

Applicant: **Schofield, Andy**
Organisation: **RSPB**
Funding Sought: **£249,999.00**

DPR10S2\1022

Inhabited Territory restoration: completing preparations for a rodent-free Pitcairn Islands

The Pitcairn Islands are an environmental hotspot with a natural World Heritage Site and vast marine reserve. Introduced rodents are devastating two of the islands' ecosystems and significantly impacting the community. This project will address outstanding questions around the feasibility of removing Pitcairn's rodents and provide final technical inputs regarding Henderson. Continuous community consultation, pre-operational mapping and non-target species mitigation research will empower fully-informed local decisions to proceed with eradication delivery, potentially enabling the first rodent-free inhabited Overseas Territory.

Section 1 - Contact Details

PRIMARY APPLICANT DETAILS

Name Jonathan
Surname Hall
Organisation RSPB
Tel [REDACTED]
Email (Work) [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

CONTACT DETAILS

Title Mr
Name Andy
Surname Schofield
Organisation RSPB
Tel [REDACTED]
Email [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

GMS ORGANISATION

Type	Charity/ trusts
Name	RSPB
Phone (Work)	[REDACTED]
Email (Work)	[REDACTED]
Website (Work)	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Section 2 - Title, Dates & Budget Summary

Q3. Project title

Inhabited Territory restoration: completing preparations for a rodent-free Pitcairn Islands

What was your Stage 1 reference number? e.g. DPR10S1\1123

Q4. UKOT(s)**Which UK Overseas Territory(ies) will your project be working in?** Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie & Oeno Islands**** if you have indicated a territory group with an asterisk, please give detail on which territories you are working on here:**

Pitcairn & Henderson Islands

Q4b. In addition to the UKOTs you have indicated, will your project directly benefit any other Territories or country(ies)? No**Q5. Project dates****Start date:**

01 June 2022

End date:

31 March 2025

Duration (e.g. 2 years, 3 months):

2 years, 10 months

Q6. Budget summary

Year:	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	Total request
Darwin funding request (Apr - Mar)	£93,328.00	£63,843.00	£92,828.00	£ 249,999.00

Q6a. Do you have proposed matched funding arrangements? Yes**What matched funding arrangements are proposed?**

The RSPB will provide match-funding of via specific staff time, overheads, project travel and accommodation / subsistence. (Confirmed)

The Government of the Pitcairn Islands Environmental, Conservation & Natural Resources Division will provide half of the Division Manager's time on the project as matched funding, plus approximately one fifth of their overheads. (Confirmed).

The FCDO, via the Pitcairn Administrator, has also indicated that he could likely make a small contribution of match-funding during delivery, though this is unconfirmed and hence not included in the project budget.

Q6b. Proposed matched funding as % of total project cost (total cost is the Darwin request plus other funding required to run the project).**Q6c. If you have a significant amount of unconfirmed matched funding, please clarify how you fund the project if you don't manage to secure this?***No Response*

Section 3 - Project Summary and Conventions

Q7. Summary of Project

Please provide a brief summary of your project, its aims, and the key activities you plan to undertake. Please note that if you are successful, this wording may be used by Defra in communications.

Please write this summary for a non-technical audience.

The Pitcairn Islands are an environmental hotspot with a natural World Heritage Site and vast marine reserve. Introduced rodents are devastating two of the islands' ecosystems and significantly impacting the community. This project will address outstanding questions around the feasibility of removing Pitcairn's rodents and provide final technical inputs regarding Henderson. Continuous community consultation, pre-operational mapping and non-target species mitigation research will empower fully-informed local decisions to proceed with eradication delivery, potentially enabling the first rodent-free inhabited Overseas Territory.

Q8. Environmental Conventions, Treaties and Agreements

Please detail how your project will contribute to the aims of the agreement(s) your project is targeting. What key OT Government priorities and themes will it address and how? You should refer to Articles or Programmes of Work here. You should also consider local, territory specific agreements and action plans here.

Letters of support from UKOT Government partners/stakeholders should also make clear reference to the agreements/action plans your project is contributing towards.

International Agreements:

Convention on Migratory Species (CMS): The Endangered Henderson petrel is a CMS Appendix 1-listed species. Removing invasive rats from the Pitcairn Islands is the key conservation management action for this CMS species. Under Article II, 3 (b), Parties "shall endeavour to provide immediate protection for migratory species included in Appendix I".

UNESCO World Heritage Convention: The 2017 UNESCO Conservation Outlook for Henderson Island World Heritage Site concluded 'Significant Concern' and that the current state and trend of values were 'High Concern' and 'Deteriorating' respectively. The Outlook notes that: "the key threat to the World Heritage values of Henderson Island continues to be rat predation and competition and its effects on avifauna, invertebrates, and the wider ecological processes of the island". Removing rodents is therefore the key action required to prevent Henderson Island being formally placed on the official 'World Heritage Site in Danger' list.

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD): The Pitcairn Islands are not party to the CBD. However, this project will support the UK's responsibilities under the CBD (Article 8(h) on alien species; Article 12 on research and training; and Article 13 on public education and awareness).

SDGs: The project will also deliver against Sustainable Development Goals 11 (Sustainable Communities), 15 (Life on Land) and 17 (Partnerships).

Pitcairn Priorities & Commitments:

Pitcairn Islands MPA Management Plan 2021-2026:

'Objective 6.3: Non-native invasive rodent eradication and island restoration project supported by the Pitcairn Island community and progressed to a stage of operation for Henderson and Pitcairn Island'. Most specifically:

- Action 6.3.1 Form a partnership with the RSPB and carry out a full consultation on-island once travel restrictions permit.
- Action 6.3.2 Work in partnership with the RSPB to investigate and gather required evidence to support a successful restoration attempt.

Pitcairn Environment Charter: Commitment 2 'attempt... eradication of invasive species'.

Pitcairn Islands Management Plan: Action 3.4.2 'eradicate non-native invasive species'.

Henderson Island Management Plan: Goal D 'Control or eradicate those alien species established on the island which pose

a threat to native wildlife’.

UK Government priorities:

The project will also deliver against the 25-Year Environment Plan (2018) target “to prevent human induced extinction or loss of known threatened species in England and the Overseas Territories”, and strategic priorities i (baseline data) and ii (invasive species) of the UK Government’s UK Overseas Territories Biodiversity Strategy (2010).

Section 4 - Project Partners

Q9. Project Partners

Please list all the partners involved (including the Lead Partner) 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 Letters of Support for the lead partner and each partner or explain why this has not been included.

N.B: There is a file upload button at the bottom of this page for the upload of a cover letter and all letters of support.

Lead Partner name:	RSPB
Website address:	www.rspb.org.uk
Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project):	<p>The RSPB will lead and manage the project, being responsible for overall delivery. Specifically, the RSPB will lead on community consultation, infrastructure and natural feature mapping, and non-target species research and mitigation measure trials. It will also be responsible for financial management, public communications and project monitoring & evaluation.</p> <p>The RSPB as an organisation has worked with the Pitcairn Island community for over 15 years. The project lead, Andy Schofield, has worked with Pitcairn for six years, including living on-island for 3 months. The RSPB has a successful track record of island community engagement for invasive species eradications, both in the UK and the Overseas Territories, and is committed to building on the outcomes of this project to co-lead on fundraising and eradication operation delivery alongside the Government of the Pitcairn Islands. The RSPB has also been involved in the successful delivery of Darwin Plus projects across 11 of the 14 Territories.</p>
Have you included a Letter of Support from this organisation?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes
Have you provided a cover letter to address your Stage 1 feedback?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes

Do you have partners involved in the Project?

Yes

1. Partner Name: The Pitcairn Environmental, Conservation & Natural Resources Division

Website address: www.government.pn/environment

Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): The Pitcairn Environmental, Conservation & Natural Resources Division will support and participate in the community consultation activities, facilitate quarterly updates to Island Council and provide technical support to the research program on mapping and the Pitcairn reed-warbler, as well as the captive-holding trials. It will participate in the short trip to Henderson Island, and be responsible for the recruitment and management of the two Pitcairn avicultural assistants.

Michele Christian, the Division Manager, has worked with the RSPB for over 12 years. Her capacity is limited as Division Manager is only a part-time Government role (3 days per week), so her involvement and responsibilities have been carefully assessed and jointly agreed.

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

2. Partner Name: *No Response*

Website address: *No Response*

Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): *No Response*

Have you included a Letter of Support from this organisation? Yes
 No

3. Partner Name: *No Response*

Website address: *No Response*

Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): *No Response*

Have you included a Letter of Support from this organisation? Yes No

4. Partner Name: *No Response*

Website address: *No Response*

Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): *No Response*

Have you included a Letter of Support from this organisation? Yes No

5. Partner Name: *No Response*

Website address: *No Response*

Details *No Response*
(including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project):

Have you included a Letter of Support from this organisation? Yes
 No

6. Partner Name: *No Response*

Website address: *No Response*

Details *No Response*
(including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project):

Have you included a Letter of Support from this organisation? Yes
 No

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

No Response

Please provide a cover letter responding to feedback received at Stage 1 if applicable and a combined PDF of all Letters of Support.

 [Letters of support and RSPB feedback letter](#)

 10/01/2022

 22:33:16

 pdf 478.5 KB

Section 5 - Project Staff

Q10. Project Staff

Please identify the key staff on this project, their role and what % of their time they will be working on the project. Further information on who should be classified as key project staff can be found in the guidance.

Please provide 1 page CVs for these staff, or a 1 page job description or Terms of Reference for roles yet to be filled. These should match the names and roles in the budget spreadsheet. If your team is larger than 12 people please review if they are key project staff, or whether you can merge roles (e.g. 'admin and finance support') below, but provide a full table based on this template in the PDF of CVs you provide.

Name (First name, Surname)	Role	Organisation	% time on project	1 page CV or job description attached?
Andy Schofield	Project Leader	RSPB	20	Checked
To be confirmed	Project Officer	RSPB	40	Checked
Sophie Thomas	Island Eradications Technical Advisor	RSPB	15	Checked
Andrew Callender	Eradications Programme Development and M&E	RSPB	20	Checked

Do you require more fields?

Yes

Name (First name, Surname)	Role	Organisation	% time on project	1 page CV or job description attached?
To be confirmed	GIS Analyst	RSPB	13	Checked
To be confirmed	Conservation Scientist	RSPB	66	Checked
Steffen Oppel	Senior Science Support and M&E	RSPB	13	Checked
Wendy Cain	Finance Officer	RSPB	4	Checked
Michele Christian	Pitcairn Lead	Pitcairn Government	20	Checked
To be confirmed	Pitcairn Avicultural Assistant	Pitcairn Government	15	Checked
To be confirmed	Pitcairn Avicultural Assistant	Pitcairn Government	15	Checked
<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>	0	Unchecked

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

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

 [Combined RSPB Pitcairn CVs and JDs](#)
 10/01/2022
 22:35:16
 pdf 1.32 MB

Have you attached all Project staff CVs?

Yes

Section 6 - Background & Methodology

Q11. Problems the project is trying to address

Please describe the problem your project is trying to address in terms of environment and climate issues in the UKOTs.

For example, what are the specific threats to the environment that the project will attempt to address? Why are they relevant, for whom? How did you identify these problems? How will your proposed project help?

Please cite the evidence you are using to support your assessment of the problem (references can be listed in your additional attached PDF document which can be uploaded at the bottom of the page).

The Pitcairn Islands are an environmental hotspot, with assets including Henderson Island World Heritage Site, the world's third largest fully-protected marine reserve and over 95 unique species. Introduced rodents have had major impacts on these remote island ecosystems, extirpating species from all four islands and driving several to extinction. Henderson Island is consequently now at high risk of being placed on the official 'World Heritage Site in Danger' list. Rodents meanwhile have a significant impact on the Pitcairn community, with agricultural produce regularly eaten or soiled, home infrastructure (especially electricity wiring) damaged, and important eco-tourism assets, such as Pitcairn's seabird colonies, wiped out.

The community have now formally asked RSPB to complete the final exploratory/preparatory steps to enable rodent eradication on their inhabited island, with the goal of combining a Henderson and Pitcairn eradication operation and being the first inhabited Territory to become entirely rodent-free. This would enable Territory-wide ecosystem recovery of avifauna, invertebrate and plant communities. The Pitcairn Council included this commitment to work with RSPB on advancing both island restorations in their recently published Pitcairn Islands MPA Management Plan 2021-2026.

A Pitcairn eradication feasibility study was completed in 2014 (updated in 2020). This concluded that eradication was technically feasible but identified a number of outstanding issues that need to be addressed before an eradication could proceed. These include confirming full community support for all final operational approaches, including domestic/feral animal management measures and mitigation methods for potential short-term risks to freshwater and inshore fisheries. The entire community of c.40 people must be in agreement with the proposed methodology, and fully aware of all its requirements and consequences, if an eradication operation on an inhabited island is to succeed.

Mapping of features of interest to inform planning is also required. Whilst a Pitcairn baiting operation would take place by helicopter, every building and source of significant alternative rat-food must also be hand-treated with bait. A comprehensive understanding of the built and (relevant) natural infrastructure is therefore essential. The Endangered Pitcairn reed-warbler meanwhile is endemic to Pitcairn and has been identified as being at potential risk of non-target poisoning. There is no reliable population estimate for this species, so quantification and risk assessment need to occur to assess whether, and how many, individuals would need to be held in protected aviaries for the duration of an eradication. A trial to ensure that a population could be safely gathered and then maintained in captivity is also required before an eradication could proceed.

By comparison, Henderson Island is in an advanced readiness state for a rodent eradication. This project would provide the last two inputs required: as requested by the Pitcairn community, an updated population assessment of the Henderson rail (which would be impacted by baiting and need to be captive-held) in order to ensure that this species can

be successfully safeguarded in sufficient number; and comprehensive maps of the invasive coconut groves behind Henderson's beaches (as these will need special baiting treatment given they are a rich alternative food source).

Q12. Methodology

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

- How you have analysed historical and existing initiatives and are building on or taking work already done into account in project design. Please cite evidence where appropriate.
- The rationale for carrying out this work and a justification of your proposed methodology.
- How you will undertake the work (materials and methods).
- How you will manage the work (role and responsibilities, project management tools etc.)

(This may be a repeat from Stage 1 but you may update or refine as necessary)

Rodents have been successfully eradicated from over 800 islands worldwide. Whilst the methods were pioneered on New Zealand's temperate and sub-antarctic islands, various world-leading eradications have been delivered in the UKOTs, including South Georgia- the world's largest. Inhabited islands are increasingly being restored: in 2013 the RSPB eradicated rats from St Agnes & Gugh (Isles of Scilly) with an 80-strong community, whilst rodents were eradicated in 2019 from Lord Howe Island (Australia, 380 residents) - with involvement of RSPB staff.

In Pitcairn, successful eradications have been delivered on Oeno and Ducie (1997), with unsuccessful attempts on Pitcairn (1997-8) and Henderson (2011, RSPB-led). This project has learned from those experiences and the post-Henderson global review of tropical island eradication methodologies. The latter concluded that the 2011 Henderson operation followed all international best practice in its delivery, and instead recommended changes to the best practice for tropical island eradications going forwards.

The Pitcairn community would like to combine Henderson & Pitcairn operation given the substantial cost and logistical efficiencies, plus immediate impact of rodents on their lives, and a Pitcairn feasibility study (2014, updated 2020) has identified required next steps.

The project will be lead by the RSPB's dedicated UKOTs team, supported by in-house invasive species and ornithological science experts plus a world-leading eradications expert. Delivery will be in partnership with the Pitcairn Government, with whom the RSPB has a very strong 15-year relationship, against the following three outputs:

Output 1: To inform community engagement discussions, bespoke desk-based 'Community Impact Assessments' will be prepared for Pitcairn that cover all areas of potential concern, including human health, water management, domestic animals, building access, local fisheries and natural-resource based export industries. This analysis will underpin continuous engagement and consultation discussions on-island, to be initiated via a face-to-face Year 1 visit by a world-leading eradication expert and RSPB community engagement lead, Andy Schofield (who has previously spent 3 months living with the Pitcairn community). This would be subject to follow-ups for further face-to-face consultation in Years 2 and 3. Proposal papers will be written for decision by the Island Council with regard to the community's preferred approach to 4 thematic areas: i) domestic animal mitigation and long-term management, ii) feral animal management, iii) freshwater management, and iv) inshore fisheries management.

Output 2: GIS expertise and ground-truthing by RSPB and local Government staff will be used to generate detailed maps and condition assessments to inform operational planning. Specifically, knowledge around the location of all built structures, domestic animal pens (and their condition), fruit trees of interest & hives on Pitcairn will be collated, alongside coconut groves on Henderson. This will be used to update the final feasibility study for submission to the Pitcairn Island Council.

Output 3: A detailed population and distribution evaluation of the key potential non-target endemic species, the Endangered Pitcairn reed-warbler, will be completed by RSPB scientists and local island leads, building wider conservation knowledge and understanding for their risk profiles. Non-toxic bait trials and veterinarian-guided captive-holding trials will be conducted, strengthening local conservation capacity and clarifying techniques (including optimal aviary design, feeding protocols, health screenings) to ensure no long-term detrimental impacts from an eradication. A survey of Henderson rails

will also be conducted to ensure that a suitable number of individuals could be taken into captivity on that island during a baiting operation, and the aviculture strategy updated accordingly.

Together this will enable a revised operational feasibility study to be written confirming all outstanding issues have been addressed and that a Pitcairn eradication is feasible with the chosen approaches. Final Council decision to proceed with one / both eradications (in-principle as funding-dependent) can then occur.

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

No Response

Section 7 - Stakeholders and Beneficiaries

Q13. Project Stakeholders

Who are the stakeholders for this project and how have they been consulted (include local or host government support/engagement where relevant)? Briefly describe what support they will provide and how the project will engage with them.

The key stakeholders are the Government and community of the Pitcairn Islands. This 40-person community has an elected Island Council, and a (part-time) Manager of its Government Environmental, Conservation & Natural Resources Division, Michele Christian.

Michele Christian has been engaged on the potential for preparatory work towards a Pitcairn eradication operation since the original feasibility study was co-commissioned by the RSPB and Pitcairn Government in 2014. She submitted both the original feasibility study and the 2020 update to the Island Council for comment and has subsequently been engaged in all development discussions around this particular project proposal. Specifically, Michele submitted a concept note to Island Council for approval prior to the Stage 1 application, receiving formal support to proceed on the basis of two conditions: that quarterly updates to Island Council are submitted, and that a survey of the Henderson rail population is included. Both of these have been clearly incorporated into Stage 2 project design. Michele Christian has also been involved in wider project development for this Stage 2 application.

Initial community discussions were also held on-island when the project lead last visited in December 2020. This included accompanying a number of Pitcairn Islanders around all four of their islands, where the difference between the rat-free and rat-infested islands was stark to all concerned, engendering further in-principle support for exploring the eradication agenda.

Q14. Institutional Capacity

Describe the Lead Partner's capacity (and that of partner organisations where relevant) to deliver the project.

The RSPB is the largest conservation NGO in Europe and has a track record of successful project delivery in the Overseas Territories under both Darwin, Darwin Plus and EU BEST. The project leader, Andy Schofield, has longstanding community ties, making us well-placed to lead and facilitate a project on this potentially highly sensitive issue. We have also learnt valuable lessons on how to deliver successful projects in this remote Territory from delivering two other Darwin/Darwin Plus projects there over the past decade, as well as the 2011 Henderson Island eradication operation. DPLUS095, which concludes this financial year, is of particular relevance as it has focussed on working with the Pitcairn Government to strengthen pre-border and on-island biosecurity capacity and policy.

Recognising the need for significant specialist expertise, the RSPB will be contracting a New Zealand rodent eradication expert and a qualified veterinarian, to complement the eradication and community engagement skills we have in-house. This includes our successful community engagement in three other inhabited island eradications in the past decade.

The Pitcairn community is just c.40-strong, with many islanders having multiple jobs. The Manager of the Environmental, Conservation & Natural Resources Division is consequently a part-time role and does have very limited capacity. Nevertheless, Michele Christian has confirmed that this project is a high priority and we have carefully arranged it with as much off-island capacity support as possible. We have also pre-confirmed that there are at least two islanders highly

interested in the part-time avicultural assistant roles.

Q15. Project beneficiaries

Who will your project benefit? You should consider the direct benefits as a result of your project as well as the broader indirect benefits which may come about as a result of your project achieving its Outputs and Outcome. The measurement of any benefits should be included in your project logframe.

The entire Pitcairn community will be fully informed about the implications and methodologies of a rodent eradication on their island. They will have had in-person discussions around a Community Impact Assessment, had the opportunity to take decisions on four proposal papers around possible management / mitigation measures, and received follow-up consultation in years 2 and 3 to allow for informed consideration. The Government will have access to an up-to-date map of all built and relevant natural infrastructure on Pitcairn, plus invasive coconut groves on Henderson Island. Community understanding of their iconic 'Sparrow' (the local name for Pitcairn reed-warbler) will be increased, with an accurate population estimate and feeding habit assessment. At least two Islanders will benefit from bespoke training on the capture and safe-keeping of these birds. All island animal-owners can potentially benefit from the rare visit of a trained veterinarian.

The project will also benefit the community by preventing reputational harm, with forward progress towards an eradication reducing the likelihood that Henderson is placed on the 'World Heritage Site in Danger' list. This also helps preserve the islanders' ability to effectively advance eco-tourism. Whilst very few tourists currently visit the islands, there is an eagerness to diversify their economy.

Section 8 - Gender and Change Expected

Q16. Gender (optional)

How is your project working to reduce inequality between persons of different gender? At the very least, you should be able to provide reassurance that your proposed work is not increasing inequality. Have you analysed the context in which you are working to see how gender and other aspects of social inclusion might interact with the work you are proposing?

The small Pitcairn community has strong levels of gender equality, with a female Mayor and female leader of the Environmental, Conservation & Natural Resources Division. The likeliest islanders to apply for the role of avicultural assistants meanwhile are 1 male / 1 female, meaning that two-thirds of the Pitcairners with direct project involvement would be women. Council decisions on the proposal papers etc would meanwhile be chaired by a woman (the Mayor), and we are confident that this project would not increase gender inequality on-island. If berth spaces allow, we will offer the opportunity to interested Pitcairn islanders to join the visit to Henderson Island, and would endeavour to secure equal male/female participation.

RSPB has strict employment policies in place to ensure fair and non-discriminatory recruitment practices, and these would be employed for the roles to be filled.

Q17. Change expected

Detail the expected changes this work will deliver. You should identify what will change and who will benefit a) in 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 the environment and, where relevant, for people in the OTs, and how they are linked.

Short-term:

The community will be fully informed on the specifics of an eradication, its operational requirements and its potential consequences for wildlife and key natural resource-dependent industry (honey production). Potential local concerns over human health will be addressed. The community will have decided on preferred operational approaches, in particular with regard to domestic / feral animal management, drinking water management, fishery management and any other issues arising. They are, therefore, able to give fully-informed consent prior to operational delivery. Precise maps of Pitcairn's built structures, animal pens, tropical fruit trees and hives, as well as Henderson's coconut groves, will have been created. The Endangered Pitcairn reed-warbler will be better understood via the first population estimate in 50 years, a feeding

habit analysis, a non-target risk assessment, and captive-holding trials. The methodology required to successfully captive-hold and release reed-warblers will also be established.

Long-term:

The restoration of Pitcairn and Henderson will be enabled, creating the first rodent-free inhabited Territory and enabling Territory-wide ecosystem recovery, with populations of birds and invertebrates likely to increase by orders of magnitude, and plant communities to recover in the absence of seed predation. Community agriculture will be more productive, cheaper (without the ongoing costs of rodent control) and safer for human health. Domestic rodent damage will cease, providing financial and time savings to community members, eco-tourism assets such as seabird colonies will re-establish, and vital protection will be provided to their pristine rodent-free offshore islands by addressing the main potential rodent re-introduction pathway. The maps created will be of wider use to inform environmental management, whilst the development of a specific conservation strategy will be enabled for the Endangered Pitcairn reed-warbler.

Q18. Pathway to change

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 the environment and, where relevant, for people in the OTs, and how they are linked.

The primary driver of historic and ongoing biodiversity loss on both Pitcairn & Henderson is the presence of introduced mammals. Their continued presence also represents the main threat pathway for (re-)introduction of rodents to the rat-free nature reserve islands of Oeno and Ducie. Finalising the feasibility of a Pitcairn eradication is also now the primary impediment to re-attempting to restore Henderson, as the community would ideally like both to occur together. Advancing plans for delivering rodent eradication is the necessary change pathway to address these challenges.

This project therefore seeks to resolve the outstanding technical issues raised in the Pitcairn eradication feasibility study, plus provides for detailed and ongoing community engagement and decision-making on operational approaches. A successful operation requires total community support, so this project builds on the excellent community relations fostered by Andy Schofield, and provides independent expertise and proposal papers, plus direct evidence from physical trials to secure fully-informed consent. It will therefore enable the Island Council to make a (funding-dependent) decision to proceed.

Post-project, the RSPB has a strategic commitment to restoring these globally significant sites and can reliably confirm its intention to undertake fundraising and delivery of these eradications (upon receipt of appropriate local assent).

Q19. Exit strategy

State how the project will reach a stable and sustainable end point, and explain how the outcomes will be sustained, either through a continuation of activities, funding and support from other sources or because the activities will be mainstreamed in to "business as usual". Where individuals receive advanced training, for example, what will happen should that individual leave?

This project represents a vital step in a collaborative process towards restoring the Pitcairn islands as an invasive rodent-free archipelago. It will reach a stable end point, as it will complete all the preparatory research, consultation and management decisions required for the Pitcairn Island Council and community to have a detailed understanding of exactly how a rodent eradication would be conducted and what all the potential implications would be, enabling a fully informed final decision on whether to proceed.

The RSPB is already publicly committed to completing the restoration of Henderson Island World Heritage Site, and restoration of additional globally significant sites such as Pitcairn is a core part of our new 2030 corporate strategy. We have a track record of large-scale conservation project delivery and can reliably commit to deliver a combined eradication if the Pitcairn community provide their assent. We would also be willing to conduct an operation at Henderson alone if the islanders ultimately preferred.

Finally, the Pitcairn reed-warbler is one of c.30 international priority species for the RSPB, and the organisation can therefore commit to long-term follow-up for the conservation of this species utilising any relevant findings from the research conducted under this project.

Q20. Ethics

Outline your approach to meeting Darwin's key principles for ethics as outlined in the guidance note. Additionally, are there any human rights and/or international humanitarian law risks in relation to your project? If there are, have you carried out an assessment of the impact of those risks, and of measures that may be taken in order to mitigate them?

The crux of this project is that it will enable the Pitcairn community to have Prior Informed Consent (PIC), as per the ethical requirements of the Darwin Plus guidance. Consultation is designed so as to be iterative, conducted over all three years and informed by community responses i.e. reactions to the Community Impact Assessment (Yr1) will guide development of the four management proposal papers (Yr2), and decisions on those papers will in turn inform the final feasibility study update (Yr3). Quarterly updates to Council will ensure transparency, and direct access to an independent NZ eradication expert will ensure impartial technical inputs are received. The RSPB would and could not proceed with either eradication without the fully informed consent of the Pitcairn Government.

The RSPB also operates an Animal Welfare Ethics Advisory Committee, which consists of independent practitioner and academic experts on welfare issues. All our eradication projects must align with this Committee's ethical policies and undergo individual review if any deviation is sought. All the proposal papers will be aligned with the policy direction set by this Committee, and approval would be sought for operational delivery upon receipt of a positive decision from the Pitcairn Islands Council.

There are particular health and safety risks from any visit to the Pitcairn Island group given the need for any medical evacuation to take place by ship. This gives the RSPB a special duty of care to all staff visiting Pitcairn or Henderson, and bespoke risk management plans will be put in place.

Section 9 - Budget, Risk Management & Funding

Q21. Budget

Please complete the appropriate Excel spreadsheet, which provides the Budget for this application. Some of the questions earlier and below refer to the information in this spreadsheet. Note that there are different budget templates for grant requests under £100,000 and over £100,000.

- [Budget form for projects under £100,000](#)
- [Budget form for projects over £100,000](#)

Please refer to the [Finance Guidance](#) for more information.

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

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

 [RSPB Pitcairn Budget-over-100k-Dec21-MASTER](#)
 10/01/2022
 23:33:15
 xlsx 75.43 KB

Q22. Financial Risk Management

This question considers the financial risks to the project. Explain how you have considered the risks and threats that may be relevant to the successful financial delivery of this project. This includes risks such as fraud, bribery or corruption, but may also include the risk of fluctuating foreign exchange, delays in procurement or recruitment and internal financial processes such as storage of financial data.

The RSPB takes financial risk very seriously, especially in projects implemented outside the UK, and has established an International Financial Risk Management Working Group to deal with exactly this issue.

RSPB has zero tolerance systems in place around bribery and conducts spot check financial audits of all our overseas partners to assess for fraud risk. We have long-term partnerships in which we provide regular funding to numerous Territory Governments and NGOs, so are very familiar with Territory financial management systems and challenges.

For the project proposed here, we consider the risk to be low.

The amount of money involved, although substantial, is a sum similar to previous projects which have been successfully managed. Most of the grant meanwhile will be spent by the RSPB on behalf of the project, permitting greater direct control and reducing consequent risk. Internal RSPB procedures will ensure close monitoring of project spend- a separate budget line will be established, and monthly financial reports issued.

Q23. Funding

Q23a. Is this a new initiative or a development of existing work (funded through any source)?

Development of existing work

Please provide details:

This is development of existing work. The RSPB and Pitcairn Government began working on the restoration of Henderson Island World Heritage Site in 2008, with expeditions to the island in 2009, 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2015. These were financed via a wide-range of philanthropic funders, RSPB core-funding and UK Government support.

The original Pitcairn feasibility study of 2014 meanwhile was funded by a Darwin Initiative grant. Andy Schofield's 3-month community engagement visit of 2016 was funded by the RSPB, whilst his capacity-building visit in 2020 was joint funded by the RSPB and the Government of the Pitcairn Islands. The FCDO directly funded a feral goat eradication on Pitcairn in 2014. DPLUS095 meanwhile has financed very complementary work, strengthening the pre-border and on-island biosecurity capacity of the Pitcairn Islands. Also of relevance to eradication delivery is Pitcairn's exemplary waste management scheme, which was financed by EU EDF funds.

Q23b. Are you aware of any other individuals/organisations/projects carrying out or applying for funding for similar work?

No

Section 10 - Finance

Q24. Financial Controls

Please demonstrate your capacity to manage the level of funds you are requesting. Who is responsible for managing the funds? What experience do they have? What arrangements are in place for auditing expenditure?

RSPB will manage the grant and has extensive experience of managing project funding and of prioritising spending, a good track record with the management of Darwin Projects, and procedures which follow the highest standards of financial accountability and control. Wendy Cain, the relevant lead in the RSPB's International Financial Management Unit, has over five years of experience working with Territory Government partners and has first-hand knowledge of the challenges such small-capacity institutions can face.

RSPB will sub-grant to the Pitcairn Government, who will produce quarterly financial and technical reports and submit them to the RSPB. RSPB will contract the expert consultants through the appropriate tendering process that Darwin and RSPB require.

The project will be audited once it has ended and as final reports are submitted.

Q25. Balance of budget spend

Defra are keen to see as much Darwin Plus funding as possible directly benefiting OT communities and economies. While it is appreciated that this is not always possible every effort should be made for funds to remain in territory.

Explain the thinking behind your budget in terms of where Darwin Plus funds will be spent. What benefits will the Territory/ies see from your budget? What level of the award do you expect will be spent locally? Please explain the decisions behind any Darwin Plus funding that will not be spent locally and how those costs are important for the project.

The c.40 people of the Pitcairn Islands are all already extremely busy and have highly limited capacity (the Environment lead, Michele Christian, is only part-time in her role at 3 days per week). They have therefore explicitly asked the RSPB to be responsible for as much of the financial management / spending as possible. Michele will put [REDACTED] of her time towards this project, with [REDACTED] of that being co-funding so as to demonstrate the Government's commitment to this work. All costs of the Pitcairn avicultural assistants will be covered by the Darwin budget.

The major financial benefits to the local community / economy will come through homestays. These provide a very important income source for the island's 12 accommodation providers (representing the majority of the community), with the very lowest price USD\$ [REDACTED] per day. The ornithological scientist alone will require 6-months on-island, whilst the aviculturalist and veterinarian will both require two. We will endeavour to regularly rotate all project staff visiting Pitcairn around the different accommodation providers so as to ensure as equitable a distribution as possible of this significant homestay income.

In total, we estimate that [REDACTED] of the Darwin funding (£ [REDACTED]) would be spent in Territory.

Q26. Capital Items

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

No capital equipment will be purchased via this funding.

Q27. Value for Money

Please describe why you consider your application to be good value for money including justification of why the measures you will adopt will secure value for money.

Invasive rodents are driving species extinctions and harming the World Heritage Site values of Henderson Island, whilst causing significant damage to the subsistence agriculture upon which Pitcairn islanders heavily depend. They also regularly damage domestic infrastructure on Pitcairn, create recurring control (rat poisoning) costs and pose a permanent public health risk. This project will provide value for money by comprehensively answering all the outstanding questions to implement a permanent solution to these problems. It is therefore based on a convincing theory of change and represents a pathway to genuine impact.

The RSPB has worked closely with Pitcairn for over a decade so was able to design this project based on first-hand experience of working there. Budgeting was based on prior RSPB experience of travelling to Pitcairn, plus of contracting NZ eradication experts and avicultural / veterinarian expertise. Travel to Pitcairn is always extremely expensive (boat passage costs over £ [REDACTED] and UK-Tahiti-Mangareva flights are roughly the same). We have minimised the number of trips to Pitcairn as far as possible, but the only way to conduct genuine and iterative consultation and ensure fully-informed consent can be given is through face-to-face discussion. Michele Christian has stressed throughout project development the need for the community to be able to have repeated face-to-face conversation. Accommodation costs are high, but this is a vital source of income in this ODA-eligible community.

The project has considerable co-funding ([REDACTED]) and RSPB is committed to delivering the eradication operations, ensuring

long-term post-project impact.

Q28. Outputs of the project and Open Access

All outputs from Darwin Plus projects should be made available on-line and free to users whenever possible. Please outline how you will achieve this and detail any specific costs you are seeking from Darwin Plus to fund this.

Open access to data and the products of research is a general policy of RSPB. All data, reports, photographs and other outputs from the project will be free to access, and available in digital form where possible and appropriate on the Darwin, RSPB, and Pitcairn Government websites.

All data gathered and analysed during the project will be made available in digitised format. Data collected on the Henderson rail and Pitcairn reed-warbler, as well as the Henderson and Pitcairn mapping outputs, will be stored and made available for management applications by the Government of the Pitcairn Islands. All data will be stored on RSPB servers with appropriate backup. All files will be accompanied by README files which will describe all field-codes and associated metadata.

Datasets that underpin publications and reports will be deposited in appropriate digital repositories e.g. figshare where datasets are publicly searchable and discoverable.

A minimum of one peer-reviewed paper is envisaged as part of the project outputs – all paper(s) will be available online either through green or gold open access routes dependent on the publishing location.

Section 11 - Safeguarding

Q29. Safeguarding

Projects funded through Darwin Plus must fully protect vulnerable people all of the time, wherever they work. In order to provide assurance of this, projects are required to have appropriate safeguarding policies in place. Please confirm the lead organisation has the following policies in place and that these are available on request:

Please upload the lead partner's Safeguarding Policy as a PDF on the certification page.

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

Please outline how you will implement your policies in practice and ensure that downstream partners apply the same standards as the lead organisation.

The RSPB have clear safeguarding policies and procedures which apply to our international work and includes appropriate annual training for all our staff members working internationally. We have recently established an internal Global Safeguarding Subgroup to oversee and advise on our international safeguarding work. This group includes staff with extensive safeguarding experience as well as representation from staff posted overseas working with partners and local communities.

We have a strong commitment to work closely with all our partners to ensure they adhere to good safeguarding practices and any sub-grant will include our standard Annex outlining the obligations of the partner to safeguarding and how they report, record and mitigate any incidents. We will work closely with partners on safeguarding issues and are currently in the process of developing a Safeguarding Good Practice Guide for our key international partners which will assist them in strengthening their current policies and procedures.

We will also continue to liaise with the relevant FCDO desk officer around whether there any new potential safeguarding issues on Pitcairn which we should be aware of during the course of delivery.

Section 12 - Logical Framework

Q30. Logical Framework

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

- [Stage 2 Logframe Template](#)

Please complete your full logframe in the separate Word template and upload as a PDF using the file upload below – **please do not edit the template structure other than adding additional Outputs if needed as a logframe submitted in a different format may make your application ineligible**. Copy your Impact, Outcome and Output statements and your activities below - these should be the same as in your uploaded logframe.

Please upload your logframe as a PDF document.

-  [R10-DPlus-St2-Logical-Framework-Template- Pitcairn feasibility finalisation Dec 2021](#)
-  10/01/2022
-  22:53:52
-  pdf 81.42 KB

Impact:

The Pitcairn island group is free of introduced rodents, enabling native wildlife and habitat recovery, safeguarding rodent-free islands and benefitting community agriculture, infrastructure & eco-tourism assets.

Outcome:

Community consultation, pre-operational mapping and non-target species mitigation research enables and empowers the Pitcairn community to make fully-informed decisions to proceed with rodent eradication operation delivery on Henderson & Pitcairn.

Project Outputs

Output 1:

Detailed community consultation achieves agreement on the eradications' operational approach and mitigation measures, plus ensures local understanding to achieve prior informed consent.

Output 2:

Mapping and condition assessment of built infrastructure and natural features fills outstanding knowledge gaps required to inform operational planning.

Output 3:

Potential non-target bird species are better understood, have more detailed risk assessments and, if necessary, have undergone successful trials of mitigation measures to inform operational planning.

Output 4:

No Response

Output 5:

No Response

Do you require more Output fields?

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

No

Activities

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

- 1.1 Community Impact Assessments written for Pitcairn island community.
- 1.2 RSPB engagement lead and an eradication operation expert complete initial face-to-face consultations with Island Council & community.
- 1.3 Four bespoke Pitcairn eradication proposal papers written and submitted in-person to Island Council for consideration.
- 1.4 Pitcairn reed-warbler mitigation proposal written and submitted to Island Council for consideration.
- 1.5 In-depth face-to-face follow-up consultations undertaken by RSPB community engagement lead.
- 2.1 Mapping of coconuts on Henderson is undertaken and ground-truthed.
- 2.2 Mapping of built structures, domestic animal pens, fruit trees of interest and hives on Pitcairn is undertaken.
- 2.3 Photographic survey of domestic animal pens and waste management facilities on Pitcairn undertaken.
- 2.4 All built infrastructure and natural feature issues re-assessed as part of an updated final feasibility study.
- 3.1 Surveys of Pitcairn reed-warblers provide a population estimate and feeding habit assessment, with the results written up for submission to a peer-reviewed journal.
- 3.2 Pitcairn reed-warbler feeding trials with non-toxic blue bait and rat carcasses conducted and used to inform an updated risk assessment.
- 3.3 Avicultural-holding trials of Pitcairn reed-warblers take place on Pitcairn in partnership with local Government staff.
- 3.4. All Pitcairn reed-warbler mitigation needs and issues are re-assessed as part of an updated final feasibility study.
- 3.5. Surveys of Henderson rail provide a population status estimate and are used to inform the writing of an updated Henderson avicultural strategy.

Section 13 - Implementation Timetable

Q31. Provide a project implementation timetable that shows the key milestones in project activities

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

[Implementation Timetable Template](#)

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

 [R10-DPlus-Implementation-Timetable-Template-Pitcairn feasibility finalisation](#)
 10/01/2022
 22:56:20
 pdf 174.52 KB

Section 14 - Monitoring and Evaluation

Q32. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)

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

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

The M&E component of the project will be led by the Project Leader. However, Andrew Callender, as the UKOT Island Restorations Programme Manager, will have a vital role providing scrutiny and oversight. He is best placed to provide a critical eye as he will have overall responsibility for subsequent implementation of the eradications and will need to be personally satisfied that all feasibility and consent criteria have been suitably met. It will be expected that all other team members will feed into M&E as well, given the iterative and consultative nature of the project.

The logframe will be used as the basis for tracking and reviewing project progress and reporting to Darwin, together with the implementation timetable and budget. A detailed M&E plan will be developed at project start-up, based on these three key documents. Monthly team review meetings, including Pitcairn representation, and quarterly Island Council updates, will form the regular backbone of M&E. Annual visits by the community engagement lead will also enable M&E scrutiny and adaptive management, as will the consequential nature of the Council/community engagement documentation (Community Impact Assessments informing the four proposal papers, in turn informing the final feasibility study updates).

The M&E plan will be constructed around the indicators shown in the logframe. The Output indicators relate mainly to the 'monitoring' aspect of M&E (i.e. to project progress), whereas the Outcome indicators relate mainly to 'evaluation' (i.e. project impact). The indicators at both levels are 'SMART', enabling assessment.

Output 1: The main targets are: a community impact assessment (end of Yr1 Q2); initial consultations with islanders (end Yr1 Q3); four proposal papers on key issues relating to island restoration (end Yr2), and a fifth (end Yr3); and >95% of islanders involved in face-to-face consultations (both Yr2 and Yr3).

Output 2: maps showing the location of all coconut palms on Henderson (end Yr1 Q3); maps showing the location of all built structures, fruit trees and bee hives on Pitcairn (end Yr3 Q1); and a photographic record of animal pens and waste management facilities on Pitcairn (end Yr3 Q1).

Output 3: the population status of the Henderson rail re-assessed (end Yr1 Q4); a population and feeding assessment of the Pitcairn reed-warbler (end Yr2 Q3); a field trial to allow an updated risk assessment for this species should also have been completed by that date; and methods for capturing and holding Pitcairn reed-warblers should be established by end Yr3 Q2.

Outcome: The 'indicators of impact' at this level are that, by end Yr3: >95% of islanders should indicate that they feel well informed about the implications of the Pitcairn and Henderson operations; the Island Council should take decisions on the four proposal papers; a revised feasibility study (Pitcairn) and avicultural strategy (Henderson) should confirm that outstanding issues have been addressed and eradications can proceed; and, crucially, the Council should make a final decision on whether to undertake these eradications.

Total project budget for M&E in GBP (this may include Staff, Travel and Subsistence costs)

██████████

Number of days planned for M&E

█

Percentage of total project budget set aside for M&E (%)

█

Section 15 - Lead Partner Track Record

Q33. Lead Partner track record

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

Yes

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

Reference No	Project Leader	Title
DPLUS121	Sarah Havery	Strengthening biosecurity to protect Turks & Caicos' Iguana Islands
DPLUS102	Andy Schofield	Saving Tristan's only native tree and its associated unique buntings
DPLUS098	Charlie Butt	Restoring and safeguarding wetlands of the Caribbean UKOTs
DPLUS095	Jonathan Hall	Strengthening biosecurity for remote Territory communities and their World Heritage
DPLUS076	Cleo Small	Reducing South Georgia albatross mortality in High Seas tuna fisheries
DPLUS062	Andy Schofield	Securing the future of the Tristan marine environment

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

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

Yes

Section 16 - Certification

Certification

On behalf of the

trustees

of

RSPB

I apply for a grant of

██████████

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

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

- I have enclosed CVs for project key project personnel, letters of support, budget and project implementation timetable (uploaded at appropriate points in application).
- Our last two sets of signed audited/independently verified accounts and annual report are also enclosed.

Checked

Name	Jonathan Hall
Position in the organisation	Head of UK Overseas Territories
Signature (please upload e-signature)	 Jonathan signature  10/01/2022  22:24:28  jpg 22.93 KB
Date	10 January 2022

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

 [RSPB Safeguarding Policy - December 2019](#)
 10/01/2022
 22:25:18
 pdf 959.46 KB

Please attach the requested signed audited/independently examined accounts.

 [RSPB accounts 2020-21](#)
 10/01/2022
 22:25:05
 pdf 881.89 KB

 [RSPB accounts 2019-20](#)
 10/01/2022
 22:24:55
 pdf 499.89 KB

Section 17 - Submission Checklist

Checklist for submission

	Check
I have read the Guidance documents, including the “Guidance Notes for Applicants” and “Finance Guidance”.	Checked
I have read, and can meet, the current Terms and Conditions for this fund.	Checked
I have provided actual start and end dates for this proposed project.	Checked

I have provided a budget based on UK government financial years i.e. 1 April – 31 March and in GBP.	Checked
I have checked that the budget is complete, correctly adds up and I have included the correct final total at the start of the application.	Checked
The application has been signed by a suitably authorised individual (clear electronic or scanned signatures are acceptable).	Checked
I have attached my completed logframe and timeline as a PDF using the templates provided.	Checked
I have included a 1 page CV or job description for all the Project staff identified at Question 11, including the Project Leader, or provided an explanation of why not.	Checked
I have included a letter of support from the Lead Partner and main partner organisation(s) identified at Question 10, or an explanation of why not.	Checked
I have included a cover letter from the Lead Partner, outlining how any feedback at Stage 1 has been addressed where relevant.	Checked
I have included a signed copy of the last 2 years annual report and accounts for the Lead Partner, or provided an explanation if not.	Checked
I have checked the Darwin Plus website immediately prior to submission to ensure there are no late updates.	Checked
I have read and understood the Privacy Notice on the Darwin Plus website.	Checked

We would like to keep in touch!

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

Unchecked

Data protection and use of personal data

Information supplied in this application form, including personal data, will be used by Defra as set out in the latest copy of the Privacy Notice for Darwin, Darwin Plus and the Illegal Wildlife Trade Challenge Fund available [here](#). This Privacy Notice must be provided to all individuals whose personal data is supplied in the application form. Some information, but not personal data, may be used when publicising the Darwin Initiative including project details (usually title, lead partner, location, and total grant value) on the GOV.UK and other websites.

Information relating to the project or its results may also be released on request, including under the 2004 Environmental Information Regulations and 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 General Data Protection Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2016/679).