



Submit by Monday 24 October 2011

DARWIN INITIATIVE APPLICATION FOR GRANT FOR ROUND 18: STAGE 2

Please read the Guidance Notes before completing this form. Where no word limits are given, the size of the box is a guide to the amount of information required. Information to be extracted to the database is highlighted blue.

1. Name and address of organisation (NB: Notification of results will be by post to the Project Leader)

Name: Prof. Nicholas Polunin	Address: School of Marine Science & Technology, Ridley Building, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU
-------------------------------------	---

2. Project title (not exceeding 10 words)

Responding to fish extirpations in the global marine biodiversity epicentre

3. Project dates, duration and total Darwin Initiative Grant requested, matched funding

Proposed start date: 1 April 2012		Duration of project: 4 years			End date: 31 March 2016	
Darwin funding requested	2011/12 £0	2012/13 £62649	2013/2014 £45255	2014/15 £85857	2015/16 £100390	Total £294151
Proposed (confirmed and unconfirmed) matched funding as percentage of total Project cost:						
26%						

4. Define the purpose of the project (extracted from logframe)

Vulnerable marine finfish species identified in 5 key marine biodiversity areas; changes in abundance of reef finfish families and fishery target species modelled for 5 key marine biodiversity areas; capacity of LGUs and POs for local resource management in conservation site enhanced; conservation needs reconciled with sustainable livelihoods; policy recommendations made at local, national and international levels

5. Principals in project. Please provide a one page CV for each of these named individuals. You may copy and paste this table if you need to provide details of more UK personnel or more than one project partner.

Details	Project Leader	Other UK personnel (working more than 50% of their time on project)	Main project partner and co-ordinator in host country/ies
Surname	Polunin	To be appointed	Lavides
Forename (s)	Nicholas		Margarita Nerier
Post held	Professor		Assistant Professor
Institution (if different to above)		Newcastle University	Ateneo De Manila University
Department	School of Marine Science & Technology	School of Marine Science & Technology	Environmental Science
Telephone			
Email			

6. Has your organisation received funding under the Darwin Initiative before? If so, please provide details of the most recent (up to 6 examples).

Reference No	Project Leader	Title
162/13/027	AJ Edwards	Developing Reserves for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Fisheries in Rodrigues

7. IF YOU ANSWERED 'NO' TO QUESTION 6 describe briefly the aims, activities and achievements of your organisation. (Large institutions please note that this should describe your unit or department)

Aims (50 words)
Activities (50 words)
Achievements (50 words)

8. Please list all the partners involved (including the Lead Institution), and explain their roles and responsibilities in the project. Describe the extent of their involvement at all stages, including project development. This section should illustrate the capacity of partners to be involved in the project. Please provide written evidence of partnerships. Please copy/delete boxes for more or fewer partnerships.

Applicant institution and website where available: Newcastle University (NU)	Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): NU has international standing in interdisciplinary marine science, both teaching and research. NU played a key role in developing the ideas for and writing the proposal through its School of Marine Science & Technology (MAST), where the Marine Ecosystem Dynamics Group has a 35 year track record in tropical marine ecology and fisheries management research (http://research.ncl.ac.uk/fish) and 25 years' experience in teaching and supervising projects in tropical coastal management http://www.ncl.ac.uk/marine/postgrad/taught/tropical.htm). NU will contribute its scientific excellence in planning, conducting and interpreting social and underwater fisheries-related surveys, and staff time to field research, training dissemination and outreach activities. Lead institution leader Prof. Nicholas Polunin's CV is attached.
Lead Partner and website where available: Ateneo De Manila University (ADMU)	Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): The premier Philippines university ADMU will through its Environmental Science Department (http://www.ateneo.edu/depts/es/) contribute personnel, facilities and expertise in fishery surveys. Its pilot study around Bohol (Lavides et al. 2010) largely informed this proposal and the team there has more than a decade of experience in community-based marine conservation, in particular with the Haribon Foundation and its network, including work on the Lanuza Bay pilot site for 5 years. Partner leader Dr Margarita Lavides' CV is attached.

Partner Name and website where available: Haribon Foundation for the Conservation of Natural Resources (HF)	Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): The oldest Philippines environmental NGO, HF is committed to preserving nature and life through community empowerment and scientific excellence (http://www.haribon.org.ph/). HF pioneered community-based approaches in Philippines marine conservation, and will contribute services, its experience and personnel especially to local training, sustainable livelihoods work and policy development in the conservation site at Lanuza Bay, where it has been working since 2002 through Packard Foundation, MacArthur Foundation, European Union and Spanish Government funding (2002-2011). Trust of local stakeholders in HF has already been established through these projects, and HF will contribute its deep understanding of local communities in the project areas. The Lead Partner has worked extensively with and for HF, including with the HF staff member who will participate in the project, Mr Gregorio Escobar de la Rosa, Jr (CV attached).
---	--

9a. Have you consulted stakeholders not already mentioned above? Yes No
If yes, please give details:

The fisherfolk organization Namanaka/Kaampaka was consulted, and a special meeting considered and ultimately agreed to support this project and gather inputs from among its officers and members regarding its status and directions of the organization in relation to sustainable livelihoods and capacity building. These inputs largely informed the relevant components of this proposal. The project has been discussed with the chair of the Lanuza Bay Development Alliance (LBDA, local government unit federation).

9b. Do you intend to consult other stakeholders? Yes No
If yes, please give details:

The project will be discussed with the other LBDA officers and representatives of the Bay from the start to initiate a stakeholder-led approach together with: Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources/National Fisheries Research and Development Institute (BFAR/NFRDI) [data sharing and national policy development for threatened fish species]; Department of Environment and Natural Resources-Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (DENR-PAWB) [next generation NBSAP, compliance with CBD commitments]; local NGOs Project Seahorse (Danajon Bank, Bohol), Institute of Social Order (Pollilio Group of Islands), ELAC (Honda Bay, Palawan) and Tambuyog Development Foundation (Lanuza Bay)[all for site coordination, data sharing, local policy development; Tambuyog specifically for capacity building and sustainable livelihoods]; International NGOs WWF-Philippines and Conservation International Philippines (Palawan and Verde Island Passage, respectively)[both for site coordination, data sharing and local policy development]. Such relationships have been tested through work such as the previous pilot study in Bohol which helped to highlight the urgency of testing for fishery extirpations elsewhere in the country.

9c. Have you had any (other) contact with the government not already stated? Yes No
If yes, please give details:

The BFAR in 13 Philippine regions shared fisheries landings data for 1998-2002, the inadequacy of which highlighted the value of fishermen's knowledge. At an October 2011 fishery research strategy consultation including stakeholders, in which the HF partner Mr de la Rosa participated, marine fish extinction was voted in the top 4 priority research items for the research agenda of the BFAR/NFRDI. The project has been discussed with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources Coastal and Marine Management Office (DENR-CMMO) which has indicated interest in funding collaboration on it.

9d. Will your project support any work in the UK Overseas Territories? Yes No
If yes, please give brief details stating which Territory/ies will be involved.

PROJECT DETAILS

10. Please provide a Concept note (Max 1,000 words) (repeat from Stage 1, with changes highlighted)

The Philippines lies in the global marine biodiversity epicentre, coral reefs are the most biodiverse marine ecosystem (e.g. 50% marine fish species in <0.01% of ocean area), and the ecological footprint of Philippines reef fishing is the fourth highest among island nations, yet the implications of this intensive use for marine biodiversity are scarcely known. Philippine marine fisheries landings are declining but the trajectories of even the most vulnerable species are scarcely known because landings data alone are insufficient in detail and time span to explore possible extinctions. Which species are being lost and where, and reference points for possible future recovery are unclear. Threatened also by other anthropogenic and related impacts (e.g. blast fishing, climate-related coral bleaching), this internationally important biodiversity is very vulnerable, together with the environmental services (e.g. nutrition, poverty alleviation) which it delivers. Fish local extinctions have been detected in pilot studies off Bohol Island by the principal partners (Lavides et al. 2010) and these ideas need urgently to be tested more widely in the country. Only fishers' knowledge can now possibly access a 40-50 year time span and the ca. 3000 reef fish species involved, but time is running out if knowledge of the 1940s and 1950s is to be confidently captured. Gathering this knowledge has the added benefit of furthering understanding, collaboration and trust between scientists, NGOs and the fishing communities involved. Hence, the Bohol pilot fishers' knowledge surveys (Lavides et al. 2010) will be rolled out to five key marine biodiversity areas of the country, including Verde Island Passage (reputed world epicentre of shorefish diversity), Palawan, the Pollilio Group of Islands, Danajon Bank and Lanuza Bay. The project will:

- 1) **Determine which fish species** are threatened at the five locations, through capturing fishers' knowledge and well-replicated underwater survey (Targets 6, 10, 18). The interview protocol, and survey design of Lavides et al. (2010) will be rolled out to the 5 new study sites to analyse fishers' knowledge of species absences and derive socio-economic data on the fisheries. Diver-based underwater visual census data on shallow water fishery target species presence-absence using widely-used methods will be gathered and the data similarly analysed. A list of vulnerable fish species will be drafted. Five ADMU and HF personnel will be trained in design and application of fisheries surveys, database management and data analysis during a two month stay in Newcastle, and they will routinely apply these techniques under supervision from Newcastle across the life time of the project.
- 2) **Ascertain temporal abundance trends of fish species and groups** and see how these trends vary among the five areas using fishers' retrospective knowledge of abundances on decadal scales. Bureau of Fisheries & Aquatic Resources (BFAR) and National Fisheries Research & Development Institute (NFRDI) temporal landings data will also be analysed, and new project underwater survey data will be compared with existing data (e.g. Danajon Bank 1997-present, Lanuza Bay 2002-2009) to further assess changes over time. Spatial variations in these trends will be compared across the three datasets, using a mixed-methods approach and statistical modelling similar to that employed in the Lavides et al. (2010) study, to identify which of the candidate species have substantially declined or disappeared, and assess drivers of this, particularly climate-related habitat loss (e.g. coral-dependent vs other species), life history traits and fishing pressure (Targets 6, 10).
- 3) **Strengthen capacity in resource management** in Lanuza Bay through training and work among local government units (Lanuza Bay Development Alliance) and fisherfolk organisations (Namanaka) (Targets 10, 18). This will be achieved through delivery of workshops on marine ecology, fisheries and conservation, training sessions on fisheries monitoring and distribution of appropriate materials (e.g. posters, fliers, radio). Information derived from established participatory methods will be used to guide development of ordinances and policies on fisheries conservation and management in the area.
- 4) **Reconcile conservation needs with sustainable livelihoods** in Lanuza Bay through building on existing projects in which stakeholders and local partners have fully participated and: (i) determining socio-economic drivers of vulnerable species depletion (ii) identifying communities' willingness criteria (e.g. household income, available time) to consider alternative or supplementary livelihoods (iii) understanding attitudes and perceptions towards conservation needs and resolving these with livelihoods for food security and income generation (iv)

assessing existing livelihood initiatives and acceptable new options, assessing training needs and resources required, and formulating mechanisms including **placement and implementation of conservation-livelihood agreements with fishers' organizations** and a funding plan for implementation of any pertinent livelihood activities.

5) Make policy recommendations at local, national and international levels. Lessons pooled from the site conservation and threatened species work will be used to inform local, national and international conservation plans (Targets 17, 18). This will be achieved through writing and disseminating a **policy paper on Lanuza Bay, and preparing and submitting a national level policy paper (NBSAP)**. Recommendations will be made to the IUCN (World Conservation Union) Red List Authority, and BFAR and DENR-PAWB will be targeted for uptake of outputs **into Philippine Fisheries Strategic Plan and next-generation NBSAP respectively.**

The natural and social science understanding along with detailed knowledge of each site and other planned work addresses three of six national and four Aichi Biodiversity Targets of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan, and informs future NBSAP and IUCN Red Listing. The HF inputs especially to local training and policy development in Lanuza Bay, ADMU contributes crucial expertise in fisheries surveys, and Newcastle University brings expertise in fish and fisheries survey and statistical modelling, and interdisciplinary experience needed for translating science-into-policy. The Lanuza Bay Development Alliance is the local government unit partner, while Namanaka is the major host country fisherfolk federation partner. Additional NGOs will also contribute data and expertise in their respective areas (section 9).

11a. Is this a new initiative or a development of existing work (funded through any source)?

Please give details:

The novelty of this project resides in: the extension fish extinction work from 2 small island sites to 5 significant marine biogeographic regions of the Philippines; this being the first multidisciplinary study of national scope to identify the fish species most vulnerable to extinction; and its being complemented with a local conservation component including conservation-compatible livelihood considerations, capacity building and policy development.

11b. Are you aware of any other individuals/organisations/ projects carrying out or applying for funding for similar work?

Yes No

If yes, please give details explaining similarities and differences, and explaining how your work will be additional to this work and what attempts have been/will be made to co-operate with and learn lessons from such work for mutual benefits:

To our knowledge there are no other projects of, or applications for, similar work of this multidisciplinary character.

11c. Are you applying for funding relating to the proposed project from other sources? Yes No

If yes, please give brief details including when you expect to hear the result. Please ensure you include the figures requested in the spreadsheet as Unconfirmed funding.

No other funding specifically for fish extinction work which is the focus of this study has been applied for.

12. Please indicate which of the following biodiversity conventions your project will contribute to: -

At least one must be selected.

- Only indicate the conventions that your project is directly contributing to.

- No additional significance will be ascribed for projects that report contributions to more than one convention

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Yes No

CITES Yes No

Convention on Migratory Species (CMS)* Yes No

*If CMS please indicate whether it is the main Convention or one or more of the daughter agreements/MoUs (ACAP, AEWAs etc)

Is any liaison proposed with the CBD/CMS/CITES focal point in the host country? Yes No
If yes, please give details:

The CBD focal point in the Philippines is the DENR-PAWB (see section 11c), and this project's engagement with it will be especially enhanced by Haribon's GEF-5 funded current work with DENR-PAWB to review and revise the Philippine NBSAP. Regional level discussion on marine fish extinction as it relates to marine conservation policy, led by the HF at the 5th IUCN Asia Regional Conservation Forum (Asia RCF, September 2011, Incheon, Republic of Korea) will input to the IUCN World Conservation Congress (September 2012, Jeju, Republic of Korea).

What specific issues covered by the Convention(s) will this project address and how were they identified? (150 words)

Informed by ongoing Haribon Foundation and Ateneo De Manila University engagement with the CBD focal agency in the Philippines (DENR-PAWB) in reviewing and revising the NBSAP, the project principally addresses four Aichi Biodiversity Targets of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan by: measuring trends in reef fish abundance (Target 6), understanding fishing practices on coral reefs (Target 10), inputting to the national biodiversity strategy and action plan (Target 17) and drawing on experiences of customary use and knowledge (Target 18). Four other Targets will also be supported (11 [marine protected areas], 14 [including data on essential services], 19 [including relevant new research] and 20 [including mobilising financial resources]). The lead partner's and Haribon's work with the BFAR/NFRDI in crafting the Philippine Fisheries Strategic Plan also informed the project's focus on 3 of 6 Philippine national biodiversity conservation objectives: (i) expanding and improving knowledge on the characteristics, uses and values of biological diversity; (ii) enhancing and integrating existing and planned biodiversity conservation efforts with emphasis on in-situ activities; and (iii) strengthening capacities for integrating and institutionalizing biodiversity conservation and management.

What will change as a result of this project? (150 words)

The project will help challenge a prevalent assumption that marine populations are resilient to extirpation and this in the region where anthropogenic threats and marine biotic diversity coincide in the world's marine biodiversity epicentre. Sound information is the keystone to environmental action and yet the trajectories of vulnerable species in this globally important marine region are unknown. The project will derive and disseminate such knowledge for five marine hotspots in the country, thus adding a national dimension to current understanding, for the first time draw up a list of threatened species, promulgate relevant policy at local and national levels, and enhance resource management capacity in a local area, while also potentially helping develop conservation-compatible livelihood alternatives where adverse effects of current practices are identified.

Why is the project important for the conservation of biodiversity? (150 words)

The new knowledge of fish extinction vulnerability will directly strengthen the scientific evidence base for marine biodiversity conservation in this global marine biodiversity epicentre, allowing more rational prioritisation of investments and improved planning for future conservation measures. It will enduringly benefit the project purpose through: informing the national NBSAP and Fisheries Strategic Plan and such plans further afield (e.g. IUCN Red List); training of researchers whose

capacity for future relevant research will be enhanced; training of local community members (including LGUs and POs) who will better understand conservation and biodiversity concepts and monitoring mechanisms in the particular coastal context; lessons learned in the site conservation component of the project; enhanced capacity for resource management across levels (e.g. local, national) and sectors (e.g. academe, government, peoples' organizations); consideration of alternative livelihoods that are more compatible with marine biodiversity conservation; and the capacity that will be built generally for the trainees to act in turn as trainers themselves, across a wide range of research and management areas.

13. How will the results of the project be disseminated; how will the project be advertised as a Darwin project and in what ways will the Darwin name and logo be used? (max 200 words)

Dissemination of project outputs will target a variety of media, including press releases, oral presentations, radio broadcasts, public awareness materials, educational modules, reports and ecological and policy-oriented peer-reviewed papers. These will acknowledge the Darwin Initiative funding. Details of the Darwin funding will be included on the Ateneo, Haribon and Newcastle University websites and in research papers. Other printed materials (e.g. posters, flyers, reports) will also acknowledge Darwin Initiative funding.

14. What will be the long term benefits (particularly for biodiversity and local communities) of the project in the host country or region and have you identified any potential problems to achieving these benefits? (max 200 words)

Data on vulnerability of fishery resources to local extinction is expected to influence the national NBSAP and achievement of CBD targets. The site-based conservation work on management action and including livelihood impacts and alternatives is likely to positively impact local communities because the loss of resources to fisheries inflicts long-term harm through loss of development options. Through the project, local communities will become more aware of these losses and able to participate in discussion and planning about mitigation measures. Depending on community understandings and perceptions of what is important, which will be considered by the project through capacity building and participatory training work, the project may consider several options including building on existing mariculture projects and developing low-impact fishing gears outside MPAs, and tourism inside and outside MPAs. Resource management instruments will be enhanced through such as conservation-compatible livelihood agreements among and between local communities and local government units. Meanwhile, the long-term capacity of local communities will be addressed through the conservation-sustainable livelihood management cycle including topics such as marine ecology and accounting principles. Potential roadblocks include the weather/climate hindering timely implementation of the project. The Philippines seems currently to be among the hardest hit by extreme and erratic weather, leading to damage to coastal infrastructure (e.g. mariculture facilities) and impeding field work (e.g. underwater surveys).

15. State whether or not the project will reach a stable and sustainable end point. If the project is not discrete, but is part of a progressive approach, give details of the exit strategy and show how relevant activities will be continued to secure the benefits from the project. Where individuals receive advanced training, for example, what will happen should that individual leave? (Max 200 words)

The outputs of the project are outlined particularly in sections 10 and 17. These are discrete but the intention is that the project will have lasting impact and that this impact will lead to many of the outputs being further developed, including further research on vulnerable species and fishery extinctions within the overall region, building management capacity among other local communities, increasing awareness of the issue and means to conservation and considering and where acceptable implementing livelihoods that are more conservation-compatible. It is clear that the site conservation component is just a start towards implementation more widely in the country. In this case, the following elements are envisaged: 1) integrating the present project with the LBDA Strategic Plan including biodiversity/resource management policy targets; 2) integrating relevant

activities of the present project with the Namanaka/Kaampaka Strategic Plan including conservation and sustainable livelihoods and capacity building targets. To this end, the LBDA and Namanaka sustainability plans will be reviewed and via the funding access plan that will be drawn up, gaining further funding and drawing lessons from monitoring and evaluation in place within an adaptive management framework. The individuals to be given advanced training will be those on a university tenure track and/or have been with the NGO partner for 6-10 years and have proven commitments to their institutions and to marine conservation. Further, they are from various levels and ages, sustaining the human resources for Philippines marine biodiversity conservation into the future.

16. If your project includes capacity building in local communities in the host country, please indicate how you will assess the training needs in relation to the overall purpose of the project. Who are the target groups? How will the training be delivered? What skills and knowledge you expect the beneficiaries to obtain and how these may be used beyond the life of the project and any wider application How will you measure training effectiveness. (max 300 words)

You should address each of these points.

Drawing on experience and insights from existing and previous projects in the pilot conservation site, the principal project partners (HF/ADMU/NU) will conduct a training needs assessment among local government units, peoples' organizations and local academia on cross-cutting topics such as marine ecology and fisheries, participatory fisheries monitoring, sustainable livelihood cycle management, financial recording, accounting/auditing and accessing and mobilizing funds. Where desirable, other local groups with long experience and key skills in sustainable livelihoods will be engaged to complement the expertise of the principal partners. Training effectiveness is measurable in terms of local communities' competence in and awareness of conservation actions. The project is expected to have lasting impact on the capacity of the targeted communities to respond to biodiversity initiatives both short and long term.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

17. Please enter the details of your project onto the matrix using the note at Annex 3 of the Guidance Note. This should not have substantially changed from the Logical Framework submitted with your Stage 1 application. Please highlight any changes. (Use no smaller than Arial 10 pt) minor changes of substance made at some other points not highlighted

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
Goal: Effective contribution in support of the implementation of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (CMS), as well as related targets set by countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources.			
Sub-Goal: New knowledge gained, stakeholder-led management capacity built and new conservation action taken to conserve marine biodiversity in Philippines hotspots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Threatened marine finfish added to national and international listings * Management measures taken in response * Ongoing research and outreach activity on species trends and distributions and their drivers * Key personnel training level increased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Uptake of lists by NBSAP, IUCN Red List * Planning of new actions e.g. marine protected areas motivated by project outputs * New project proposals, papers and other means of dissemination * Increased competence and skills of key staff * More positive management attitudes 	
Purpose: Identify vulnerable reef finfish species, model changes in reef finfish abundances, enhance local capacity in local resource management, reconcile any conservation needs with sustainable livelihoods , recommend policy from local to international levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Vulnerable species identified * Relevant policy derived and delivered at international, national and a local area * Resource management capacity in Lanuza Bay enhanced * Training and experience required to sustain project outputs in future achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Progress and final reports, peer-reviewed scientific papers * New projects planned and proposals to funding agencies submitted * Popular articles, related outreach materials and their uptake * Support for future biodiversity conservation science and actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * LGU and other government agencies continue to be supportive of the project * PO and other community groups continue to be receptive of the project * Funding schemes remain available for local and national studies in future
Outputs			
1. Vulnerable marine finfish species identified in 5 key marine biodiversity areas,	1.0 Inception workshop and database/statistics training conducted 1.1 Fishers' knowledge of threatened species surveyed, data processed and analysed 1.2 Underwater visual census conducted, presence/absence data gathered and analysed 1.3 List of vulnerable species drafted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Workshop minutes, copies of trainee-completed database and statistical assessments * Data and technical reports * Paper submitted for peer-review publication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Fishers are amenable to survey * Agencies permit access to further data * Weather conditions do not impede underwater data gathering

<p>2. Changes in abundance of reef finfish families and fishery target species modelled for 5 key marine biodiversity areas</p>	<p>2.1 Fishers' retrospective perceptions of abundance trends surveyed and analysed; 2.2 Abundance trends in underwater visual census and landings data analysed; 2.3 Trends compared between methods within and among sites, drivers analysed; revised vulnerable species list</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Data and technical reports * Papers submitted for peer-reviewed publication * Popular articles, other outreach materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Fishers are amenable to survey * Agencies permit access to further data * Weather conditions do not impede underwater data gathering
<p>3. Capacity of LGUs and POs for local resource management in conservation site enhanced</p>	<p>3.1 Training in marine ecology, fisheries and conservation conducted 3.2 Workshops on management needs and training on fisheries monitoring conducted 3.3 Communication plan and materials (ie. posters, fliers, radio ads) produced and future funding plan drafted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Minutes and feedback from sessions on local competence and awareness of conservation actions * Progress and final reports * Seminar training materials * Communication plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Political conditions do not substantially impede project or deliverables * LGUs and POs continue to be receptive to training and materials
<p>4. Conservation needs reconciled with sustainable livelihoods</p>	<p>4.1 Human behavioural drivers of any diversity losses assessed 4.2 Existing conservation-livelihood agreements with fishers' organizations; initiatives and new options including continuity mechanisms evaluated; 4.3 Any new livelihood options with conservation agreements (e.g. low-impact mariculture) installed; management system reviewed and improved; 4.4 Economic impact of livelihood options of participant groups surveyed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Minutes of consultations with LGUs and POs on livelihoods initiatives/options for Lanuza Bay * Paper on socio-economic drivers of any losses * Report on design and management of new conservation-livelihood agreement project and agreed funding plan, aim to involve ≥25 families * Surveys of income and savings levels of participants before and after project; aim for ≥20% savings by target families * Enforcement reports for marine protected areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * LGUs and POs continue to be receptive to training, seminars and conservation-livelihood agreements * Extreme weather does not substantially affect any conservation-compatible livelihood project(s)
<p>5. Policy recommendations made at local, national and international levels</p>	<p>5.1 Lanuza Bay policy paper completed 5.2 National level policy paper completed 5.3 Recommendations made to IUCN</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Papers taken up by LGUs and/or POs in Lanuza Bay * Policy paper taken up by government agency, used to inform next NBSAP * Report to IUCN Red List Authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Local and international stakeholders remain receptive of project outcomes * Weather and political conditions do not substantially impede project or deliverables

Activities (details in workplan)

- 1.0 Inception workshop: in Manila, review of proposal, preparation for Newcastle training, inception of field work planning
- 1.1 Training in database and statistical modelling: in Newcastle University, introduction and application of Access, application of R to time-series and multivariate data
- 1.2 Fishers' knowledge, socio-economic and underwater surveys conducted: presence-absence data by site, socio-economic variables derived for Output 5
- 1.3 Analysis of vulnerable species: entry, processing and statistical analysis of data, technical report
- 2.1 Fishers' knowledge of fish abundance trends: own catch and size data, recollection of decadal trends, data on fishers themselves
- 2.2 Underwater survey and landings data: new data from 1.2, previous underwater visual data (e.g. Danajon Bank 1997-present, Lanuza Bay 2002-2009), landings data normalised by effort data (data from BFAR/NFRDI)
- 2.3 Fish abundance trends analysed across methods, among locations, writing and submission of papers for peer-reviewed publication
- 3.1 Training sessions: in Lanuza Bay, marine ecology/fisheries, participatory monitoring
- 3.2 Workshops on management needs and training in fisheries monitoring, participatory management, indicators; in Lanuza Bay
- 3.3 Communication planning, production and distribution of posters, flyers, radio plugs etc in Lanuza Bay area
- 4.1 Social-economic drivers of diversity losses assessed: analysis of socio-economic data from Output 1, relationships across the sites, writing of report and paper
- 4.2 **Conservation-livelihood agreements** assessments, options and training needs: workshops, iterative feedback etc in Lanuza Bay
- 4.3 **Installation of new livelihood option under conservation agreement** (e.g. low-impact mariculture, conservation-compatible fishing gear) set up with peoples organisation(s) in Lanuza Bay, funding agreement e.g. as in some existing projects materials covered by LGUs and/or the POs
- 4.4 Surveys to compare income and **savings** levels of participants at start of project and following project, including participants in any livelihood project
- 5.1 Formulation with LGUs and POs in Lanuza Bay of local policy, submission of policy paper on Lanuza Bay
- 5.2 Formulation with government agencies of paper targeting national policy including NBSAP, National Fisheries Strategy Plan, submission to BFAR/NFRDI, DENR-PAWB etc
- 5.3 Recommendations to IUCN Red List Authority: e.g. status of species/families to be revised

18. Provide a project implementation timetable that shows the key milestones in project activities. Complete the following table as appropriate to describe the intended workplan for your project. Milestone activities in bold with milestone quarter indicated by M.

Activity	No of Months	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3				Year 4			
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
1.0 Inception workshop	0.25	✓															
1.1 Training in database and statistical modelling (M1 training completed)	2	✓	✓	M1													
1.2 Fishers' knowledge, socio-economic and underwater surveys conducted	36		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
1.3 Analysis of vulnerable species	24						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
2.1 Fishers' knowledge of fish abundance trends (M2 completed)	18		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	M2									
2.2 Underwater survey and landings data	21						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
2.3 Fish abundance trends analysed and written up (M3 first research paper submitted)	33						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	M3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3.1 Training sessions in Lanuza Bay	1.5					✓											
3.2 Workshops on management needs and training in fisheries monitoring	0.5						✓										
3.3 Communication planning, production and distribution of materials	6							✓	✓								
4.1 Social-economic drivers of diversity losses	6								✓	✓							
4.2 Conservation-livelihoods agreements assessments, options and training needs	12									✓	✓	✓	✓				
4.3 Installation of new livelihood option under conservation agreement	12												✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4.4 Surveys of income and savings levels of participants	0.25	✓														✓	
5.1 Formulation of local policy	6													✓	✓		
5.2 Formulation of national policy paper (M4 submitted)	12												✓	✓	✓	M4	
5.3 Recommendation to IUCN	1																✓

19. Please indicate which of the following Standard Measures you expect to report against by providing indicative figures. These will help gauge project achievements if you receive funding. You will not necessarily plan to cover all these Standard Measures in your project. Separate guidance on Standard Measures can be found at http://darwin.defra.gov.uk/resources/reporting/standard_measures/

Standard Measure	Description	Estimate
1A	Number of people to submit thesis for PhD qualification (in host country)	0
1B	Number of people to attain PhD qualification (in host country)	0
2	Number of people to attain Masters qualification (MSc, MPhil etc)	2
3	Number of people to attain other qualifications (ie. Not outputs 1 or 2 above)	2
4A	Number of undergraduate students to receive training	17
4B	Number of training weeks to be provided	2 wks (15 students) 12 wks (2 students)
4C	Number of postgraduate students to receive training	4
4D	Number of training weeks to be provided	64
5	Number of people to receive at least one year of training (which does not fall into categories 1-4 above)	5
6A	Number of people to receive other forms of education/training (which does not fall into categories 1-5 above)	700
6B	Number of training weeks to be provided	10-44
7	Number of (ie different types - not volume - of material produced) training materials to be produced for use by host country	6
8	Number of weeks to be spent by UK project staff on project work in the host country	13
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) to be produced for Governments, public authorities, or other implementing agencies in the host country	2
10	Number of individual field guides/manuals to be produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording	2
11A	Number of papers to be published in peer reviewed journals	2
11B	Number of papers to be submitted to peer reviewed journals	6
12A	Number of computer based databases to be established and handed over to host country	10
12B	Number of computer based databases to be enhanced and handed over to host country	5
13A	Number of species reference collections to be established and handed over to host country(ies)	0
13B	Number of species reference collections to be enhanced and handed over to host country(ies)	0
14A	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops to be organised to present/disseminate findings	2
14B	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated	10
15A	Number of national press releases in host country(ies)	4
15B	Number of local press releases in host country(ies)	10
15C	Number of national press releases in UK	1
15D	Number of local press releases in UK	2
16A	Number of newsletters to be produced	4
16B	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(ies)	1000
16C	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the UK	300
17A	Number of dissemination networks to be established	5 baywide
17B	Number of dissemination networks to be enhanced/ extended	1 national
18A	Number of national TV programmes/features in host country(ies)	1
18B	Number of national TV programmes/features in UK	0
18C	Number of local TV programmes/features in host country(ies)	2
18D	Number of local TV programmes/features in UK	0
19A	Number of national radio interviews/features in host county(ies)	5
19B	Number of national radio interviews/features in UK	2
19C	Number of local radio interviews/features in host country(ies)	5
19D	Number of local radio interviews/features in UK	2
20	Estimated value (£'s) of physical assets to be handed over to host country(ies)	£6,699
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisations to be established and then continued after Darwin funding has ceased	1
22	Number of permanent field plots to be established during the project and continued after Darwin funding has ceased	42
23	Value of resources raised from other sources (ie in addition to Darwin funding) for project work	£102,381

PROJECT BASED MONITORING AND EVALUATION

20. Describe, referring to the Indicators in the Logical Framework, how the progress of the project will be monitored and evaluated, including towards delivery of its outputs and in terms of achieving its overall purpose. This should be during the lifetime of the project and at its conclusion. Please include information on how host country partners will be included in the monitoring and evaluation.

Four milestones which are identified as likely drivers of success (Section 18, M1-M4) and the requirements for achievement of these clearly identified with respect to the responsible partners and time scales for inputs. This will be achieved at the inception workshop which will involve the Lead Institution, main project partner and partner NGO (HF) in the Philippines. All three of these will be involved in delivery of all of these milestones and the plan for monitoring progress will be agreed at the workshop. It will likely hinge primarily on coordination by Ateneo de Maila and Newcastle Universities, and this will necessitate quarterly use video conferencing and Skype. The means of verification of progress towards successful project outputs are explicit in the logframe (section 17) and include the requirement not only of data, technical reports, trainee-completed assessments and peer-review papers, but also minuting of workshops and archiving of training materials used.

FUNDING AND BUDGET

Please complete the separate Excel spreadsheet which will provide the Budget information for this application. Some of the questions below refer to the information in this spreadsheet.

NB: Please state all costs by financial year (April to March). Use current prices – and include anticipated inflation, as appropriate, up to 3% per annum. The Darwin Initiative cannot agree any increase in grants once awarded.

21. How is your organisation currently funded? (max 100 words)

Consolidated income for year ending 31 July 2010 £377.7 million, of which: Funding council grants 31.97%; Academic fees and support grants 24.56%; Research grants and contracts 22.55%; Other operating income including joint ventures 20.40%; Endowments and income receivable 0.52%

22. Provide details of all confirmed funding sources identified in the Budget that will be put towards the costs of the project, including any income from other public bodies, private sponsorship, donations, trusts, fees or trading activity. Please include any additional unconfirmed funding the project will attract to carry out addition work during or beyond the project lifetime. Indicate those funding sources which are confirmed.

Confirmed:

Haribon Foundation: in kind (equipment) £9029

Ateneo De Manila University: in kind equipment and facilities £5530

Newcastle University: staff time £24096, in kind other training and equipment £12878

Unconfirmed:

Haribon Foundation: from Global Environment Facility (GEF-5) conservation site action project at Lanuza Bay (Surigao Del Sur, Philippines) £67117

Ateneo De Manila University: Loyola Schools Small Grant £5882, Rufford Small Grant £6000, in kind (equipment and facilities) £4706

23. Please give details of any further resources (confirmed or unconfirmed) for this project that are not already detailed in the Budget or Question 22. This will include donations in kind or un-costed support eg accommodation. (max 50 words per box)

Possible additional financial resources (not yet applied for):
Funding in kind: POs/LGUs: transport of staff to field sites £3500/year, materials £1000/yr

FCO NOTIFICATIONS

Please check the box if you think that there are sensitivities that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office will need to be aware of should they want to publicise the project's success in the Darwin competition in the host country.

Please indicate whether you have contacted the local UK embassy or High Commission directly to discuss security issues (see Guidance Notes) and attach details of any advice you have received from them.

Yes (no written advice) Yes, advice attached No

CERTIFICATION 2011/12

On behalf of the trustees/company* of
(*delete as appropriate)

I apply for a grant of £ in respect of all expenditure to be incurred during the lifetime of this project based on the activities and dates specified in the above application.

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 lead UK institution to submit applications and sign contracts on their behalf.)

I enclose CVs for project principals and letters of support. Our most recent audited accounts and annual report are also attached/~~can be found at~~ (delete as appropriate):

Name (block capitals)	LEE BRITON
Position in the organisation	Assistant Grants & Contracts Manager

Signed Date:

Stage 2 Application - Checklist for submission

	Check
Have you provided actual start and end dates for your project?	✓
Have you provided your budget based on UK government financial years ie 1 April – 31 March?	✓
Have you checked that your budget is complete, correctly adds up and that you have included the correct final total on the top page of the application?	✓
Is the concept note within 1,000 words?	✓
Is the logframe no longer than 3 pages and have you highlighted any changes since Stage 1?	✓
Has your application been signed by a suitably authorised individual? (clear electronic or scanned signatures are acceptable in the email, but a wet signature should be provided in the hard copy version)	✓
Have you included a 1 page CV for all the Principals identified at Question 5?	✓
Have you included a letter of support from the <u>main</u> overseas partner(s) organisations identified at Question 5?	✓
Have you checked with the FCO in the project country/ies and have you included any evidence of this?	✓
Have you included a copy of your most recent annual report and accounts? An electronic link to a website is acceptable.	✓
Have you read the Guidance Notes ?	✓
Have you checked the Darwin website immediately prior to submission to ensure there are no late updates?	✓

Once you have answered Yes to the questions above, please submit the application, not later than midnight GMT on Monday **24 October 2011** to Darwin-Applications@ltsi.co.uk using the application number (from your Stage 1 feedback letter) and the first few words of the project title **as the subject of your email**. However, if you are e-mailing supporting documentation separately please include in the subject line an indication of the number of e-mails you are sending (eg whether the e-mail is 1 of 2, 2 of 3 etc). **In addition**, a hard copy of the signature page should be submitted to Darwin Applications, c/o LTS International, Pentlands Science Park, Bush Loan, Penicuik EH26 0PL **postmarked** not later than Tuesday 25 October 2011.

DATA PROTECTION ACT 1998: Applicants for grant funding must agree to any disclosure or exchange of information supplied on the application form (including the content of a declaration or undertaking) which the Department considers necessary for the administration, evaluation, monitoring and publicising of the Darwin Initiative. Application form data will also be held by contractors dealing with Darwin Initiative monitoring and evaluation. It is the responsibility of applicants to ensure that personal data can be supplied to the Department for the uses described in this paragraph. A completed application form will be taken as an agreement by the applicant and the grant/award recipient also to the following:- putting certain details (ie name, contact details and location of project work) on the Darwin Initiative and Defra websites(details relating to financial awards will not be put on the websites if requested in writing by the grant/award recipient); using personal data for the Darwin Initiative postal circulation list; and sending data to Foreign and Commonwealth Office posts outside the United Kingdom, including posts outside the European Economic Area. Confidential information relating to the project or its results and any personal data may be released on request, including under the Environmental Information Regulations, the code of Practice on Access to Government Information and the Freedom of Information Act 2000.