure, threats to individual's wellbeing).	Moderate	Possible	Moderate	Project partners will be required to use feasibility criteria (already established and tested) to assess the risk of conflict at a protected or conserved area before beginning work. Where key risks are identified, feasibility criteria will not be met, and the protected or conserved area will not be included in	Moderate

Delivery Chain Funds granted to IIED or sub-granted by IIED may be used for purposes that do not comply with the financial guidance of the Darwin Fund. Note that subgrants will only be £20k per partners	Moderate	Unlikely	Moderate	IIED has shared its organisational documents and financial reports as evidence of our financial responsibility. All IIED partners proposed in this project are known and contracted in accordance with our financial policy. There will be close financial monitoring throughout the project with an external audit at project close.	Minor
Risk 4 GIZ unable to provide co-finance	Minor	Possible	Minor	This is a minor risk as only a risk at all in the sense that it will limit the potential to deliver more impact than is indicated by the project targets. To some extent we will be able to mitigate this risk with limited funds from IIED, WCPA and CEESP.	Minor
Risk 5 Inability to secure funds for a follow-on project	Moderate	Possible	Minor	This is always a risk with a short project focused on innovation that has major scaling up potential but will need additional resources to realise this potential – in this case at least £300k over 3 years. We will proactively build donor interest from the beginning of year 2	Minor
Risk 6 Political instability in one or more of the four target countries	Major	Unlikely	Minor	Not likely in Kenya but possible in Uganda, Nepal and Mindanao, Philippines where our partner is based. Since field testing is a small element of the project we could easily switch field-testing to another country. IIED has many country level partners interested in this work	Minor





Section 8 - Implementation Timetable

Q23. Provide a project implementation timetable that shows the key milestones in project activities

Provide a project implementation timetable that shows the key milestones in project activities. Complete the Word template as appropriate to describe the intended workplan for your project and upload this below as a PDF.

[Implementation Timetable Template](#)

Please add/remove columns to reflect the length of your project. For each activity (add/remove rows as appropriate) indicate the number of months it will last, and fill/shade only the quarters in which an activity will be carried out.

 [Project implementation timetable](#)
 07/11/2022
 18:23:49
 pdf 110.34 KB

Section 9 - Monitoring and Evaluation

Q24. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)

Describe how the progress of the project will be monitored and evaluated, making reference to who is responsible for the project's M&E.

Darwin Initiative projects are expected to be adaptive and you should detail how the monitoring and evaluation will feed into the delivery of the project including its management. M&E is expected to be built into the project and not an 'add on'. It is as important to measure for negative impacts as it is for positive impact. Additionally, please indicate an approximate budget and level of effort (person days) to be spent on M&E (see [Finance Guidance](#)).

The logframe summarises the project M&E plan. This will be further elaborated into a more detailed M&E plan in the first 3 months of the project. The project M&E system will be managed by the project manager

For output-level indicators 1.1 to 1.4 and outcome indicators 0.1, and 0.4, the M&E information will be easy to collect from existing documents and other secondary information.

Outcome indicator 0.2 (indirect contributions to human wellbeing of PCA governance becoming more locally-led), will be more challenging and use the outcome harvesting method that IIED developed and applied in an earlier Darwin-funded project. This method is based on interviews with key actors to identify changes in different aspects of governance. For the more significant outcomes, these will be supplemented with focus group discussions including participatory impact assessment tools (cattley et al) to provide quantitative data, for example on numbers of households impacted, and tackle issues of attribution versus other initiatives.

The third element of 0.2 will use indicators of change in the balance of authority/power that have been developed by local community members themselves. These will be selected and adapted from a list of such indicators that is being developed by Indigenous Peoples and Local community members of the Task Force guiding this project.

Outcome indicator 0.3 (reduction in incidents of illegal activities within the PCA) is a widely used proxy for conservation outcomes where it is unlikely that there will be any measurable change in ecological indicators within the project lifetime. Since even the outcome harvesting method is unlikely to detect changes within a year of a governance intervention, we will simply use focus group discussions to identify the extent to which a selection of stakeholders believe change in governance type might deliver reduction in illegal activities and evidence that supports their assumptions.

In addition to monitoring outputs and outcomes of the project (ie within the dashed box in the Theory of Change) the assumption that proof of concept of the tool will encourage other sites in each country to use the new tool beyond the 3 testing sites will be carefully monitoring under activity 3.1.

If additional funding for activities 3.3-3.7 is secured, then this add-on will also include monitoring of use of the tool beyond the four target countries and impact of project generated evidence on development of the GBF monitoring framework.

M&E activities will be disaggregated throughout to understand the impacts (positive and negative) of SAGE assessments and actions on key actor groups (e.g. women, poorer households, Indigenous Peoples).

Data from participating PCAs will be added to the Global Database on PA Governance and Equity (GD-PAGE) being

developed by the EU's Joint Research Centre and IIED. This will eventually be hosted by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre, thus contributing to its use in monitoring progress against the post 2020 GBF targets.

Total project budget for M&E (this may include Staff and Travel and Subsistence Costs)	██████████
Percentage of total project budget set aside for M&E	█
Number of days planned for M&E	44

Section 10 - Logical Framework





Q25. Logical Framework (logframe)

Darwin Initiative projects will be required to monitor and report against their progress towards their Outputs and Outcome. This section sets out the expected Outputs and Outcome of your project, how you expect to measure progress against these and how we can verify this.

[Logframe Template](#)

Please complete your full logframe in the separate Word template and upload as a PDF using the file upload below - please do not edit the logframe template structure (other than adding additional Outputs if needed) as this may make your application ineligible. On the application form, you will be asked to copy the Impact, Outcome and Output statements and activities - these should be the same as in your uploaded logframe.

Please upload your logframe and Theory of Change as a combined PDF document.

-  [A new tool for advancing locally-led conservation - logframe and ToC](#)
-  07/11/2022
-  18:27:02
-  pdf 283.89 KB

Impact:

At least 500 PCAs across 20 countries have used the tool and 40% reporting significant shifts in the balance of power towards IPLCs and corresponding benefits for people and nature

Outcome:

Proof of concept for an effective and readily replicable tool for assessing PCA governance type in both terrestrial and marine contexts, including early indications of conservation becoming more locally led.

Project Outputs

Output 1:

A prototype tool created, tested at one site in each country, and improved

Output 2:

A further improved tool developed through testing, learning and adapting in at least two more sites in each country, and a strategy and supporting materials for roll-out.

Output 3:

Evidence of the tools' potential for enhancing conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting locally led conservation has been co-produced and effectively communicated at national and global levels

Output 4:

No Response

Output 5:

No Response

Do you require more Output fields?

It is advised to have less than 6 Outputs since this level of detail can be provided at the activity level.

No

Activities

Each activity is numbered according to the Output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1.

- 1.1 From the membership (c 20 people) of the WCPA/CEESP Governance Type Task Force (GTTF) identify 4 countries and collaborators in each with interest and capacity to field test the tool, and establish a Whatsapp group of these collaborators for sharing experience
- 1.2 Hold a hybrid workshop of GTTF to develop the first prototype tool (indicators and process) and refine the projects monitoring, evaluation and learning system – 3 days in person for the four field-testing collaborators, virtual participation for others.
- 1.3 Collaborators field-test the tool at one site in each country (round 1 field testing)
- 1.4 Hold a virtual workshop of the GTTF to reflect on the field-testing experience and modify the tool as necessary to produce Beta version – core group two days, other members up to one day.
- 1.5 Develop a draft users' manual for the Beta version of the new tool to support round 2 field testing
- 2.1 Plan round 2 field-testing for at least two additional sites per country
- 2.2 Collaborators conduct round 2 field-testing in at least two additional sites per country
- 2.3 Hold an in-person workshop of the whole GTTF (20 people) to reflect on experience to date (June 2024) and make further adaptations to the tool (indicators and process) to create version 1.
- 2.4 Develop a users' manual and virtual training package for version 1 of the tool that will be rolled out post project
- 2.5 Develop a strategy for rollout and engage donors to secure funding for a technical support facility
- 3.1 Conduct applied research on impact pathways and enabling conditions for roll out based on focus groups and key informant interviews with actors at testing and other adopting sites, and higher levels.
- 3.2 Prepare an IIED Working Paper and Briefing on experience and results that validate the tool, make recommendations for enabling roll out, and support advocacy on the importance of PCA governance type and quality for conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting locally led conservation

Section 11 - Budget and Funding

Q26. Budget

Please complete the appropriate Excel spreadsheet, which provides the Budget for this application. Some of the questions earlier and below refer to the information in this spreadsheet.

Note that there are different templates for projects requesting under £100,000 and over £100,000. Please refer to the Finance Guidance for more information.


- [Budget template for projects under £100k](#)


- [Budget template for projects over £100k](#)

Please ensure you include any co-financing figures in the Budget spreadsheet to clarify the full budget required to deliver this project.

NB: Please state all costs by financial year (1 April to 31 March) and in GBP. The Darwin Initiative cannot agree any increase in grants once awarded.

Please note the next section is about the financial aspects of your project, rather than technical elements.

 [IIED A new tool for advancing IPLC-led conservation Budget Darwin format \(1\)](#)

 07/11/2022

 16:55:27

 xlsx 89.57 KB

Q27. Funding

Q27a. Is this a new initiative or does it build on existing work (delivered by anyone and funded through any source)? Please give details.

- Development of existing work

Please give details.

The WCPA/CEESP Task Force which guides this project is currently being established with support from GIZ and will have developed an expanded governance typology and draft indicators of power balance by the start of this project (April 2023). This will form the analytical framework for the assessment tool. Other than this five month preparation phase, this is an entirely new initiative.

Q27b. Are you aware of any current or future plans for similar work to the proposed project?

- No

Q28. Capital items

If you plan to purchase capital items with Darwin funding, please indicate what you anticipate will happen to the items following project end. If you are requesting more than 10% capital costs, please provide your justification here.

None

Q29. Value for Money

Please demonstrate why your project is good value for money in terms of impact and cost-effectiveness of each pound spend (economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity).

ECONOMY

The main cost categories of this project are:

Field testing [REDACTED]

Workshops of the tool development task force [REDACTED]

National consultants for applied research [REDACTED]

IIED staff and overheads

Partner costs are low because the staff cost of project partners is a contribution in kind from their other projects working

on governance.

There will be two international workshops, the first at a low-cost venue in Kenya and participants other than the partners will participate virtually. The second will use low-cost university accommodation in the UK, and participants from international agencies cover their own travel costs.

Although IIED staff costs are quite high, the project leader and manager are highly experienced, well known governance experts, able to provide the best possible support.

EFFICIENCY

Economy of scale comes from there being four country partners whose role is exactly the same. Furthermore, we have two donors interested in supporting additional activities and funding 1-2 additional countries with as much as £80k though we assume £40k. These leveraged funds that expand the project without additional management cost will increase both the efficiency and effectiveness of the project.

EFFECTIVENESS

This project has huge impact potential in responding to a) strong interest from both national and global conservation agencies (see support letters) and b) an identified gap in the GBF monitoring framework (see annex 1). If the tool is as effective and low cost as we expect, our target number of 500 PCAs seeing results after 5 years could be exceeded by 5X.

Section 12 - Outputs, Open Access, Ethics & Safeguarding

Q30. Safeguarding

Projects funded through the Darwin Initiative must fully protect vulnerable people all of the time, wherever they work. In order to provide assurance of this, projects are required to have appropriate safeguarding policies in place.

Please confirm the Lead Partner has the following policies in place and that these can be available on request:

We have a safeguarding policy, which includes a statement of our commitment to safeguarding and a zero tolerance statement on bullying, harassment and sexual exploitation and abuse	Checked
We have attached a copy of our safeguarding policy to this application	Checked
We keep a detailed register of safeguarding issues raised and how they were dealt with	Checked
We have clear investigation and disciplinary procedures to use when allegations and complaints are made, and have clear processes in place for when a disclosure is made	Checked
We share our safeguarding policy with all partners	Checked
We have a whistle-blowing policy which protects whistle blowers from reprisals and includes clear processes for dealing with concerns raised	Checked
We have a Code of Conduct in place for staff and volunteers that sets out clear expectations of behaviours -- inside and outside the work place -- and make clear what will happen in the event of non-compliance or breach of these standards	Checked

Please outline how you will implement your safeguarding policies in practice and ensure that all partners apply the same standards as the Lead Partner. If any partner of the responses are "no", please indicate how it is being addressed.

The project will have an inception workshop for key staff of all partners with a session devoted to the concept of safeguards and specifically the safeguard policies that apply to this project. Thereafter at all quarterly meetings of the partners there will be a regular agenda item to check in on any safeguard issues.

Q31. Ethics

Outline your approach to meeting the key principles of good ethical practice, as outlined in the guidance.

To ensure compliance with legal and ethical obligations in the UK and the four target countries, the project will be screened through IIED's Research Ethics and Data Protection review procedure under its policy on 'Integrity and Ethics in Research, Partnership and Policy Engagement'. This seeks to protect the health and safety of project staff; the rights, privacy and safety of informants and beneficiaries; and the credibility of research findings. To comply with data protection legislation, data will be anonymised. The project will not collect or commercially use any information collected through use of the governance type assessment tool that it is developing.

A Free Prior and Informed Consent process will be conducted prior to the start of field-testing at a new PCA that is supported by the project, and all information collected by the assessment and subsequent progress monitoring will be communicated in summary form back to those who participated in the process and the people they represent. This is a key element of the governance assessment process which will help to institutionalise key ethical considerations.

Section 13 - FCDO Notifications

Q32. FCDO notifications

Please state if you think that there are sensitivities that the Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office will need to be aware of should they want to publicise the project's success in the Darwin Initiative in any country.

No

Please indicate whether you have contacted FCDO Embassy or High Commission to discuss the project and attach details of any advice you have received from them. If you have not, please say why not.

No

Why not?

With sub-grants of just £20k per country and to countries with no significant problems we take the view that they will not be interested.

Section 14 - Project Staff

Q33. Project staff

Please identify the core staff (identified in the budget), their role and what % of their time they will be working on the project.

Please provide 1-page CVs or job description, further information on who is considered core staff can be found in the Finance Guidance

Name (First name, surname)	Role	% time on project	1 Page CV or job description attached?
----------------------------	------	-------------------	--

Phil Franks	Project Leader	7	Checked
Barbara Lassen	Project manager	25	Checked
Joy Molina Mirasol	Project lead - Philippines	6	Checked
Lenice Atieno Ojwang	Project lead - Kenya	6	Checked


Do you require more fields?


Yes


Name (First name, surname)	Role	% time on project	1 Page CV or job description attached?
Medard Twinamtsiko	Project lead - Uganda	6	Checked
Pradeep Budhathoky	Project lead - Nepal	6	Checked
<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>	0	Unchecked
<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>	0	Unchecked
<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>	0	Unchecked
<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>	0	Unchecked
<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>	0	Unchecked
<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>	0	Unchecked


Please provide 1 page CVs (or job description if yet to be recruited) for the project staff listed above as a combined PDF.

Ensure the file is named clearly, consistent with the named individual and role above.

 [11308 all CVs](#)

 07/11/2022

 15:25:57

 pdf 539.07 KB

Have you attached all project staff CVs?

Yes

Section 15 - Project Partners

Q34. Project Partners

Please list all the Project Partners (including the Lead Partner – i.e. the partner who will administer the grant and coordinate the delivery of the project), clearly setting out their roles and responsibilities in the project including the extent of their engagement so far and planned.

This section should demonstrate the capability and capacity of the Project Partners to successfully deliver the project. Please provide Letters of Support for all project partners or explain why this has not been included.

The partners listed here should correspond to the Delivery Chain Risk Map (within the Risk Register template) which you will be asked to submit if your project is recommended for funding.

Lead Partner name: International Institute for Environment and Development

Website address: <https://www.iied.org/>

Why is this organisation the Lead Partner, and what value to they bring to the project?
(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

IIED has a long history of applied research on natural resource governance. In the last 8 years this research has increasingly focused on the governance of protected and conserved areas (PCAs), and the related issue of equity, including the development of a framework of principles of equitable governance that was endorsed by CBD parties at COP14. Based on this set of principles IIED has developed two tools (Governance Assessment for Protected and conserved Areas - GAPA and Site Assessment of Governance and Equity -SAGE) for stakeholder-led assessment of governance quality. Those tools have now been used by 45 PCAs across 22 countries and with the success of this tool IIED has become recognised as a global leader on equitable governance of PCAs. With this profile IIED has not only the technical competence to lead this project but also strong convening and networking capability with both large international agencies and an increasing number of national NGOs that have been involved in development and testing of governance and equity assessments. IIED will be responsible for project leadership, coordination, monitoring & evaluation and training and mentoring of the four national partners. In addition, IIED will lead development of applied research activities to develop this new tool.

International/In-country Partner International

Allocated budget (proportion or value): ██████████

Represented on the Project Board Yes

Have you included a Letter of Support from the organisation? Yes

Do you have partners involved in the project?

Yes

1. Partner Name: Bukidnon State University, The Philippines

Website address: www.buksu.edu.ph

What value does this Partner bring to the project?

This partner has been collaborating with IIED on PCA governance assessment for more than 7 years including using our GAPA tool at 2 sites and SAGE tool at 2 sites.

Dr Joy Mirasol will participate in the Task Force that will provide overall guidance to the project and develop the tool, organise field tests of the tool at 3 marine PCAs in Mindanao and contract and oversee action research on enabling conditions for scaling up the tool.

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

International/In-country Partner

In-country

Allocated budget:



Represented on the Project Board

Yes

Have you included a Letter of Support from this partner?

Yes

2. Partner Name:

Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Uganda

Website address:

www.must.ac.ug

What value does this Partner bring to the project?

This partner has been collaborating with IIED on PCA governance assessment for more than 5 years including using our GAPA tool at 2 sites in Uganda.

Dr Medard Twinamatsiko will participate in the Task Force that will provide overall guidance to the project and develop the tool, organise field tests of the tool at 3 terrestrial PCAs in Uganda and contract and oversee action research on enabling conditions for scaling up the tool.

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

International/In-country Partner

In-country

Allocated budget:



Represented on the Project Board

Yes

Have you included a Letter of Support from this partner? Yes

3. Partner Name: Coastal Oceans Research and Development Indian Ocean

Website address: www.cordioea.net

What value does this Partner bring to the project? This partner has been collaborating with IIED on PCA governance assessment for more than 5 years including using our GAPA tool at 1 site and SAGE tool at one site on the coast of Kenya.

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

Dr Lenice Ogwang will participate in the Task Force that will provide overall guidance to the project and develop the tool, organise field tests of the tool at 3 marine PCAs in Kenya and contract and oversee action research on enabling conditions for scaling up the tool.

International/In-country Partner In-country

Allocated budget: 

Represented on the Project Board Yes

Have you included a Letter of Support from this partner? Yes

4. Partner Name: RECOFTC Centre for People and Forests - Nepal

Website address: www.recoftc.org

What value does this Partner bring to the project? This partner is a renowned centre of expertise of natural resource governance in Asia that has been collaborating with IIED on PCA governance for more than 8 years including using our SAGE tool at one site in Nepal.

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

Dr Pradeep Budathoki will participate in the Task Force that will provide overall guidance to the project and develop the tool, organise field tests of the tool at 3 terrestrial PCAs in Nepal and contract and oversee action research on enabling conditions for scaling up the tool.

International/In-country Partner In-country

Allocated budget: 

Represented on the Project Board Yes

Have you included a Letter of Support from this partner? Yes

5. Partner Name: IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)

Website address: <https://www.iucn.org/our-union/commissions/world-commission-protected-areas>

What value does this Partner bring to the project? WCPA is the largest global network of 2500 experts covering all key issues related to conservation of protected areas and other area-based approaches to biodiversity conservation.

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity): WCPA Specialist Group on Governance, Equity and Rights (co-chaired by Phil Franks of IIED) will take the lead on convening the Task Force that will guide this project. WCPA will provide key opportunities for the work of this project to be presented at global fora including the World Parks Congress of 2024.

International/In-country Partner International

Allocated budget: 0

Represented on the Project Board Yes

Have you included a Letter of Support from this partner? Yes

6. Partner Name: IUCN Commission on Environment Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)

Website address: <https://www.iucn.org/our-union/commissions/commission-environmental-economic-and-social-policy>

What value does this Partner bring to the project? CEESP is the centre of expertise in IUCN that led all the original work on PCA governance type in the period 1990-2010 before WCPA became engaged. Like WCPA, CEESP has a specialist group Governance, Equity and Rights which has strong engagement of academics with research interests in this area (complementing WCPA member which are mostly practitioners).

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity): CEESP members will make up 50% of the Task Force that will guide this project. Like WCPA, CEESP will provide key opportunities for the work of this project to be presented at global fora including the World Parks Congress of 2024.

International/In-country Partner International

Allocated budget: 0





Represented on the Project Board Yes

Have you included a Letter of Support from this partner? Yes

If you require more space to enter details regarding Partners involved in the project, please use the text field below.

No Response

Please provide a combined PDF of all letters of support.

 [11308 all letter of support](#)
 07/11/2022
 18:03:36
 pdf 1.23 MB

Section 16 - Lead Partner Track Record

Q35. Lead Partner Capability and Capacity

Has your organisation been awarded Darwin Initiative, Darwin Plus or Illegal Wildlife Trade Challenge Fund funding before (for the purposes of this question, being a partner does not count)?

Yes

Please provide details of the most recent awards (up to 6 examples).

Reference No	Project Leader	Title
25-006	Phil Franks	Enhancing equity and effectiveness of protected areas conservation
DARNV009	Dilys Roe	Developing and testing a sustainability assessment framework for wildlife use
IWT060	Dilys Roe	LeAP: Learning and Action Platform for Community Engagement Against IWT
IWT036	Dilys Roe	Implementing park action plans for community engagement to tackle IWT
25-015	Francesca Booker	Why Eat Wild Meat?
28-017	Krystyna Swiderska	Establishing a biocultural heritage territory to protect Kenya's Kaya Forests

Have you provided the requested signed audited/independently examined accounts?

If yes, please upload these on the certification page. Note that this is not required from Government Agencies.

Yes

Section 17 - Certification

Q36. Certification

On behalf of the

Company

of

International Institute for Environment and Development

I apply for a grant of







I certify that, to the best of our knowledge and belief, the statements made by us in this application are true and the information provided is correct. I am aware that this application form will form the basis of the project schedule should this application be successful.





(This form should be signed by an individual authorised by the applicant institution to submit applications and sign contracts on their behalf.)





- I have enclosed CVs for key project personnel, a cover letter, letters of support, a budget logframe, theory of change, Safeguarding Policy and project implementation timetable.
- Our last two sets of signed audited/independently verified accounts and annual report (or other financial evidence - see Financial Guidance) are also enclosed.

Checked





Name	James Mayers
Position in the organisation	Director, Natural Resources Group
Signature (please upload e-signature)	 James JPEG  07/11/2022  18:40:08  jpg 12.89 KB
Date	07 November 2022

Please attach the requested signed audited/independently examined accounts.

 [IIED A new tool for advancing IPLC-led conservation Trustee Report & Accounts 21-22](#)
 07/11/2022
 13:26:09
 pdf 0 B

 [IIED A new tool for advancing IPLC-led conservation Trustees Report & Accounts 20-21](#)
 07/11/2022
 13:26:05
 pdf 0 B

Please upload the Lead Partner's Safeguarding Policy as a PDF

 [IIED A new tool for advancing IPLC-led conservation Safeguarding Policy \(2021\)](#)
 07/11/2022
 13:26:16
 pdf 0 B

Section 18 - Submission Checklist

Checklist for submission

I have read the Guidance, including the "Guidance Notes for Applicants", "Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Guidance", "Risk Guidance" and "Finance Guidance".	Checked
I have read, and can meet, the current Terms and Conditions for this fund.	Checked
I have provided actual start and end dates for my project.	Checked
I have provided my budget based on UK government financial years i.e. 1 April – 31 March and in GBP.	Checked
I have checked that the budget is complete, correctly adds up and I have included the correct final total at the start of the application.	Checked
The application has been signed by a suitably authorised individual (clear electronic or scanned signatures are acceptable).	Checked
I have attached the below documents to my application:	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none">my completed logframe as a PDF using the template provided	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">my 1 page Theory of Change as a PDF which includes the key elements listed in the guidance	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none">my budget (which meets the requirements above)	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none">my completed implementation timetable as a PDF using the template provided	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none">1 page CV or job description for all the Project Staff identified at Question 32, including the Project Leader, or provided an explanation of why not.	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none">a letter of support from the Lead Partner and partner(s) identified at Question 33, or an explanation of why not.	Checked

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a cover letter from the Lead Partner, outlining how any feedback received at Stage 1 has been addressed where relevant. 	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a copy of the Lead Partner's safeguarding policy, which covers the criteria listed in Question 29. 	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a signed copy of the last 2 annual report and accounts for the Lead Partner, or provided an explanation if not. 	Checked
(If copying and pasting into Flexi-Grant) I have checked that all my responses have been successfully copied into the online application form.	Checked
I have been in contact with the FCDO in the project country(ies) and have included any evidence of this. If not, I have provided an explanation of why not.	Checked
I have checked the Darwin website immediately prior to submission to ensure there are no late updates.	Checked
I have read and understood the Privacy Notice on the Darwin Initiative website.	Checked

We would like to keep in touch!

Please check this box if you would be happy for the lead applicant (Flexi-Grant Account Holder) and project leader (if different) to be added to our mailing list. Through our mailing list we share updates on upcoming and current application rounds under the Darwin Initiative and our sister grant scheme, the IWT Challenge Fund. We also provide occasional updates on other UK Government activities related to biodiversity conservation and share our quarterly project newsletter. You are free to unsubscribe at any time.

Checked

Data protection and use of personal data

Information supplied in the application form, including personal data, will be used by Defra as set out in the **Privacy Notice**, available from the [Forms and Guidance Portal](#).

This **Privacy Notice must be provided to all individuals** whose personal data is supplied in the application form. Some information may be used when publicising the Darwin Initiative including project details (usually title, lead partner, project leader, location, and total grant value).

Project Title: **A new tool for advancing locally led conservation**

	SMART Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Impact: (By end 2030): At least 500 PCAs across 20 countries have used the tool and 40% reporting significant shifts in the balance of power towards IPLCs and corresponding benefits for people and nature.</p>			
<p>Outcome (By end of project): Proof of concept for an effective and readily replicable tool for assessing PCA governance type in both terrestrial and marine contexts, including early indications of conservation becoming more IPLC-led.</p>	<p>0.1. At least 12 PCAs in 4 countries are using the tool, 0.2. Indirect contribution to human well-being: - At least 600 community women and/or IPs have more influence over PCA-related decision-making - At least 600 community women and 300 men have better access to PCA-related information - At least 450 community men and women reporting a change in power balance in their favour based their indicators of locally led conservation 0.3. Reduction in unauthorised resource use that can be expected to improve conservation outcomes 0.4. The tool has been recommended for rollout by the Governance, Equity and Rights Specialist Group of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Area</p>	<p>0.1 Reports from collaborators 0.2 Outcome harvesting plus one focus group discussion at each testing site. 0.3 One focus group discussion at each of the 3 testing sites 0.4 IUCN WCPA Newsletter</p>	<p>In the 5 years following the project, use of the tool extends to at least 20 countries through IUCN's WCPA and CEESP commissions and other peer-to-peer networks and endorsement by at least 2 major international conservation agencies For roll-out to additional countries, donor funding of at least £300k can be secured for a technical support unit</p>
<p>Outputs: 1. A prototype tool created, tested at one site in each country, and improved</p>	<p>1.1. First prototype tool developed and basic manual 1.2. First prototype tested at 1 site in each country and 4 site reports produced 1.3. Second prototype of the tool developed and a revised users' manual 1.4. At least 200 peer-to-peer messages on the Whatsapp group in the first year</p>	<p>1.1 Peer review of the tool and manual 1.2 Peer review of site reports from country level collaborators 1.3 Peer review of the tool and manual 1.4 Review Whatsapp communication of year 1</p>	<p>Two additional countries added to the portfolio with support from IUCN-WCPA members and other donors GIZ supports activities 3.3-3.7 Actors at 50% of the 12 sites are motivated by the assessment results to take some action towards making governance more locally led. We see this is our work with our SAGE tool and so believe it to be a fair assumption.</p>
<p>2. A further improved tool developed through testing, learning and adapting in at least two more sites in each country, and a strategy and supporting materials for roll-out.</p>	<p>2.1 Second prototype tool tested in at least 2 sites in each of the 4 countries 2.2 Version 1.0 of the tool, users' manual and virtual training package developed</p>	<p>2.1 Peer review of site reports from collaborators 2.2 Peer review of version 1, manual and virtual training package 2.3 Review strategy and materials</p>	

Project Title: A new tool for advancing locally led conservation

	<p>2.3 Roll-out strategy and supporting materials developed</p> <p>2.4 At least 400 peer-to-peer WhatsApp messages in the second year</p>	<p>2.4 Review WhatsApp communication of year 2</p>
<p>3. Evidence of the tools’ potential for enhancing conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting locally-led conservation has been co-produced and effectively communicated at national and global levels.</p>	<p>3.1. Number, type and quality of communications materials produced by IIED, in country collaborators and GTTF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - at least 3 blogs - at least 2 articles in WCPA and/or other relevant newsletters - IIED working paper and Briefing <p>3.2. Number of mentions of the tool in descriptions of events at the World Parks Congress 2024</p>	<p>3.1 Review of communication materials</p> <p>3.2 Search for the name of the tool in programmes for the 2024 World Parks Congress</p>
<p>1.1 From the membership (c 20 people) of the WCPA/CEESP Governance Type Task Force (GTTF) identify 4 countries and collaborators in each with interest and capacity to field test the tool, and establish a Whatsapp group of these collaborators for sharing experience</p> <p>1.2 Hold a hybrid workshop of GTTF to develop the first prototype tool (indicators and process) and refine the projects monitoring, evaluation and learning system – 3 days in person for the four field-testing collaborators, virtual participation for others.</p> <p>1.3 Collaborators field-test the tool at one site in each country (round 1 field testing)</p> <p>1.4 Hold a virtual workshop of the GTTF to reflect on the field-testing experience and modify the tool as necessary to produce Beta version – core group two days, other members up to one day.</p> <p>1.5 Develop a draft users’ manual for the Beta version of the new tool to support round 2 field testing</p> <p>2.1 Plan round 2 field-testing for at least two additional sites per country</p> <p>2.2 Collaborators conduct round 2 field-testing in at least two additional sites per country</p> <p>2.3 Hold an in-person workshop of the whole GTTF (20 people) to reflect on experience to date (June 2024) and make further adaptations to the tool (indicators and process) to create version 1.</p> <p>2.4 Develop a users’ manual and virtual training package for version 1 of the tool that will be rolled out post project</p> <p>2.5 Develop a strategy for rollout and engage donors to secure funding for a technical support facility</p> <p>3.1 Conduct applied research on impact pathways and enabling conditions for roll out based on focus groups and key informant interviews with actors at testing and other adopting sites, and higher levels.</p> <p>3.2 Prepare an IIED Working Paper and Briefing on experience and results that validate the tool, make recommendations for enabling roll out, and support advocacy on the importance of PCA governance type and quality for conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting IPLC-led conservation</p> <p>3.3 Prepare and update a communication plan including plan for the World Parks Congress 2024</p> <p>3.4 Prepare a WCPA publication on the revised framework of PCA governance type, PCA governance quality and their inter-relationship illustrated with results from using the new tool for governance type and SAGE for governance quality.</p> <p>3.5 Prepare and publish a policy brief on why IPLC-led conservation needs attention to PCA governance type and governance quality alongside financing</p> <p>3.6 Events at the World Parks Conservation Congress 2024 and CBD COP16</p>		