



Submit by 2359 GMT on Monday 29 January 2018

Darwin Initiative Application for Grant for Round 24: Stage 2

Before completing this form, please read both the Fair Processing Notice on pages 17 and 18 of this form and the [Guidance](#). 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. Blank cells may render your application ineligible

Eligibility

1. Name and address of organisation

(NB: Notification of results will be by email to the Project Leader in Question 6)

Applicant Organisation Name:	IIED
Address:	80-86 Grays Inn Road
City and Postcode:	London WC1X 8NH
Country:	UK
Email:	
Phone:	

2. Stage 1 reference and Project title

Stage 1 Ref: 4114	Title (max 10 words): WHY EAT WILD MEAT? Developing effective alternatives to bushmeat consumption
-----------------------------	---

3. Summary of Project

Please provide a brief summary of your project, 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 [GOV.UK](#). Please bear this in mind, and write this summary for a non-technical audience.

(max 80 words)

The hunting of wild animals for meat is widely practiced. Interventions to reduce bushmeat consumption need first to understand why bushmeat is a preferred food choice. Focussing on the Dja ecosystem in Cameroon, we use participatory approaches to understand factors affecting meat choices. We use our findings to support improvements in design of “bushmeat-alternative” interventions in the Dja and elsewhere, making them more effective at increasing food security, meeting people’s needs and priorities, and conserving species threatened by unsustainable hunting.

4. Country(ies)

Which eligible host country(ies) will your project be working in? You may copy and paste this table if you need to provide details of more than four countries.

Country 1: CAMEROON	Country 2:
Country 3:	Country 4:

5. Project dates, and budget summary

Start date:		End date: 1.7.2018		Duration: 31.3.2021	
Darwin funding request (Apr – Mar)	2018/19 £59,521	2019/20 £155,496	2020/21 £150,809	Total £365,826	
Proposed (confirmed & unconfirmed) matched funding as % of total Project cost					9%

6. Partners in project. Please provide details of the partners in this project and provide a CV for the individuals listed. You may copy and paste this table if necessary.

Details	Project Leader	Project Partner 1	Project Partner 2
Surname	Roe	Milner-Gulland	Maddison
Forename (s)	Dilys	EJ	Neil
Post held	Principal Researcher	Tasso Leventis Professor of Biodiversity	Associate Director
Organisation (if different to above)	IIED	University of Oxford	Living Earth Limited
Telephone			
Email			

Details	Project Partner 3
Surname	Mouamfon
Forename (s)	Mama
Post held	National Coordinator
Organisation (if different to above)	Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante
Telephone	
Email	

7. Has your organisation been awarded a Darwin Initiative award before (for the purposes of this question, being a partner does not count)?

If so, please provide details of the most recent awards (up to 6 examples).

Reference No	Project Leader	Title
23 032	Dilys Roe	Local Economic Development Through Pro-Poor Gorilla Tourism
EIDPO047	Dilys Roe	NBSAPS 2.0 From Policy to Practice

20-010	Phil Franks	Social Assessment of Protected Areas
20 - 015	Essam Mohammed	Economic incentives to conserve Hilsa fish (Tenualosa llisha) in Bangladesh
19-023	Steve Bass	NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming biodiversity and development
19-013	Phil Franks	Research to Policy: building capacity for conservation through poverty alleviation

8a. If you answered 'No' to Question 7 please complete Question 8a, b and c.
If you answered 'Yes', please go to Question 9 (and delete the boxes for Q8a, 8b and 8c)

9. 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.

Lead institution and website: IIED	Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to lead the project): (max 200 words) <p>IIED is an international, independent policy research institute working for a more sustainable and equitable global environment. IIED works globally through a wide range of long-standing relationships with partners across the developing world. Its partnerships generate close working relations with many key development actors at the grass roots, national and international level. This emphasis on collaboration with partners and networks enable IIED to link local development priorities to national and international policy making.</p> <p>Dilys Roe leads IIED's biodiversity team and has been the project leader on a number of earlier Darwin projects and one current project (23-032). Dilys has also partnered with Prof EJ Milner-Gulland on previous Darwin and IWT Fund projects. As Project Leader for this project, Dilys will coordinate and oversee delivery of the project outputs to time and budget. Francesca Booker (Researcher in the biodiversity team) will lead on the desk-based reviews of wild meat as a food choice and of bushmeat-alternative projects. This will build on her previous work conducting a systematic review of the effectiveness of alternative livelihood projects. IIED will also lead on project communications including providing a link to the Cameroon Poverty and Conservation Learning Group.</p>	
Have you included a Letter of Support from this institution? If not, why not?		Yes

<p>Partner Name and website where available:</p> <p>Oxford University www.iccs.org.uk</p>	<p>Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): (max 200 words)</p> <p>Oxford University's Interdisciplinary Centre for Conservation Science (ICCS) has a strong track record of successful Darwin projects, including several in collaboration with IIED. Research leader Professor E.J. Milner-Gulland has been working on bushmeat sustainability issues for nearly 20 years, including methodological innovations for researching wildlife hunting, and has supervised more than 10 PhDs on the topic, mostly in Central Africa.</p> <p>EJMG has supervised two recent PhD projects in the Dja ecosystem; Juliet Wright's analysis of the effectiveness of livelihood interventions, and project researcher Stephanie Brittain's investigation of the potential of local ecological monitoring of bushmeat species. Stephanie has worked closely with bushmeat hunters in two villages which will be part of this project, building strong relationships and a deep understanding of the issues surrounding meat choices. This expertise provides a strong scientific foundation for this project.</p> <p>EJMG will supervise the research elements of this project. Stephanie will carry out the field research in Year 2, based within ICCS, and will transfer to Living Earth Limited in Year 3 to carry out the implementation and policy elements of the project. This arrangement will enable an unusually strong research-to-policy component of the project, bringing academic expertise directly into the implementing partner's team.</p>
<p>Have you included a Letter of Support from this institution? If not, why not?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>Partner Name and website where available:</p> <p>Living Earth Limited (LEL)</p>	<p>Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): (max 200 words)</p> <p>LEL has worked in Cameroon since 1987. Since 1997 the Cameroon office has been registered as the independent NGO Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante (FCTV). LEL and FCTV approached IIED with the concept for this project as a means to build on their existing work and inform new and existing interventions.</p> <p>LEL's role is to provide technical advice and assistance to the project with in-country discussions with local communities that live around the DFR, and liaise with senior government representatives to ensure that the project gains the support at the highest level within MINFOF and MINADER.</p> <p>LEL have undertaken similar roles in two Darwin Initiative funded projects (20-007, and currently 23-024) and been instrumental in producing Theory of Change models to support the change from unsustainable (often illegal) practices to sustainable ones, working closely with FCTV to ensure realistic, practically achievable activities are implemented and managed.</p> <p>Neil Maddison, Associate Director of LEL has been a Darwin Initiative Project Leader for two previous projects 17-011 and 20-007 and has over fifteen years' experience of working with rural, poor communities living in the Dja landscape. Stephanie Brittain (research findings implementation; year 3) has expertise in bushmeat field research in Cameroon.</p>
<p>Have you included a Letter of Support from this institution? If not, why not?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>Partner Name and website where available:</p> <p>Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante (FCTV)</p>	<p>Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): (max 200 words)</p> <p>FCTV is an independent Cameroonian NGO which works to promote sustainable development and facilitate community-driven solutions to environmental problems. FCTV has been working in collaboration with Living Earth in the region since 2003 and was responsible for community engagement activities, community and game guard training, and local data collection and verification for the Darwin Project 20-007 (developing a pro-poor, sustainable bushmeat harvesting model in Cameroon).</p> <p>Building upon this experience, FCTV maintains responsibility for the field implementation of several project activities in the Dja periphery connected to community engagement activities. FCTV has carried out consultations with communities and game guards on required steps to consolidate sustainable bushmeat harvesting models, and this local knowledge has been critical to designing the approach of the project. FCTV retains a strong level of trust and local credibility through over nine years continuous project implementation around the Dja.</p> <p>FCTV, led by Cameroonian Mama Mouamfon, is also the current secretariat of the Dja Actors Forum and as such has an excellent working relationship with MINFOF and with other actors working in the target area.</p>
Have you included a Letter of Support from this institution? If not, why not?	Yes

10. Key Project personnel

Please identify the key project personnel on this project, their role and what % of their time they will be working on the project. Please provide 1 page CVs for these staff, or a 1 page job description or Terms of Reference for roles yet to be filled. Please include more rows where necessary. These should match the names and roles in the budget spreadsheet.

Name (First name, surname)	Role	Organisation	% time on project	1 page CV or job description attached*?
Dilys Roe	Project Leader	IIED	16%	Yes
Francesca Booker	Project researcher	IIED	18%	Yes
EJ Milner Gulland	Research lead	University of Oxford	5%	Yes
Stephanie Brittain	Project researcher	University of Oxford (Y2) & Living Earth Limited (Y3)	100% in years 2 & 3	Yes
Neil Maddison	Technical Advisor	Living Earth Limited	8%	Yes
Mama Mouamfon (FCTV)	In-country manager	Fondation Camerounaise de	30% in years 2 & 3	Yes

		la Terre Vivante		
*If you cannot provide a CV, please explain why not.				

11. Problem the project is trying to address

Please describe the problem your project is trying to address in terms of biodiversity and its relationship with poverty. 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?

(Max 300 words)

Hunting of wildlife for meat is widely practiced in Africa - the scale of wild meat use in the Congo Basin alone is estimated at five million tonnes/year¹. Since the late 1990s, conservation and development organisations have been concerned about the scale of exploitation because of its implications both for conservation and for food security.

Many well-intentioned projects have been instituted to reduce bushmeat hunting; providing livelihood alternatives for hunters selling meat to urban consumers, reducing demand in urban centres, and providing alternative meat sources to rural consumers (through fish, livestock or captive-bred wild species). Available evidence suggests, however, that both livelihoods and bushmeat-alternative projects are failing to achieve their conservation and food security objectives. This is often because they fail to account for the underlying drivers behind the **choice** of wild meat as a food (including price, availability, taste and culture).

While much wild meat is destined for urban consumers, in many rural areas - including around the Dja Faunal Reserve (DFR) in Cameroon - it is also routinely consumed as a key source of protein. In the DFR, threatened species such as central African chimpanzees, western lowland gorillas, and giant pangolins are regularly hunted for meat. The establishment of community hunting zones (CHZ), such as under [Darwin project 20-007](#), have helped take pressure off the reserve but are insufficient to meet the protein needs of the growing local population. It is therefore critical that additional protein supplies are available, acceptable and affordable.

This project will help to improve the design of "bushmeat-alternative" interventions, thus reducing current levels of exploitation that are threatening both species survival and long-term local food security and nutrition. We do this both specifically in the DFR, and through wider evidence-gathering and engagement with African governments and implementing NGOs.

12a. Biodiversity Conventions, Treaties and Agreements

Your project must support the objectives of one or more of the agreements listed below. Please indicate which agreement(s) will be supported and describe which objectives your project will address and how. Note: projects supporting more than one will not achieve a higher score.

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)	Yes
Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS)	No
International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA)	No
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)	Yes

¹ <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2002.00275.x/full>
R24 St2 Form

12b. Biodiversity Conventions

Please detail how your project will contribute to the objectives of the agreement(s) your project is targeting. You should refer to Articles or Programmes of Work here. Note: No additional significance will be ascribed for projects that report contributions to more than one agreement

(Max 500 words) (238)

The CBD and CITES both have programmes of work on wild meat to which this project will contribute:

- In CBD Decision IX/5, Parties were urged, *inter alia*, to strengthen the implementation of the expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity including addressing unsustainable hunting and trade of bushmeat. The CBD established a Liaison Group on Bushmeat for this purpose and at its first meeting in 2009 it developed a set of recommendations which were adopted by CoP 11 (Decision XI/25). These included a recommendation that “culturally acceptable and economically feasible alternative food and income sources.... [which] ...take into account local realities, cultures and preferences should be developed and implemented.”
- The CBD Secretariat established the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management (CPW) - of which IIED is a member - in 2013 and at the latest CoP (2016) passed a decision (XIII/8) requesting CPW to develop new guidance on bushmeat management. This draft guidance, submitted to SBSTTA in December 2017 highlights the need for better identification of “opportunities and barriers for providing sustainably produced food and livelihood alternatives.” A lack of understanding of the drivers of wild meat as a food choice is one such barrier. The guidance further calls for the development of “culturally acceptable and economically feasible alternative food and income sources.”

In addition to the CBD, CITES Resolution Conf. 13.11 advises relevant Parties to improve domestic management of CITES-listed bushmeat species including identifying alternative foods.

12c. Is any liaison proposed with the CBD / ABS / ITPGRFA / CITES focal point in the host country?

Yes **No** if yes, please give details: We have discussed the project with the CBD focal point Prudence Gatega who is in full support (see letter). Prudence will also be a member of the project advisory committee (see section 24 below).

12d. Global Goals for Sustainable Development (SDGs)

Please detail how your project will contribute to the Global Goals for Sustainable Development (SDGs).

(Max 250 words) (190)

While the SDGs do not make specific reference to wild meat, there are some relevant targets to which the project will contribute:

- SDG 2 includes Target 2.1 to end hunger by 2030 and ensure access by all people to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round. Our project will help to improve the design of interventions designed to offer alternative or supplementary sources of protein so that they are more culturally acceptable and complement existing livelihood strategies. The majority of wild meat projects have focussed on urban consumers rather than on the immediate food and protein security needs to resident local rural communities. This project will help to fill that knowledge gap.

- SDG 12 includes Target 12.2 to achieve sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources. Our project will help to reduce unsustainable hunting pressure on forest-based wildlife by supplementing its use with alternative, culturally acceptable sources of protein.
- SDG 15 includes Target 15.5 to take urgent and significant action to reduce degradation of natural habitat, halt the loss of biodiversity, and by 2020 protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species. In the Dja Faunal Reserve, hunting for wild meat includes gorillas, chimpanzees and giant pangolins, all of which are threatened species. Our project will help reduce pressure on these species as well as wide variety of more common, intensively hunted, species.

13. Methodology

Describe the methods and approach you will use to achieve your intended Outcome and Impact. Provide information on how you will undertake the work (materials and methods) and how you will manage the work (roles and responsibilities, project management tools etc.).

(Max 500 words – this may be a repeat from Stage 1, but you may update or refine as necessary. Tracked changes are **not** required.)

a) Understanding drivers of wild meat as a food choice

A desk-based evidence review will identify the drivers of wild meat as a food choice in sub-Saharan Africa. This will be complemented by research around the DFR, using focus groups and key informants, to understand food preferences, drivers and constraints, and the role of bushmeat in food security.

b) Learning from bushmeat-alternative projects

Building on previous studies² we will conduct a desk-based review to identify “bushmeat-alternative” projects in sub-Saharan Africa and draw out correlates of success in food security and conservation outcomes, using similar methodology to [Waylen et al. \(2010\)](#). We will develop an inventory of relevant interventions around DFR³ and explore the degree to which these address the drivers identified. We will explore their theories of change and identify elements predisposing to success or failure.

c) Informing better bushmeat-alternative projects

We will work with local communities in 3 contrasting sites around DFR (with high bushmeat hunting for local consumption, and where our team is already active), to understand their stated and actual food choices and the role of bushmeat. Two have Darwin-supported initiatives to provide “non-park” protein, the third has potential for a new project: 1) Mindourou, where FTCV & LEL are working on community hunting zones ([20-007](#)), 2) the “Northern Buckle”, where Antwerp Zoo are developing a fisheries project ([24-005](#)). 3) Alat Makay, a bushmeat-dependent village where villagers wish to harness the potential of a new road for sustainable development.

Using focus groups, key informant interviews and household surveys, we will explore food choice differences between households (e.g. by ethnicity or wealth) and within households (e.g. gender, age). We will use choice experiments to understand locally-desired design features of bushmeat-alternative projects, then partner with local people and project implementers to improve the design and execution of existing projects and design a new one.

² E.g. by [IUCN](#), [IIED](#) and others.

³ Based on PhD theses of J. Wright & S. Brittain, supervised by EJMG, which focus on bushmeat hunting (Stephanie Brittain) and evaluating bushmeat-alternative & livelihoods interventions around the DFR & Takamanda PA, Cameroon (Juliet Wright).

d) Synthesis, decision-support and dissemination

Based on these findings we will develop recommendations for the Cameroonian government (MINADER and MINFOF) and implementing NGOs at DFR and elsewhere. We will develop a *decision-support tool* to ensure that new interventions are better aligned with the drivers of food choice, and more nuanced in their recognition of how food choice varies *between* and *within* households, and how this affects project success.

Cameroon's [Poverty and Conservation Learning Group](#) will provide a forum for bringing together DFR-based and national stakeholders to disseminate the research and monitor uptake of recommendations into project design. Internationally, we will use our networks to disseminate research findings beyond Africa, and feed into ongoing international policy processes (including convening a side event at CBD).

Roles

IIED will coordinate the project and lead on desk-based reviews and international outreach. Oxford will lead on field research, supported by FCTV and Living Earth. Living Earth and FCTV will lead on liaison with DFR projects and ensuring findings are mainstreamed into government strategies. FCTV will lead on national dissemination and stakeholder engagement including through PCLG.

14. Change Expected

Detail the expected changes 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). Please describe the changes for biodiversity and for people in developing countries, and how they are linked. When talking about people, please remember to give details of who will benefit and the number of beneficiaries expected. The number of communities is insufficient detail – number of households should be the largest unit used. If possible, indicate the number of women who will be impacted.

(Max 500 words)

This project is intended to improve the conceptual and operational basis for “bushmeat-alternative” interventions in sub-Saharan Africa, and the Dja landscape in particular, based on a grounded understanding of how rural people actually make their food choices. Many research and implementation projects address the so-called “bushmeat crisis” but most focus on reducing demand from urban consumers and/or providing alternative livelihoods to rural hunters and suppliers, missing the major issue of meeting rural protein needs. Enhancing rural incomes to tempt people out of hunting is not enough if there is no feasible protein alternative; evidence⁴ also suggests more bushmeat is consumed as income rises. We will generate new information specifically focussed on *rural bushmeat consumers*, and address the significant challenge they face; of finding *legal, sustainable sources of animal protein*.

During the project, the key change will be improved capacity of conservation and development actors to design and implement feasible and successful bushmeat-alternative interventions that are far more likely to be acceptable to, and supported by, local people. This will be evidenced by better design of two existing projects in the Dja region (Mindourou, Northern buckle), and co-design of a potential project (Alat Makay), so they provide the right conditions for improved conservation and food security outcomes. These sites have wildlife of conservation importance (including gorillas, chimps and pangolins) which is threatened by bushmeat hunting, and communities have few protein alternatives. Potential initiatives include sustainable fisheries on the Dja river, household chicken-rearing, aquaculture; a combination might be needed to meet the needs of different sectors of society, e.g. for men culturally appropriate activities providing

⁴ E.g. [Coad et al \(2010\)](#), [Wilkie et al \(2005\)](#).

easy and rapid food/cash, for women nutritious, easy to prepare fresh food..

The project timeframe is too short to implement new projects which would lead to measurable change in populations of species currently targeted for local consumption, but in the longer term we expect reduced exploitation and improved conservation status of a wide range of mammal and reptile species in the DFR. This, combined with the improved design of bushmeat-alternative projects, will lead to higher levels of food security for rural populations (directly in DFR, and indirectly throughout sub-Saharan Africa), through access to sustainable, nutritious and locally acceptable protein sources. In DFR, our 3 sites have 200, 400 and 80 households respectively, totalling about 2500 people. The projects are village-wide, hence we expect direct benefits of improved bushmeat-alternative projects to benefit all the inhabitants.

We expect much wider uptake of our guidance within and beyond DFR, and beyond Cameroon, given the prevalence of unsuccessful bushmeat-alternative interventions in sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere. Thus, the potential reach of this project, in terms of the numbers of poor rural people who are currently the targets of conservation organisations trying to reduce wild meat consumption, and species of conservation concern, could be substantial (the recently launched 7.5 million euro [ECOFACT 6](#) programme, for example, is expected to generate >20 large-scale bushmeat-alternative projects throughout the Congo Basin).

15. Gender

All applicants must consider whether and how their project will contribute to reducing inequality between persons of different gender. Explain how your project will collect gender disaggregated data and what impact your project will have in promoting gender equality

(Max 300 words)

A focus on understanding **food choice**, rather than developing new livelihoods for hunters, is inherently female; women make household food choices and face challenges when protein sources are limited, while livelihoods projects focus on men. This is because, in the communities surrounding the DFR (as in sub-Saharan Africa generally), hunting is generally perceived as a predominantly male occupation. In contrast, meat preparation is perceived as a female role. This project's focus on understanding food preferences means that we can encourage an increase in the emphasis on the challenges faced by women in the design and implementation of future bushmeat-alternative projects.

We will ensure that women have the opportunity to take part in the participatory research, and express their views freely, through female-only focus groups, and key informant interviews with women of different ages and life-stages (young women, those with young children, matriarchs). Our choice experiments will sample a representative section of the community, and our inputs into project design and implementation will be explicitly informed by the challenges women face. As the lead field researcher (SB) is female, she will be able to have discussions with women in home environments where they feel comfortable.

In our analysis, we will explore differences between genders (as well as other socio-economic variables including age, wealth and ethnicity) in food choice and intervention type. For example nursing women may need higher-protein foods, while older women may prefer interventions that enable them to engage in protein production themselves, and that are closer to home (e.g. homestead smallstock or aquaculture). Identifying gendered differences in food choices and intervention type preferences will in turn allow future interventions to cater for both male and female preferences, as well as preferences guided by tradition, taste, the need for a fulfilling occupation, and religion.

16. Exit strategy

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)

Ongoing sustainability is inherent in the project's design; our Outcome is supporting the ability of local people, NGOs and government actors to identify and implement projects leading to increased food security (through sustainable animal protein sources), while safeguarding species of conservation concern in protected areas from overexploitation.

This is a discrete project which will reach a sustainable end point, with the findings of the research being used to guide improvements in existing bushmeat-alternative initiatives, guidance being produced and disseminated widely to project implementers looking to design future bushmeat-alternative initiatives, or improve existing ones. Our decision-support tool, databases and written materials will remain available to download from the IIED website beyond the life of the project, and our outputs will continue to be promoted regularly by all partners.

FCTV and LEL are committed to ongoing work in the Dja region. In particular, FCTV/LEL commit to working with project implementers and funders to bring to reality the bushmeat-alternative project enhancements and proposals desired by local people e.g. through the established Dja Actors' Forum. All project partners will continue to engage with international bushmeat-related processes and actions, ensuring that both locally and internationally our findings will be taken on board, and built upon.

17a. Harmonisation

Is this a new initiative or a development of existing work (funded through any source)? Please give details

(Max 200 words)

This is a new initiative, which builds on, and adds value to, previous and ongoing work by the project team and others, while laying the groundwork for future initiatives in DFR, nationally and internationally. We have explicitly sought out synergies and opportunities to add value.

In DFR, our project builds on two Darwin-funded projects: a) 20-007, led by Living Earth, which culminated in the establishment of 6 Community Hunting Zones in Mindourou (case study site 1). We will add value to this project, enhancing the sustainability of the CHZs by supporting the development of additional protein sources. b) 24-005, led by Antwerp zoo, enhancing fisheries in the Northern Buckle (case study site 2).

Project researcher Stephanie Brittain is currently completing research on the potential for local monitoring of bushmeat species' distribution and abundance, based in case study sites 1 and 3; she has already started scoping discussions with villagers in Alat Makay (site 3) on their interest in engaging with this project.

Juliet Wright (supervised by EJMG) reviewed >20 bushmeat-alternative projects in DFR and Takamanda reserve, Cameroon; she evaluated their theories of change, conservation and

livelihoods outcomes; this work forms the foundation of our DFR-based evidence review.

17b. Are you aware of any other individuals/organisations/projects carrying out or applying for funding for similar work? Yes

If yes, please give details explaining similarities and differences. Explain 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.

We are aware of a number of research projects that are addressing unsustainable wild meat hunting and consumption. However, the majority of projects focus on urban consumption and on providing alternative livelihoods for hunters. Our project is different from these in that it focusses on on-site food consumption by rural communities and on provision of alternative sources of protein rather than livelihoods.

We aim explicitly to synergise with, and add value to, these existing projects. In particular, we will link to a recently-funded EU initiative led by [FAO](#) which is intended to help African, Caribbean and Pacific countries shift from wild meat consumption to alternative sources of animal protein. This has a focus on alternative protein, and targets rural as well as urban consumers but does not have a specific focus on drivers of food choice and will work in different locations (not Cameroon). Professor John Fa will play a major role in the EU initiative, and will sit on an advisory group for this project in order to ensure synergies between the two.

In the periphery of the DFR, ZSL are working with communities dependent on wild-caught meat to support behavioural change; we include Dr Marcus Rowcliffe on our Advisory Group in order to ensure synergies with ZSL's work.

Royal Antwerp Zoological Society, together with partners African Wildlife Foundation, Living Earth and FCTV are currently implementing a Darwin Initiative project (24-005) to support poor rural communities living in the Northern buckle buffer zone; this includes support for the 'Dja Actors' Forum', which is comprised of delegates from local peoples' groups, local and international NGOs, funders and government agencies that support the implementation of the Dja Management Plan. Our project will support this initiative, and project team members are in regular contact with all the relevant organisations in order to ensure complementarity of actions.

18. Ethics

Outline your approach to meeting the Darwin Initiative's key principles for research ethics as outlined in the [Guidance](#).

(Max 300 words)

IIED has a new research ethics review process and a new policy on [Integrity and Ethics in Research, Partnership and Policy Engagement](#) which focusses on principles of terms of engagement (particularly free prior informed consent, transparency, independence and partnership), ensuring that ethical considerations inform the design and conduct of IIED activities. It seeks to facilitate ethical conduct and foster a commitment to meaningful collaboration and reciprocal responsibilities of all parties involved in IIED work. This project will be evaluated against this policy to ensure best practice is followed.

The field component of the project will be subject to the ethics procedures of the University of

Oxford. The Oxford CUREC ([Central University Research Ethics Committee](#)) is responsible for the development of University policies and procedures to ensure that all proposed research involving human participants and personal data receives appropriate ethical review. All fieldwork protocols will undergo rigorous ethical review by the Social Sciences and Humanities Interdivisional Research Ethics Committee (SSH IDREC), one of CUREC's three subcommittees.

In addition to following institutional procedures, the project team will make time in the agenda of all meetings to reflect on the ethical issues raised by this project, and how to address them. As individuals we are personally committed not just to following best practice, but to challenging and enhancing ethical standards in our work. This project aims to enhance the wellbeing and voice of marginalised people (including women), and involves confronting sensitive cultural and equity issues (food preferences, nutritional security, food access inequality, imposition of rules and interventions by external actors including conservationists, conflicts and trade-offs between the needs and priorities of individuals, groups and institutions). Hence it is vital that ethical issues are openly and transparently considered and addressed by the project team on an ongoing basis.

19. Raising awareness of the potential worth of biodiversity

If your project contains an element of communications, knowledge sharing and/or dissemination please provide a description of your intended audience, how you intend to engage them, what the expected products/materials will be and what you expect to achieve as a result. For example, are you expecting to directly influence policy in your host country or is your project a community advocacy project to support better management of biodiversity?

(Max 300 words)

Our main target audience for project outputs is project implementers and policy makers both in Cameroon and elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa, although our findings will have relevance for conservation policy worldwide. Internationally, our CBD and CITES CoP side-events will raise the issues of understanding food choice and effective participatory project design, and our policy briefs and research report will give technical detail in digestible formats. Our contact with key individuals in large internationally-funded bushmeat interventions will support and mould their activities.

We will produce a decision support tool specifically targeted at project implementers, written in practical, easily accessible language and presented in an easy-to-use format. We will disseminate this and the research findings within Cameroon, using the [Poverty and Conservation Learning Group](#) as a key channel; and internationally through the international PCLG, the [UK Bushmeat Working Group](#), the [Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management](#) and the CBD and CITES. In all these cases, we expect our audience to be a mix of practitioners (project designers and implementers) and policy makers. We will also present our research at conferences, in peer-reviewed papers and on social media for an international academic audience.

At DFR, our engagement with villagers seeking to find sustainable alternatives for bushmeat will raise their understanding of the importance of biodiversity for the continuing health both of their families and the forest ecosystem. Building on the awareness-raising activities of existing projects, we will discuss the status of species threatened by hunting, and distinguish these from species potentially able to sustain a limited offtake. We will talk with women and men about how their food preferences and consumption levels can be reconciled with the limitations of sustainable production, and how to resolve this dilemma (e.g. through local domestic livestock rearing, fishery improvement or sourcing sustainable supplies from elsewhere).

20. Capacity building

If your project will support capacity building at institutional or individual levels, please provide details of what form this will take and how this capacity will be secured for the future.

(Max 300 words)

Our outputs are intended to enhance capacity of bushmeat-alternative project designers and implementers to improve existing projects, or design more sustainable and appropriate new projects. We will build capacity at four levels; local people, project implementers, government agencies, international bodies.

Our engagement with local people will use participatory learning and action methodology (PLA), which will build their capacity to engage with implementers in future.

The ability of local people and project implementers at three field sites to work together will be enhanced through their production of revised local management plans e.g. community hunting zone management plans, community forest and fisheries management plans.

We will increase the capacity of NGOs within the DFR and elsewhere (including in-country project partner FCTV) to better design locally-relevant and sustainable in projects.

At the government level, the project will inform the processes and production of protected area management plans, such that the ability of government staff to identify *practical* working solutions for the provision of sustainable animal protein sources is enhanced.

Internationally, funding agencies (e.g. USAID), policy-makers (e.g. CBD) and implementers (e.g. CIFOR) will have a better understanding of the need for locally-designed and gender-aware projects, with strong theories of change, for both conservation and food security objectives to be successfully met.

The project has a strong emphasis on producing outputs that are grounded in fieldwork informed by interactions with end-users. This means that project lessons will support the design and implementation of many projects aimed at supporting food security for people that have, historically, relied on access to wild-caught meat and where there are growing restrictions on these sources. Implementers of such projects are typically small-scale, low-capacity local NGOs, and our project will build their capacity to design, implement and evaluate their interventions.

21. Access to project information

Please describe the project's open access plan and detail any specific funds you are seeking from Darwin to fund this.

(Max 250 words)

All written project outputs will be made freely available on IIED and project partner websites. Our policy briefs, research reports and decision support tool will be widely publicised and available both in soft copy, and in hard copy for in-country partners who are less able to access online materials. Our conference and working group presentations will be recorded or livestreamed where possible, and/or ppts placed online.

We will translate key outputs relevant for local decision-makers in Cameroon into French. This will be facilitated by project researcher Stephanie Brittain being bilingual. We will ensure project information is also made available to local villages in the DFR region in appropriate ways (including in their native languages where necessary).

Peer-reviewed papers will be deposited into the Oxford Research Archive and on ResearchGate, for free download once journal embargo periods are completed, and funds permitting, will be preferentially published in online open-access journals. We seek no additional funding from Darwin for open access publishing.

The titles, authors and URLs of the sources for our evidence reviews will be listed in an online archive so that others can access them. We will create an online database of active and past bushmeat-alternative projects in the DFR region, and disseminate this information within Cameroon through the PCLG network.

Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Measuring Impact

22. Logical Framework

Darwin projects will be required to report against their progress towards their expected Outputs and Outcome if funded. 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.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Impact: Improved “bushmeat-alternative” projects in Cameroon and Africa-wide result in reduced exploitation of wild species and increased food security, contributing to achievement of SDGs while meeting CBD and CITES obligations</p>			
<p>Outcome: (Max 30 words)</p> <p>Strengthened capacity of policy-makers and practitioners in Cameroon and Africa-wide to design and implement effective “bushmeat-alternative” interventions that reflect drivers of food choice, conserve biodiversity and contribute to food security.</p>	<p>0.1 Improved understanding by conservation policy-makers in sub-Saharan Africa of different drivers of wild meat as a food choice of local people, compared to baseline at start of project</p> <p>0.2 Improved understanding by “bushmeat-alternative” project designers in sub-Saharan Africa of characteristics of effective bushmeat-alternative projects compared to baseline at start of project</p> <p>0.3 Enhancements to two bushmeat alternative projects at DFR, and a proposal for another, by the end of the project, so that projects have the right conditions in place to a) improve food security and provide sustainable nutrition while also b) reducing exploitation of wild species.</p> <p>0.4 Receipt, uptake and commitments to use project-generated evidence and tools by at least 50% of existing</p>	<p>0.1 Survey of policy-makers to determine understanding before and after project implementation</p> <p>0.2 Survey of project designers/implementers (identified in evidence review) before and after dissemination of project findings/tool, to determine understanding and willingness to implement improved projects</p> <p>0.3 Reports from project designers/managers; feedback from villagers</p> <p>0.4 Reports on uptake of decision support tool and policy guidance materials; feedback from project funders and implementers</p>	<p>International NGOs and policy-makers (e.g. ECOFAC, CBD) are responsive to findings and change their processes accordingly [our strong international networks and involvement of key players in Advisory group will help here]</p> <p>Feasible and effective bushmeat alternatives exist, that can divert enough consumption from bushmeat to reduce hunting pressure [In the long run, food systems need to reflect changing environmental, social & economic realities. In the short-medium term there is potential for e.g. aquaculture, wild-caught fisheries, mini-livestock]</p> <p>Better-designed “bushmeat-alternative” projects will lead to reduced hunting and reduced threats to wildlife (because rural consumption is a major threat) [Our experience in DFR and elsewhere suggests rural consumption is a threat; detailed research by J Wright suggests design improvements are feasible and</p>

	bushmeat-alternative project designers, funders and implementers in DFR (from inventory generated in output 2).		<p>could be effective]</p> <p>Local people are willing to take part in surveys and engage with research team [the team has very good relationships with local people in areas around the DFR and have worked with them for a number of years]</p> <p>Creation of decision support tool is feasible based on information collected, and evidence from DFR will be generalisable [we expect the evidence internationally to be weak; our new evidence-base for DFR will be locally relevant and our expectation based on previous work is that broad general lessons will emerge]</p> <p>Cameroon government remains supportive of the project and responsive to research findings</p>
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. Factors influencing use of wild meat as a food choice around Dja Biosphere Reserve and elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa understood and documented</p>	<p>1.1 Evidence review of drivers of wild meat as a food choice across Africa completed by end of year 1</p> <p>1.2 Field work to gain local communities' perspectives on food choice at DFR completed and analysed by end of Y2Q2</p> <p>1.3 Findings of the evidence review and fieldwork are discussed with Cameroon and DFR policy makers and conservation practitioners by end of Y2.</p> <p>1.4 Findings reported to CBD at 2020</p>	<p>1.1 Report and database of sources available online and disseminated via partner networks</p> <p>1.2 Biannual progress reports to Darwin, research findings report, research paper</p> <p>1.3 Meeting reports</p> <p>1.4 CBD reports</p> <p>1.5 PCLG meeting reports, dissemination records</p>	<p>Sufficient information is available at the international scale to draw conclusions</p> <p>Local people are willing to participate in surveys and interviews</p> <p>Policy makers and practitioners are sufficiently interested and engaged to attend meetings and provide feedback</p>

	<p>CoP in Y3</p> <p>1.5 Findings disseminated in Cameroon and internationally by end of project</p>	<p>1.5 IIED and partner websites with materials available</p> <p>1.5 Research papers and conference presentations</p>	
<p>2. Characteristics of existing bushmeat alternative projects in DFR and elsewhere, and the role of drivers of food choice in project success, analysed</p>	<p>2.1 Evidence review of the factors affecting success of bushmeat-alternative projects in sub-Saharan Africa completed by end of year 1</p> <p>2.2 Inventory of existing bushmeat alternative projects in Dja region completed and placed in online database by end of Y1Q3</p> <p>2.3 Analyses of evidence review & inventory to discern success factors completed by end of year 1</p> <p>2.4 Fieldwork completed to explore bushmeat-alternative intervention preferences in three case study sites in DFR, and data analysed, by Y2Q4</p> <p>2.4 Findings discussed with Cameroon and DFR policy makers and conservation practitioners by end of Y2Q2.</p> <p>2.5 Findings reported to CBD at 2020 CoP in Y3</p> <p>2.6 Findings disseminated internationally by end of project</p>	<p>2.1 Project progress reports and publications</p> <p>2.2 Project report and database of projects published on website</p> <p>2.3 Research paper and report</p> <p>2.4 Results of household surveys; write up of focus group discussions, data from choice experiments; project progress reports, research report/paper</p> <p>2.5 Meeting reports</p> <p>2.6 CBD reports</p> <p>2.7 Dissemination reports, web download stats, conference proceedings, journal article altmetrics</p>	<p>Sufficient information is available [we already have a foundation from J Wright's work]</p> <p>Local people prepared to respond to survey questions and engage with project design.</p> <p>Policy makers and practitioners are sufficiently interested and engaged to attend meetings and provide feedback</p>

<p>3. Enhancements to existing bushmeat-alternative projects and a new proposal, agreed with villagers and implementers at DFR case study sites</p>	<p>3.1 Improved design of at least one new or existing bushmeat-alternative project in each of three sites around DFR agreed with local communities and implementers by end of project</p> <p>3.2 At least 50% of project implementers acting within the DFR report improved understanding of the drivers and barriers to successful bushmeat-alternative projects, resulting in improved implementation effectiveness by end of project</p> <p>3.3 At least 50% of households in case study communities report increased engagement with bushmeat-alternative projects in their area by end of the project</p>	<p>3.1 Inventory results, minutes of meetings held with implementers, project progress reports</p> <p>3.2 Feedback from survey of project implementers;</p> <p>3.7 Community surveys at beginning and end of project</p>	<p>Local people willing to participate in the project</p> <p>There is sufficient information generated from the research under outputs 1 and 2 that a locally acceptable and effective project design improvement can be agreed</p> <p>Implementers of existing and planned projects are prepared to engage with us to improve their projects and monitor outcomes. [our strong relationships with these project implementers, and careful laying of the groundwork in year 1, makes this likely]</p>
<p>4. Capacity to design and implement improved “bushmeat alternative” interventions improved elsewhere in Cameroon and internationally.</p>	<p>4.1. Policy recommendations developed discussed and agreed with Cameroonian government by end of project</p> <p>4.2 Decision support tool designed, and tested in DFR, by end of Y3Q2.</p> <p>4.3. Decision support tool disseminated to at least 100 conservation and/or development organisations, tested and validated for at least 20 projects, and refined accordingly, by end of Y3Q3.</p> <p>4.4. Endorsement of guidance/ recommendations by at least one international conservation policy process</p>	<p>4.1 Policy recommendations available in French and English on project website; minutes of meetings</p> <p>4.2 Tool available on project website, web download stats, PCLG meeting reports; project design documents, project implementer feedback and reports</p> <p>4.3 Evidence of dissemination online and at CBD side-event. Report of validation testing.</p> <p>4.4 Dissemination records, downloads from website, feedback surveys reporting on uptake and usefulness,</p>	<p>Policy makers and practitioners are receptive to research findings and recommendations and willing to provide feedback</p> <p>Tool is useful and generalizable beyond case study sites.</p> <p>“Bushmeat-alternative” projects continue to be developed by other actors</p>

	or large-scale programme developing bushmeat-alternative interventions, by end of project.	letter of confirmation of use from at least one organisation.	
<p>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)</p> <p>0.0 Agreement of ToRs and contracts for project partners (IIED)</p> <p>0.1 Inception meeting with project partners in Cameroon (All)</p> <p>0.2 Project webpage established and flyer developed (including translation of flyer into French) (IIED)</p> <p>0.3 Biannual skype-based progress review meetings</p> <p>0.4 Annual project meetings in Cameroon (1 day project partners and advisors, 1 day outreach via PCLG)</p> <p>1.1 Desk-based evidence review of drivers of food choice (sub-Saharan Africa) (IIED)</p> <p>1.2 Fieldwork in Dja on local preferences, drivers and constraints, & role of wild meat in food security (focus groups, key informant interviews) (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)</p> <p>1.3 Synthesis and write up of food choice evidence review (IIED)</p> <p>1.4 Synthesis and write up of first phase of fieldwork (Oxford)</p> <p>1.5 Meetings with DFR and national policy-makers, conservation actors and community representatives/associations to present findings and discuss uptake (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)</p> <p>1.6 Side event at CBD CoP (IIED)</p> <p>1.7 Dissemination of food choice evidence review report internationally (IIED)</p> <p>2.1 Desk-based evidence review of bushmeat alternative projects (IIED)</p> <p>2.2 Inventory of bushmeat-alternative initiatives around DFR completed and posted in online database (IIED & all teams)</p> <p>2.3 Cross checking of Dja projects with success factors from evidence review (IIED and Oxford)</p> <p>2.4 Synthesis and write up of evidence review on bushmeat alternative projects (IIED and Oxford)</p> <p>2.5 Fieldwork to explore preferences for bushmeat-alternative interventions with villagers in 3 case study sites (including survey design, training of FCTV staff in survey techniques, implementation of choice experiment and household surveys) (Oxford & FCTV/LEL)</p> <p>2.6 Data analysis and write up of overall research report & other outputs such as papers (Oxford with inputs from all)</p> <p>2.7 Meetings with DFR and national policy-makers and conservation actors to present findings and discuss uptake (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)</p> <p>2.8 Side event at CBD CoP (IIED)</p> <p>2.9 Dissemination of report internationally</p> <p>3.1 Work with villagers and project implementers in 3 sites to improve existing projects based on findings (Mindourou, Northern buckle) or design new project for future fundraising (LEL/FTCV & Oxford)</p> <p>3.2 Meetings with project designers/implementers (community organisations, NGOs, govt) in DFR to disseminate project findings and explore ways to improve project design & implementation (FCTV/LEL)</p> <p>3.3 End of project survey of villagers in 3 case study sites to assess engagement with, and perceived effectiveness of, bushmeat-alternative projects or proposals</p>			

(FCTV/LEL & Oxford)

- 4.1 Drafting and translation of policy recommendations (IIED & FCTV/LEL with inputs from Oxford)
- 4.2 Development of Decision Support Tool based on experience in case study sites & evidence reviews (LEL/FCTV with inputs from all)
- 4.3 Meetings with project designers/implementers (community organisations, NGOs, govt) in DFR to test & validate tool and refine/update its design (FCTV/LEL)
- 4.4 Presentation of tool (and experience from case study sites including new project designs) to other project implementers via the Dja Actors Forum & PCLG (FCTV/LEL)
- 4.5 Meetings with Cameroon policy makers to discuss recommendations & feasible changes in interventions (FCTV/LEL)
- 4.6 International dissemination of project findings and tool (IIED with inputs from all)
- 4.7 Validation exercise for tool in other projects (IIED & Oxford)
- 4.8 Feedback survey on project's impact on intervention design internationally (IIED with inputs from all)
- 4.9 Presentation at CBD CoP (IIED)

23. 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 (starting from Q2 July 2018)

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 shade only the quarters in which an activity will be carried out. The workplan can span multiple pages if necessary.

Activity	No. of months	Year 1			Year 2				Year 3			
		Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Cross cutting												
0.0 Agreement of ToRs and contracts for project partners (IIED)	1	X										
0.1 Inception meeting with project partners in Cameroon (All)	1	X										
0.2 Project webpage established and flyer developed (including translation of flyer into French) (IIED)	1	X										
0.3 Biannual skype-based progress review meetings (All)	1			X		X		X		X		X
0.4 Annual project meetings in Cameroon (1 day project partners and advisors, 1 day outreach via PCLG)	1					X					X	
Output 1 Factors influencing use of wild meat as a food choice around Dja Biosphere Reserve and elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa understood and documented												
1.1 Desk-based evidence review of drivers of food choice (sub-Saharan Africa) (IIED)	3	X	X	X								
1.2 Fieldwork in Dja on local preferences, drivers and constraints, & role of wild meat in food security (focus groups, key informant interviews) (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)	3				X	X						
1.3 Synthesis and write up of evidence reviews (IIED)	1			X								
1.4 Analysis and write-up of first phase of fieldwork (Oxford)	3						X					
1.5 Meetings with DFR and national policy-makers and conservation actors to present findings and discuss uptake (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)	1								X			
1.6 Side event at CBD CoP (IIED)	1									X	X	
1.7 Dissemination of evidence review report internationally (IIED)	24				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Output 2	Characteristics of existing bushmeat alternative projects in DFR and elsewhere, and the role of drivers of food choice in project success, analysed												
2.1	Desk-based evidence review of bushmeat-alternative projects (sub-Saharan Africa) (IIED)	3	X	X	X								
2.2	Inventory of bushmeat-alternative initiatives around DFR completed and placed in online database (IIED & all teams)	1		X									
2.3	Cross checking of Dja projects with success factors from evidence review (IIED and Oxford)	1			X								
2.4	Synthesis and write up of evidence review (IIED and Oxford)	1			X								
2.5	Fieldwork to explore preferences for bushmeat-alternative interventions with villagers in 3 case study sites (Oxford & FCTV/LEL)	3				X	X						
2.6	Data analysis and write up of overall research report & other outputs such as papers (Oxford with inputs from all)	3						X	X				
2.5	Meetings with DFR and national policy-makers and conservation actors to present findings and discuss uptake (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)	1								X			
2.6	Side event at CBD CoP (IIED)	1									X	X	
2.7	Dissemination of report internationally (IIED)	9									X	X	X
Output 3	Enhancements to existing bushmeat-alternative projects, at DFR, and a new proposal, agreed with villagers and implementers												
3.1	Work with villagers and project implementers in 3 sites to improve existing projects based on findings or design new project for future fundraising (LEL/FTCV & Oxford)	3								X	X		
3.2	Meetings with project designers/implementers (community organisations, NGOs, govt) in DFR to disseminate project findings and explore ways to improve project design & implementation (FCTV/LEL)	3									X	X	
3.3	End of project survey of villagers in 3 case study sites to assess engagement with, and perceived effectiveness of, bushmeat-alternative projects or proposals (FCTV/LEL & Oxford)	1										X	
Output 4	Capacity to design and implement improved bushmeat-alternative interventions improved elsewhere in Cameroon and internationally												
4.1	Drafting and translation of policy recommendations (IIED & FCTV/LEL with inputs from Oxford)	2									X	X	

4.2	Development of Decision Support Tool based on experience in case study sites & evidence reviews (LEL/FCTV with inputs from all)	3								X	X		
4.3	Meetings with project designers/implementers (community organisations, NGOs, govt) in DFR to test & validate tool and refine/update its design (FCTV/LEL)	1									X		
4.4	Presentation of tool (and experience from case study sites including new project designs) to other project implementers via the Dja Actors Forum & PCLG (FCTV/LEL)	1										X	
4.5	Meetings with Cameroon policy makers to discuss recommendations & feasible changes in interventions (FCTV/LEL)	1										X	
4.6	International dissemination of project findings and tool (IIED with inputs from all)	9									X	X	X
4.7	Validation exercise for tool in other projects (IIED & Oxford)	2										X	
4.8	Feedback survey on project's impact on intervention design internationally (IIED with inputs from all)	2											X
4.9	Presentation at CBD CoP (IIED)	1									X	X	

24. Project based monitoring and evaluation (M&E)

Describe, referring to the Indicators above, 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.

(Max 500 words)

This project has been designed so that all partners have direct input into project delivery and evaluation. Throughout, IIED will facilitate self-evaluation to continuously track progress towards achieving our outcome, incorporate stakeholder input into project outputs, and ensure that outputs are of practical and policy relevance for the Cameroonian government, project implementers in the Dja region, and the international conservation community.

The Core Team will meet formally six-monthly to review progress (alternating in-person and skype calls) and have monthly email catch-ups; more regularly if necessary.

We have selected a Project Advisory Group of experts with complementary skills, to play a vital role in project M&E: Prudence Galega (tbc) (Cameroon Ministry of the Environment, linking us to Cameroonian governmental policy), Yaa Ntiamoah-Baidu (University of Ghana – bushmeat expert with strong links to cross-African policy and academic processes), John Fa (CIFOR – leader of a large-scale EU-funded project on bushmeat in Central Africa), Marcus Rowcliffe (ZSL – bushmeat expert, linking us to ZSL's programme in the Dja region). The PAG will contribute to M&E through reviewing our project plans and reports, attendance at project meetings where possible, and ongoing engagement and advice. They will also support us with networking and dissemination, and help us to engage with ongoing international processes and large-scale initiatives.

During the Inception Workshop, we will develop a Theory of Change for the project based on the logframe. This will involve identifying baselines, a process for monitoring indicators, and agreement on responsibilities of each project partner for M&E of project progress, so that each project partner is fully involved with M&E. IIED will lead this process, and utilise the partners' expertise in developing Theories of Change for conservation interventions.

Progress against the ToC will be reviewed at each 6-monthly meeting. At the Year 2 meeting, we will evaluate project achievement of its intended outputs and identify opportunities for adaptation and improvement. IIED will update the ToC to incorporate the findings of this review in a continual process of action-based learning. At the final Project Workshop, we will evaluate each logframe indicator and review project achievements at the different scales of project impact including the site, national and international levels.

Many of our project activities are M&E activities in themselves (e.g. before-after household surveys to determine satisfaction with bushmeat-alternative projects; before-after surveys of project implementers to assess improvements in capacity to design effective projects and uptake and usefulness of the tool for project design).

We will also specifically monitor and evaluate the ethical aspects of our project on an annual basis. In particular we will consider comments received as part of our internal ethics review processes, revisit our data protection and data handling policies to check that they are being implemented as intended, discuss any concerns and new information from our surveys, and reflect upon the gender aspects of our research. We will use these occasions for reflective

evaluation to ensure that our procedures represent absolute best practice.	
Number of days planned for M&E	40
Total project budget for M&E	£25,045
Percentage of total project budget set aside for M&E	6%

Funding and Budget

Please complete the separate Excel spreadsheet which provides the Budget for this application. Some of the questions earlier and below refer to the information in this spreadsheet. You should also ensure you have read the '[Finance for Darwin and Illegal Wildlife Trade Challenge Fund](#)' document and considered the implications of payment points for cashflow purposes.

NB: The Darwin Initiative cannot agree any increase in grants once awarded.

25. Value for Money

Please explain how you worked out your budget and how you will provide value for money through managing a cost effective and efficient project. You should also discuss any significant assumptions you have made when working out your budget.

(max 300 words)

The key cost driver of the project is the salaries of project personnel. This reflects the personnel-intensive nature of a project based on literature review, field research, and on-site technical support and capacity development. Salaries have been costed using actual salary day rates for project staff, careful estimates of the amount of time needed to complete each project activity described in the proposal, and the location, seniority and organisational affiliation of the individuals best placed to undertake each task. Each organisation involved has a standard set of measures and processes to ensure that its staff rates are fair, competitive and benchmarked compared to other similar organisations.

The University of Oxford budgets non-direct costs according to the FEC model used as standard across UK-based universities. At IIED and Living Earth/FCTV, overheads are levied in order to cover the actual organisational costs of facilitating the running of projects and allocated proportionately to projects according to organisational policies.

The project will build on previous and ongoing work by the project partners at the case study sites which brings with it ready-established links to target communities and target policy makers. The project also capitalises on established networks and resources of all partner organisations including IIED's membership of the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management and the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group as well as FCTV and Living Earth's involvement in the Dja Actors Forum. Our project advisory group will be providing inputs free of charge, further adding to the value of the project.

International travel costs and meeting costs will be kept to a minimum by timing events to enable cost-sharing across projects in the region and venues for events will be chosen to balance convenience, necessary facilitates, and (where relevant) the ability to attract a target audience, with cost.

26. 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.

(max 150 words)

We have no plans to purchase capital items other than one laptop computer for FCTV. This will remain with FCTV at the end of the project for ongoing use.

27. Match funding (co-finance)**a) Secured**

Provide details of all funding successfully levered (and identified in the Budget) towards the costs of the project, including any income from other public bodies, private sponsorship, donations, trusts, fees or trading activity.

Confirmed: £28,928

Oxford University will contribute £XX,XXX in overheads.

Living Earth will contribute £X,XXX in the form of in-kind contributions from Neil Maddison during year 1 of the project and international travel costs.

IIED will contribute funding for Cameroon PCLG workshops from the Arcus Foundation during years 1 and 2: total £X,XXX. In addition, IIED will fund from biodiversity team reserves the costs over £X,XXX needed for the project end audit: approximately £X,XXX.

27b) Unsecured

Provide details of any matched funding where an application has been submitted, or that you intend applying for during the course of the project. This could include matched funding from the private sector, charitable organisations or other public-sector schemes.

Date applied for	Donor organisation	Amount	Comments
To be confirmed, needed for year 3	To be confirmed	£X,XXX	IIED funding for participation in CBD COP – time and travel, Dilys Roe

27c) None

If you are not intending to seek matched funding for this project, please explain why.

(max 100 words)

28) Financial Management Risks

Explain how you have considered the risks and threats that may be relevant to the success of this project, including the risks of fraud or bribery.

(max 200 words)

IIED has risk management and partner due diligence processes that it applies across all of its projects. Risk registers covering both operational and financial management risks are developed at project inception and reviewed regularly. As project coordinator, IIED will take oversight of project financial management and issue sub-grant agreements and provide user-friendly guidance that make clear i) partner budgets per project year and ii) the Darwin Initiative's financial terms and conditions. Biannual project financial reporting and skype calls that include finance-related updates and reminders will enable IIED to check that spending is on track and all partners are prepared for the Darwin Initiative's annual reporting requirements and deadlines.

Living Earth / FCTV will have the greatest amount of spend in currency other than GBP and will be required to manage the impact of currency fluctuations and discuss any significant impacts with the wider project team for mitigation.

IIED is bound by the provisions of the Bribery Act 2010 and this is reflected in our partner due diligence and sub-granting process and staff training – all undergo anti-fraud and bribery training relevant to our work.

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 your Foreign Ministry or the local embassy or High Commission (or equivalent) directly to discuss security issues (see Guidance) and attach details of any advice you have received from them.

Yes (no written advice) **Yes, advice attached** **No**

Certification

On behalf of the trustees of The International Institute for Environment and Development

I apply for a grant of **£365,826** 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 applicant institution to submit applications and sign contracts on their behalf.)

- I enclose CVs for key project personnel and letters of support.
- I enclose our last two sets of signed audited/independently verified accounts and annual reports

Name (block capitals)	Andrew Norton
Position in the organisation	Director

Signed**

Date:

29/01/2018

If this section is incomplete or not completed correctly the entire application will be rejected. You must provide a real (not typed) signature. You may include a pdf of the signature page for security reasons if you wish. Please write PDF in the signature section above if you do so.

Stage 2 Application – Checklist for submission

	Check
Have you read the Guidance ?	X
Have you read and can you meet the current Terms and Conditions for this fund?	X
Have you provided actual start and end dates for your project?	X
Have you provided your budget based on UK government financial years i.e. 1 April – 31 March and in GBP?	X
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?	X
Has your application been signed by a suitably authorised individual? (clear electronic or scanned signatures are acceptable)	X
Have you included a 1 page CV for all the key project personnel identified at Question 6 and Question 10?	X
Have you included a letter of support from your <u>key</u> partner organisations identified at Question 9?	X
Have you been in contact with the FCO in the project country/ies and have you included any evidence of this?	X
Have you included a signed copy of the last 2 years annual report and accounts for the lead organisation?	X
Have you checked the Darwin website immediately prior to submission to ensure there are no late updates?	X

Once you have answered the questions above, please submit the application, not later than 2359 GMT on Monday 29 January 2018 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**. 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). You are not required to send a hard copy.

Data Protection Act 1998 - Fair Processing Notice

The purpose of this Fair Processing Notice is to inform you of the use that will be made of your personal data, as required by the Data Protection Act 1998.

The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) is the data controller in respect of any personal data that you provide when you complete your application, the grant acceptance and the supplier forms.

Defra will use your personal data primarily for the purpose of processing your application for Darwin Initiative funding. By submitting an application, applicants have agreed to any disclosure of the information supplied (including the content of a declaration or undertaking) which Defra considers necessary for the administration, evaluation, monitoring and publicising of the Funds (as detailed in the paragraphs below).

A completed application form signifies agreement to place certain details of successful applications (i.e. name, title, total grant value, project summary, lead organisation and location of project work) on the Darwin Initiative websites listed below. A completed application form also signifies agreement to send data on the project proposals during the application process to British Embassies and High Commissions outside the UK, including those outside the European Economic Area.

<http://www.darwininitiative.org.uk>;

<https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/the-darwin-initiative>;

Application form data will also be processed by Defra contractors dealing with Darwin Initiative administration, monitoring and evaluation (working within relevant data protection rules).

Defra may be required to release information, including personal data and commercial information, on request under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 or the Freedom of Information Act 2000. However, Defra will not permit any unwarranted breach of confidentiality nor will we act in contravention of our obligations under the Data Protection Act 1998. The Grantee shall assist and co-operate with the Department (at the Grantee's expense) to enable the Department to comply with its disclosure obligations under these enactments.

We may use information, including personal data, to test computer systems to ensure that they work effectively and efficiently and to develop new systems in order to improve efficiency and the service that we provide to you and other persons. Any use of information for testing or developing computerised systems will be conducted in a secure manner in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 to safeguard the privacy of the information that you have supplied.

Defra's Personal Information Charter, which gives details of your rights in respect of the handling of your personal data, is on the Defra section of Gov.uk. If you don't have access to the internet, please telephone the Defra helpline 08459 33 55 77 and ask to speak to the Data Protection Officer for a copy of the Information Charter.