



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 Gray's Inn Road
City and Postcode:	London WC1X 8NH
Country:	UK
Email:	
Phone:	

2. Stage 1 reference and Project title

Stage 1 Ref:	Title (max 10 words): Enhancing equity and effectiveness of Protected Area Conservation (EEEPAC)
---------------------	---

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) There is growing evidence that the success of protected areas (PAs) in terms of both biodiversity conservation and human well-being is correlated with the equity of PA management and governance, as reflected in CBD's Aichi Target 11. This project will support institutionalisation of PA social equity assessment and action planning in Kenya and Uganda, and initiate similar processes in Liberia and Malawi, thereby increasing the contribution of the target PAs to biodiversity conservation and human wellbeing.

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: Uganda	Country 2: Kenya
Country 3: Liberia	Country 4: Malawi

5. Project dates, and budget summary

Start date: 1 st July 2018	End date: 31 st March 2021			Duration: 2.75 years
Darwin funding request (Apr – Mar)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
	£103,575	£161,005	£75,167	£339,747
Proposed (confirmed & unconfirmed) matched funding as % of total Project cost				20%

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	Franks	Small	Chadza
Forename (s)	Phil	Rob	William
Post held	Senior Researcher	Technical Advisor	Executive Director
Organisation (if different to above)	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)	Fauna and Flora International (FFI) including FFI Kenya, Uganda and Liberia	Centre for Environmental Policy and Advocacy, Malawi
Department	Biodiversity	Africa	Directorate
Telephone			
Email			

Details	Project partner 3	Project Partner 4	Project Partner 5
Surname	Tumwesigye	Kasiki	TBD - our main contact in FDA along with other FDA staff was just fired by the new President of Liberia and replacements not yet appointed
Forename (s)	Charles	Samuel	
Post held	Conservation Director	Deputy Director	
Organisation (if different to above)	Uganda Wildlife Authority	Kenya Wildlife Service	Forest Development Authority
Department	Conservation	Biodiversity Research and Monitoring	TBD
Telephone			
Email			

Details	Project partner 6	Project Partner 7	
Surname	Ndadzela	Kingston	
Forename (s)	Patricio	Naomi	
Post held	Director	Head of Protected Areas Programme	
Organisation (if different to above)	Africa Parks Malawi	UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre	
Department	Directorate	Protected Areas	
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 in Uganda
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 (<i>Tenualosa ilisha</i>) in Bangladesh
19_023	Dilys Roe	NBSAPs 2.0: Mainstreaming biodiversity and development
19_013	Phil Franks	Research to Policy: building capacity for conservation through poverty alleviation

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.

<p>Lead institution and website:</p> <p>IIED www.iied.org</p>	<p>Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to lead the project):</p> <p>IIED is an international 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>IIED was a founder member of the Social Assessment of Protected Areas (SAPA) initiative on which this project builds. With support from Darwin Initiative, SAPA has become a global leader in developing relatively simple low cost methods for assessing the social impacts of protected areas. Building on SAPA, IIED is also leading global efforts to develop similarly simple and low cost methods for assessing the governance quality of PAs. In partnership with IUCN, IIED is also leading efforts to clearly articulate equity in PA conservation which provides the basis for integrating social and governance assessment. IIED will coordinate the project and lead the provision of technical support. The Project Leader, Phil Franks, has more than 20 years of experience working of these issues.</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>Fauna and Flora International (FFI)</p>	<p>Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): (max 200 words)</p> <p>FFI has been working since 1903 to conserve threatened species and ecosystems worldwide seeking sustainable solutions based on sound science that contribute to human wellbeing. FFI has a commitment to a rights-based approach to conservation.</p> <p>FFI has worked in Kenya and Uganda for 14 and 10 years respectively, supporting a wide range of both terrestrial and marine projects. Staff in FFI's Africa and Conservation, Livelihoods and Governance (CLG) teams have the technical capacity and experience to support this project, including on wellbeing, equitable governance, gender equity, and participatory approaches.</p> <p>FFI was the lead international and national partner in the project that developed the SAPA methodology. In this project FFI staff in Uganda and Kenya will be responsible for facilitating the 8 site level assessments, supporting subsequent action planning by key stakeholders, and organising national level stakeholder workshops, working in partnership with KWS and UWA. FFI staff in Liberia will organise the assessment in Liberia. FFI staff in the UK will provide technical support for these activities and contribute to the development of key publications, in particular gender aspects.</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>Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)</p>	<p>Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): (max 200 words)</p> <p>KWS is the government agency responsible for conserving and managing wildlife in Kenya for the people of Kenya and the whole world, including enforcing related laws and regulations. KWS undertakes conservation and management of wildlife resources across all protected areas systems in collaboration with stakeholders, with particular emphasis on the 50 protected areas that are fully under the authority of KWS.</p> <p>The Research and Monitoring Department of KWS will be the principle government counterpart in this project, convening and coordinating the assessments at each of the 4 target PAs and, over the duration of the project, becoming the principle source of technical support for the assessments. In addition KWS staff at zonal/national level will take the lead on data management and analysis, including mapping, and communication key findings to site-level planning process.</p> <p>Subject to successful completion of assessments at 4 sites, and funding being secured from other sources, KWS will aim to extend the assessment to at least 1 other PAs by the end of the project.</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>Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA)</p>	<p>Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): (max 200 words)</p> <p>UWA is the government agency that conserves and manages Uganda's wildlife for the people of Uganda and the whole world. UWA is mandated to ensure sustainable management of wildlife resources and supervise wildlife activities in Uganda both within and outside the protected areas. UWA has 10 national parks and 12 wildlife reserves under its jurisdiction as well as 5 community wildlife management areas and 13 wildlife sanctuaries.</p> <p>The Conservation Department of UWA, which oversees PA management and Monitoring and Research, will be the principle government counterpart in this project, convening and coordinating the assessments at each of the 4 target PAs and, over the duration of the project, becoming the principle source of technical support for the assessments. In addition, UWA staff at national level will take the lead on data management and analysis, including mapping, and communication key findings to site-level planning process.</p> <p>Subject to successful completion of assessments at 4 sites, and funding being secured from other sources, UWA will aim to extend the assessment to at least 1 other PAs by the end of the project.</p>	
<p>Have you included a Letter of Support from this institution?</p>		<p>Yes</p>

<p>Partner Name and website where available:</p> <p>FDA Liberia</p>	<p>Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): (max 200 words)</p> <p>The Forestry Development Authority is a state corporation established by an act of the Legislature in 1976 with the mandate to sustainably manage and conserve all forest resource for the benefit of present and future generation.</p> <p>The strategy of FDA comprise three pillars -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial Forestry • Community Forestry • Conservation Forestry <p>Integrating these pillars, FDA works to conserve and sustainably manage all forest resources to enable them continue to provision of a complete range of goods and services for the benefit of all Liberians and also contribute to poverty reduction.</p> <p>The conservation forestry department which oversees PA management will be the principle government counterpart in this project, convening and coordinating the assessments at the target PA, and activity engaging in the projects social equity assessment learning group for the duration of the project to gain the skills needed to extend the assessment to other PAs.</p>	
<p>Have you included a Letter of Support from this institution?</p> <p>Our main contact in FDA along with a number of other FDA staff was just fired by the new President of Liberia and replacements are not yet appointed.</p>		<p>No</p>

<p>Partner Name and website where available:</p> <p>Centre for Environmental Policy and Advocacy (CEPA)</p>	<p>Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): (max 200 words)</p> <p>CEPA is a think tank and advocacy institution promoting sustainable environment and natural resources management with a vision of a just and equitable society that promotes sustainable development</p> <p>In order to achieve its goal and vision, CEPA is guided by a strategic plan. A new strategic plan was developed to guide its operations between 2016 and 2020. Through a rigorous analysis of past performance, CEPA identified two priority thematic areas of focus for the next five years. These are: policy, research and advocacy; and institutional strengthening.</p> <p>Working in partnership, CEPA and African Parks will be responsible for organising an equity assessment at Majete National Park in Malawi and assisting IIED with raising funds for this assessment. Staff of both organisations will participate in the social equity assessment learning group. CEPA staff will also facilitate collaboration with Malawi National Parks.</p>	
<p>Have you included a Letter of Support from this institution?</p>		<p>Yes</p>

<p>Partner Name and website where available:</p> <p>Africa Parks Malawi (AP-Malawi)</p>	<p>Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): (max 200 words)</p> <p>African Parks is a non-profit conservation organisation that takes on the complete responsibility for the rehabilitation and long-term management of national parks in partnership with governments and local communities. AP currently manages 13 national parks and protected areas in nine countries covering seven million hectares: Benin, Central African Republic, Chad, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Malawi, Mozambique, the Republic of Congo, Rwanda and Zambia.</p> <p>Founded in 2000 in response to the dramatic decline of protected areas due to poor management and lack of funding, African Parks utilises a clear business approach to conserving Africa's wildlife and remaining wild areas. While securing vast landscapes and carrying out all activities needed to protect the parks and their wildlife, we maintain a strong focus on economic development and poverty alleviation of surrounding communities to ensure that each park is ecologically, socially, and financially sustainable for the long term.</p> <p>Our goal is to manage 20 parks by 2020, protecting more than 10 million hectares. Because of the geographic spread and representation of different ecosystems, this will be the most ecologically diverse portfolio of parks under one management across Africa.</p> <p>Working in partnership, African Parks and CEPA will be responsible for organising an equity assessment at Majete National Park in Malawi and assisting IIED with raising funds for this assessment. Staff of both organisations will participate in the social equity assessment learning group</p>	
<p>Have you included a Letter of Support from this institution?</p>		<p>Yes</p>

Partner Name and website where available: UNEP-WCMC	Details (including roles and responsibilities and capacity to engage with the project): (max 200 words) <p>The UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) works with scientists and policy makers worldwide to place biodiversity at the heart of environment and development decision-making to enable enlightened choices for people and the planet. Our 100-strong international team are recognised leaders in their field and have unrivalled understanding of the institutional landscape surrounding biodiversity policy and ecosystem management. Based in Cambridge, UK, UNEP-WCMC is a collaboration between UN Environment and the UK charity, WCMC.</p> <p>Although it is not receiving funding from this project UNEP-WCMC will provide advice on the development of IUCN WCPA best practice guidelines on understanding and assessing equity (activity 3.2), the synthesis of results from 10 PA sites (activity 3.3) and creating data fields in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) for this data, and developing a policy brief to inform international policy development (activity 3.5).</p>	
Have you included a Letter of Support from this institution?		Yes

10. 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*?
Phil Franks	Project Leader, technical support	IIED	15%	Yes
Francesca Booker	Technical support	IIED	22%	Yes
Rob Small	Technical support & capacity building	FFI	10%	Yes
Helen Anthem	Gender advisor	FFI	1% for 3 yrs	Yes
Rogers Niwamanya	Country lead	FFI Uganda	33% for 3 yrs	Yes
Josephine Nzalani	Country lead	FFI Kenya	33% for 3 yrs	Yes
Mary Molokwu-Odzi	Country lead	FFI Liberia	5% in years 2 & 3	Yes
William Chadza	Country lead	CEPA Malawi	5% in years 2 & 3	Yes

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)

Global efforts to reduce biodiversity loss are heavily focused on expanding the network of PAs. But the reality of our 4 target countries (and many others) is that PAs are struggling to achieve and maintain conservation effectiveness in the face of powerful drivers of biodiversity loss – notably poaching and expansion of agriculture. Poverty is often cited as the primary underlying driver but there is growing evidence that resentment related to perceived injustices of conservation actions is also a key driver of illegal poaching and encroachment just as it is a driver of crime in more developed countries. Resentment relates both to perceived inequity in the *distribution* of costs and benefits and reluctance of some authorities to *recognise* concerns of local communities and strengthen PA governance *procedures*.

Conventional “alternative livelihoods” approaches to addressing drivers of biodiversity loss have been widely applied but have a patchy record of success in conservation terms because benefits often fail to reach those most deserving, and because they do not address recognition and procedure. For example, in Uganda national policy for sharing PA revenue with communities stipulates that priority be given to those suffering human-wildlife conflict who are generally poorer, but these people and this criterion are largely ignored (<http://pubs.iied.org/17612IIED>).

Recent ESPA-funded research demonstrates the importance of all three equity dimensions in terms of a PAs contribution to conservation and well-being (<http://pubs.iied.org/14671IIED>). Despite growing acceptance of this idea at international level, and growing concerns over the failure of alternative livelihood interventions, progress in delivering more equitable PA management is severely hampered by the fact that few people understand the meaning of equity in a conservation context, and there are no practical methodologies to assess the equity of PA management and governance, and track progress over time. This project directly addresses this need.

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)	No

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)

Under goals 2.1 and 2.2, the CBD’s Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) calls for parties to:

- Assess the economic and socio-cultural costs, benefits and impacts arising from the establishment and maintenance of protected areas,
- Carry out participatory national reviews of the status, needs and context-specific mechanisms for involving stakeholders, ensuring gender and social equity, in PA policy and management.

Aside from a limited number of academic studies, little progress has been made in assessing benefits, costs and impacts of PAs or ensuring social equity in mechanisms to involve stakeholders in PA policy and management. This project addresses these gaps with a relatively simple, low cost approach to social equity assessment that is feasible under typical constraints of human and financial resources in Africa.

Aichi Target 11 within the current CBD Strategic Plan calls for “equitable management” of PAs by 2020, but with less than three years to go there has been little progress on this element according to a recent review. With the SDGs giving strong emphasis to issues of equity and equality, equity is likely to remain a key issue in the CBD’s post 2020 strategic plan. However, there is still no clarity on what equitable PA management means let alone tools for equity assessment, planning and monitoring progress over time.

CBD decision CBD/COP/DEC/XIII/2 from the last COP specifically requests the CBD Secretariat to develop guidance for parties on PA governance and equity (para 10a). IIED is currently working with the CBD Secretariat to respond to this request and this project will take this a major step further with the IUCN-WCPA Best Practice guidance on equity assessment that it will generate (activity 3.3) and related capacity building events (activities 3.6 & 3.7).

CBD decisions typically make little or no mention of gender. This is changing, as is evident from recent submissions related to the process for developing the next CBD strategic plan. However, few CBD parties and conservation organisations have much capacity on gender, in part because the need is not very evident - problems of male-bias in the allocation of benefits at a particular site, and in decision-making more generally, tend to be invisible to decision-makers.

As we have already seen from IIED’s work on PA social and governance assessment, including an earlier Darwin project, a participatory assessment approach that disaggregates the responses of men and women can be very powerful in revealing gender bias and empowering women to challenge this. By making gender equity/equality an integral part of work on equitable PA management (as opposed to a stand-alone agenda) we believe that this project will make an important contribution to advancing gender equity/equality with the CBD.

The value that the CBD Secretariat attaches to our work on understanding equity and equity assessment, and its interest in this project, is clear from their support letter which is submitted with this proposal.

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

Yes No if yes, please give details:

With the CBD focal points for the Programme of Work on Protected Areas in Uganda and Kenya who work closely with our partners KWS and UWA.

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)

This project will enhance the contribution of PAs in Uganda, Kenya, Liberia, and Malawi, to poverty reduction and food security by:

- a) revealing negative social impacts of PAs that often fall disproportionately on the poorest and planning for their more effective mitigation, and
- b) revealing bias in the allocation of benefits such as development projects, employment and access to resources within PAs, and planning for corrective actions.

In this way the project aims to enable existing resource flows to deliver greater poverty reduction impact. A good example is our social assessment in OI Pejeta Conservancy in Kenya which led to changes to the fencing of the PA to better protect many neighbouring farms from

baboons, and more pro-poor targeting of the PAs substantial investment in community development (around £200,000/year).

As described in the previous section, the project will directly contribute to gender equality (SDG5) within PA adjacent communities. More broadly, the ability of social equity assessment to reveal and support efforts to counteract inequity in distribution, procedure and recognition will contribute to SDG10 (reducing inequality) in the context of conservation.

The contribution of the project to SDG 14 (life below water) and SDG15 (life on land) is premised on the theory that conservation that is more equitable in terms of recognition, procedures and distribution of benefits and costs tends to be more effective in achieving conservation goals (see <http://pubs.iied.org/14671IIED>). There is a growing body of evidence supporting this assertion and this project will itself contribute to this evidence base (activity 3.4).

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.).

- a) *At site level and system level in Kenya and Uganda* (outputs 1 & 2). The project will support four PAs in Uganda and four in Kenya, including one marine area, to conduct social equity assessments and action planning. These two countries are selected because each is keen to institutionalise social equity assessment across their PA system based on the positive results they have seen from pilot assessments.

The assessment methodology is based on the SAPA methodology developed by IIED and partners (<http://pubs.iied.org/14659IIED/>), plus elements of a methodology for PA governance assessment also developed by IIED. In combination, these address all equity principles (see <http://pubs.iied.org/14671IIED>). Following each assessment, action planning to enhance equity will take place within existing planning processes of PA management, civil society organisations, local government and other key stakeholders.

In consultation with KWS and UWA the following national parks have been selected:

Kenya: Tsavo West, Kisite, Nakuru, Marsabit

Uganda: Kibale, Murchison, Mgahinga, Lake Mburo

- b) *At site and system level in other countries* (activities 3.1 & 3.2). A peer-to-peer learning process that initially engages 2 other countries in Africa – Liberia and Malawi. Liberia is selected because of its high interest in SAPA following an assessment in 2016. Malawi is selected because of the interest of Africa Parks – a non-profit company that currently manages 13 PAs across Africa. The project will train PA and NGO staff from these countries and provide technical support to conduct an assessment in at least one site. To facilitate on-going learning the project will establish a learning group for facilitators from all 4 countries under the international Poverty and Conservation Learning Group which is hosted by IIED (<https://www.iied.org/poverty-conservation-learning-group-pclg>). Beyond the scope of this Darwin project IIED will seek additional resources to extend this learning group to a further 4 countries in Africa including a second learning workshop in year 3.
- c) *At global level* (output 3). Assessment results will be analysed in conjunction with data on illegal activities from PA ranger-based monitoring. This analysis will generate evidence on the relationship between equity and incidence of illegal activities as evidence of the instrumental argument for why equity in conservation is important. Supported by policy briefs, this will inform policy development at national and global levels. Furthermore, the project will produce a major publication in the IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidelines entitled “Assessing equity in protected area management and governance”, including detailed guidance on conducting and institutionalising social equity assessments, which will provide the foundation for further roll-out during the final year and thereafter.

Management

IIED will oversee the project and lead activities under output 3 including the engagement with

Malawi and Liberia. FFI in Uganda and Kenya will lead activities under outputs 1 and 2 working in partnership with the planning, research and monitoring units of the relevant PA agencies.

The project will partner with the UNEP-WCMC and collaborate closely with the CBD Secretariat. WCMC, CBD Secretariat, FFI and IIED will meet at least once a year to review progress and strategy going forward.

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.

Short-term (by end of project)

Following social equity assessment and planning at the 8 sites supported by this project and the 2 additional sites supported by other donors, PA managers and other stakeholders will make changes to PA management and governance that improve equity in terms of recognition, procedure and distribution. It is not possible to predict exactly what issues of recognition, procedure and distribution will emerge from an assessment but the eight sites all have substantial tourism and associated employment opportunities, damage to crops or livestock caused by wildlife (except the marine park), and some degree of community consultation in PA governance. Based on experience from other assessments, we expect to see one or more of the following outcomes at each site that should contribute to reducing poverty/improving well-being of at least 2400 households:

- increased community consultation in decision-making (and possibly real participation),
- more effective mitigation measures for crop/livestock damage by wildlife,
- increased employment of women in tourism-related business.
- Fairer allocation of development projects funded by PA revenue sharing (Uganda only)

On the conservation side we expect to see an average of 15% reduction in the incidence of poaching by local people. Furthermore, we expect changes at PA system level, including increasing interest in equity work, that will be evident from the PA Authorities institutionalising social equity assessment and extending it to other PAs with their own resources.

Long term

We expect to see evidence of substantial benefits for conservation and human well-being at 10 sites within 5 years (mid 2023) affecting at least 6000 households, and early indications of similar benefits in at least 10 additional sites across the 8 country members of the social assessment learning group that will have completed one or more assessments by that time.

At the international level this project will be at the forefront of work to support PA managers, PA authorities and other key stakeholders to understand the meaning of equitable PA management and governance, promote actions to improve equity at site and system levels, and assess progress for national reporting to the CBD. Given growing interest in this issue in international conservation agencies and a number of countries, uptake of our social equity assessment and action planning methodology may well exceed our targets.

In conjunction with data on levels of illegal activity from ranger-based monitoring, the results from the growing number of assessments that will be compiled by IIED and WCMC should provide strong evidence of both the instrumental and ethical case for more emphasis on equity in conservation. Over the medium to longer term, this could spearhead a paradigm shift in PA conservation policy and practice, and in conservation-related investment in local communities (from alternative livelihoods to enhancing equity).

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)

Our social equity assessment methodology includes gender disaggregation by design in having separate focus groups for women and men in the scoping phase. This ensures that womens' concerns are taken forward into the in-depth assessment.

Our approach to gender disaggregation enables comparison of the perspectives of men and women for all social impacts and related governance constraints. We have used this approach with related governance assessment work in Kenya and Uganda over the last year. In many cases women invited to focus groups said it was the first meeting on PA issues that they had ever been invited to, and the discussions proved very successful in giving voice to womens' concerns. The problem came when their concerns were presented at the final stakeholder workshop where the organisers had usually invited far more men than women and men frequently tried to suppress womens' views. From this experience we have developed specific measures to reduce the risk of such situations including changing the ratio of male to female community representatives in stakeholder workshops to favour women (given that non-community participants will be mainly male), and enabling women community representatives to meet and discuss their priorities prior to these workshops.

With this approach we have seen very impressive results such as where Masai women in the Masai Mara challenged men over their support for a ban on firewood collection within a PA. We expect to see similar results in each of the PA sites where social equity assessment will be supported by this project. In terms of outcome we expect the see substantial progress in terms of gender balanced community participation in decision-making (eg on benefit sharing), respect for statutory requirements for womens' participation, and in some cases affirmative action in favour of women to counter existing imbalances, eg in park-related employment.

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 training, for example, what will happen should that individual leave?

The overall outcome of this project is framed in terms of institutionalisation of social equity assessment within the PA authorities of Kenya and Uganda by the end of the project. Output 1 focuses on using the assessment at enough sites to demonstrate its value to PA managers. Output 2 is focused on building the awareness, understanding and capacity to sustain social equity assessment as an integral part of PA monitoring and planning after the project, through:

1. Building capacity in the research and monitoring units of KWS and UWA and providing tools to plan the assessment process, analyse the data and prepare reports.
2. Building capacity within the PA planning units of KWS and UWA to systematically include assessment findings as an input for annual planning and management planning.

With Liberia and Malawi, and other countries that join the learning group, our assumption is that Uganda and Kenya – the core members - will provide enough evidence of value to sustain interest in the learning group post project, and that this platform along with the IUCN WCPA guidance will provide sufficient technical support for scaling up in these other countries.

17a. Harmonisation

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

(Max 200 words)

This project builds on three projects:

1. Darwin-funded Social Assessment of Protected Areas (SAPA) project that piloted social assessment in one PA in Kenya (concluded in March 2016)
2. GIZ-funded "Site-level Governance Assessment for PAs" project which has developed and applied at three community conservancies in Kenya a participatory PA governance assessment methodology (to be concluded in May 2018).
3. ESPA-funded "developing an equity framework for PAs" which has supported work to further elaborate the equity framework and respond to requests for equity guidance from CBD (to be concluded in March 2018).

The social assessment and governance assessment projects (1&2) provide the basis for the social equity assessment methodology that will be used by this project, fully institutionalised in Kenya and Uganda, and demonstrated in at least 2 other countries.

The equity framework project (3) provides the conceptual linkage between social and governance assessment and the notion of equitable PA management and governance that is part of Aichi Target 11 and a growing number of national conservation policies. The equity framework also provides the principles that form the normative basis for equity assessment.

17b. Are you aware of any other individuals/organisations/projects carrying out or applying for funding for similar work? Yes/No

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

There are many academics conducting various types of research on equity and justice in the context of conservation, but we are not aware of any organisation working on practical methodologies for assessing equity at PA sites other than WCMC with whom we are partnering on this project.

18. Ethics

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

IIED has developed a statement on research ethics (<http://pubs.iied.org/G03763.html>) and has articulated a set of ethical principles that we apply to different elements of our work including: research design; choosing methods; working with research partners; working with policy partners; publishing and communicating. Our principles are in line with the Darwin Initiative's principles and include:

- Quality and objectivity
- Transparency
- Confidentiality
- Free, prior and informed consent
- Respect for all
- Participation
- Transparency about level of independence or partiality
- Fairly distributed costs and benefits
- Avoidance of harm
- Multiple accountabilities
- Only conducting research that supports action and brings positive change and whose purpose is contributing to a fairer, more sustainable world

These principles will be applied to this project to ensure our research process is based on partnership and empowerment, and produces results that contribute to positive social and environmental change.

FFI, the main NGO partner in this project international, has a policy to ensure its conservation

activities do not disadvantage poor, vulnerable or marginalised natural resource dependent women and men and wherever possible to conserve biodiversity in ways that enhance human wellbeing and equity. FFI's Conservation, Livelihoods and Governance team work to support this policy across the organisation. FFI's position statement on conservation, livelihoods and governance, is available here.

FFI and IIED are founding members of the [Conservation Initiative on Human Rights \(www.thecihr.org\)](http://www.thecihr.org) which promotes integration of human rights in conservation.

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?

The project has a total of 9 communication activities targeting the following audiences:

Audience	Activity/product	Expected result
Staff of PA agencies, relevant conservation and development NGOs and other key stakeholders	First national workshop	Participants understand the meaning of equitable PA management and governance and express interest in social equity assessment
Staff of PA agencies, relevant conservation and development NGOs and other key stakeholders	Second national workshop	Participants are aware of social assessment results and express increasing interest in engaging.
1. PA stakeholders at site level 2. PA authority HQ staff	Social equity assessment reports for each site (c 6 pages for distribution at site level)	PA specific stakeholders and PA management authority aware and able to act upon findings of social equity assessments
1. Conservation practitioners and donors in Kenya and Uganda 2. Practitioners and donors globally including	Lesson learnt about equity assessment (IIED Working Paper)	Stimulate wider interest in social equity assessment beyond the 4 target countries
Conservation policy-makers in Kenya and Uganda	Policy brief that encourages more attention to equity in national policy	More robust equity provisions added to national policy
Conservation policy-makers at international level	Policy brief that encourages more attention to equity in CBD decisions	Strong equity provisions in the post 2020 CBD strategic plan, and additions to the plan over time
Conservation agencies, donors and practitioners globally	Equity assessment best practice guidelines	Scaling up of social equity assessment in countries that have enough capacity to do the assessment based solely on a comprehensive manual
Conservation agencies, donors and practitioners globally	Side event at 2020 World Conservation Congress	Stimulating wider interest
CBD parties and PoWPA focal	Events organised and	CBD parties become more

points	funded by the CBD Secretariat, including CBD COP in 2020	supportive of robust equity provisions in national and international policy
--------	--	---

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)

Under output 1 the project will build the capacity of members of the assessment facilitation teams for each site. Typically these teams will include 1-2 PA management staff, 1-2 local government staff and one staff of a national NGO or university. This capacity building will take two forms: a) a 3 day training workshop including staff from the research and monitoring units at KWS and UWA HQ, b) targeted technical support which will be "hands on" for the first sites in each country and thereafter remote support from IIED and FFI by email and skype, and c) a learning event in year 2 where facilitators from the first two sites in each country will share experience with a workshop process designed to capture key learning (activity 1.6).

Under output 2 the project will build the capacity of staff from the research and monitoring units and the planning units at KWS and UWA HQ to manage an equity assessment database, conduct analysis, produce summary reports of results and apply results through annual plans and PA management plans. This will also be achieved through a combination of a training workshop and remote technical support.

Under output 3 (wider impact) the project will build the capacity of PA agencies and NGO staff from Liberia and Malawi to conduct social equity assessments through a cross visit to a site in Uganda where an assessment is taking place and a 2 day capacity building event in Nairobi (activity 3.2) which will immediately follow the year 2 learning event (activity 1.6).

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 the project outputs that are funded by the project will be made freely available on IIED and partner websites.

Where we find an opportunity to publish the results of the project in a journal that does not have an open access policy we will cover the cost of this from our own funds – we are therefore not seeking specific costs from Darwin for this purpose.

Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Measuring Impact

22. Logical Framework

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
Impact (by 30 th June 2023): Improved conservation and poverty alleviation of at least 6000 households across 10 PAs in Uganda, Kenya, Liberia and Malawi, and indications of similar impacts with at least 10 other PAs			
<p>Outcome (by 31st March 2021):</p> <p>PA equity assessment institutionalised in Kenya and Uganda, initiated in Liberia and Malawi, actions taken in response to strengthen management and governance, and equity provisions strengthened in international conservation policy</p>	<p>0.1 KWS and UWA and other key stakeholders conduct social equity assessments at a total of 8 PA sites with active engagement of their central planning, research & monitoring units.</p> <p>0.2 FDA in Liberia and Africa Parks in Malawi conduct social equity assessments at 2 PA sites and start an institutionalisation process.</p> <p>0.3 Changes in PA management and governance at site and system levels that will plausibly deliver better conservation and social outcomes.</p> <p>0.4 At least 2400 households (average 400 at each of first 6 sites) report poverty reduction and improved equity attributable to changes in PA management and governance</p> <p>0.5 Decreased threat to biodiversity in 8 PAs in Kenya and Uganda as a result of 15% reduction in poaching</p> <p>0.6 CBD strategic plan 2020-30 refers explicitly to the 3 dimensional equity framework as the basis for advancing equity in PA management/governance</p>	<p>0.1 Review of site assessment reports for all 8 sites</p> <p>0.2 Review of site assessment reports for 2 sites</p> <p>0.3 Key informant interviews with representatives of key stakeholder groups (as 0.2) using an outcome harvesting method, plus focused case studies to further investigate outcome quality and causality</p> <p>0.4 Participatory impact assessment methods with community-level focus groups (men and women separately)</p> <p>0.5 Reports of ranger-based monitoring conducted by UWA and KWS and discussions with community focus groups</p> <p>0.6 Review of CBD documents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least two major international conservation agencies adopt PA social equity assessment and action planning as recommended procedures for PAs that they support ▪ Evidence of results from using social equity assessment demonstrates that it is a good investment from a conservation perspective ▪ Resources are secured from PA authorities and/or donors supporting them for extending the learning group from 4 to 8 countries in Africa. This will deliver the additional 10 PA sites in the impact statement (and potentially many more) although beyond the scope of the project

<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. Social equity assessment and action planning have been conducted at 8 PA sites in Uganda and Kenya</p>	<p>1.1 KWS and UWA conduct social equity assessments at a total of 8 sites</p> <p>1.2 Key stakeholders at 8 PAs have responded to social equity assessment findings through their own annual planning processes</p> <p>1.3 At least (?) 4 men and 4 women assessment facilitators in each country trained in understanding equity, social equity assessment and action planning</p>	<p>1.1 Assessment reports for the 8 sites</p> <p>1.2 Survey conducted by the project</p> <p>1.3 Project reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At least one NGO actively participates in each assessment and offers to provide political and/or financial support to implement some of the suggested actions. ▪ At least two major international conservation organisations (in addition to IIED and FFI) lobby CBD and IUCN to encourage country parties/IUCN members to conduct social equity assessment.
<p>2. Staff of KWS and UWA HQ have understanding, skills and tools to plan, coordinate and analyse PA social equity assessments and action planning, and there is broad awareness and support for PA equity assessment within civil society</p>	<p>2.1 A total of 10 senior managers KWS and UWA gain a good understand of social equity in relation to PAs</p> <p>2.2 A total of 20 staff of civil society organisations and tourism operators gain a good understand of social equity in relation to PAs</p> <p>2.3 A total of 10 staff of KWS and UWA planning, research and monitoring units gain understanding, skills and tools for social equity assessment</p>	<p>2.1 Workshop reports and evaluations by workshop participants</p> <p>2.2 Workshop reports and evaluations by workshop participants</p> <p>2.3 Interviews at the end of the project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding is secured by FFI and FDA in Liberia to implement social equity assessment for at least at 1 PA site ▪ Funding is secured to implement social equity assessment for at least 1 PA site in Malawi in partnership with CEPA and KFW or African Parks ▪ At least 4 other social equity assessment conducted in other countries that already expressed interest in SAPA following launch of version 1 of the SAPA manual.
<p>3. Capacity, guidance and tools necessary for wider scaling up of social equity assessment and action planning, and evidence to support advocacy for more supportive international and national policy</p>	<p>3.1 IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidelines for advancing equity in PA management and governance</p> <p>3.2 3 staff of PA Authorities and NGOs in Liberia and Malawi participate in training and peer to peer learning</p> <p>3.2 Report of a meta-analysis of social equity assessments from 10 sites</p> <p>3.4 Policy briefs targeting CBD policy and strategic planning processes</p>	<p>3.1 Quality of the document and level of interest from IUCN and other key actors</p> <p>3.2 Project reports</p> <p>3.3 Quality of research report</p> <p>3.4 Quantity and quality of policy briefs and response of CBD Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Close collaboration with the IUCN Green List Certification process ▪ Sufficient interest and political will in each participating country to support implementation of some measures to advance equity at site level in response to the social equity assessment findings.

- 1.1. Capacity building workshop for assessment facilitation teams and monitoring staff of PA agencies in Kenya and Uganda
- 1.2. Conduct assessments in 4 sites per country with targeted hands-on technical support for site 1 and remote technical support for all other sites
- 1.3. Communicate key results of assessments to site-level and national stakeholders through brief reports for each site with substantial use of maps and graphics.
- 1.4. Facilitate a follow-up meeting at each site to prioritise actions and assign responsibilities
- 1.5. Support facilitation teams to engage in action planning processes of key stakeholders at each site to encourage and plan responses to key assessment findings
- 1.6. Learning event for 2 facilitation teams from Kenya and 2 from Uganda to share experience and results (2 days combined with activity 3.2), and learning report
- 2.1. First national workshop (inception) with staff of PA agencies, relevant conservation and development NGOs and other key stakeholders for project introduction, including "understanding equity" (1 day)
- 2.2. Capacity building and technical support for planning, research and monitoring units of PA agencies in Kenya and Uganda to manage a social equity assessment database, conduct analysis, produce summary reports of results and apply results through annual plans and PA management plans.
- 2.3. Produce a policy brief for each country aiming to support policy development to enable more equitable PA management and increase political support
- 2.4. Second national workshop with staff of PA agencies, relevant conservation and development NGOs and other key stakeholders to present and review social equity assessment results from the first 2 sites (1 day)
- 2.5. Facilitate effective linkages with related processes in focal countries (IUCN Green list certification, PA system-level governance assessment)
- 3.1. Organise a cross visit for peer to peer learning between learning group countries (Kenya, Uganda, Liberia, Malawi)
- 3.2. Organise a capacity building event for the PA social equity assessment learning group (2 days in Nairobi)
- 3.3. Develop and publish IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidelines for assessing equity in PA management and governance (similar to WCPA BPG #14 on effectiveness)
- 3.4. Conduct synthesis of results from 10 PA sites and basic PA management effectiveness and ranger-based monitoring data from same sites and produce a report for launch at World Conservation Congress or CBD COP15
- 3.5. Develop policy brief to inform international policy development including for use at CBD COP15
- 3.6. Facilitate inclusion of sessions on social equity assessment in relevant regional and sub-regional events organised by CBD Secretariat and IUCN
- 3.7. Organise capacity building events/side events at World Conservation Congress (Sept 2020) and CBD COP15 (Dec 2020)

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)

Activity	No. of months	Jul 18-Mar19			Apr 19-Mar 20				Apr 20-Mar 21			
		Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Output 1												
1.1 Capacity building workshop for assessment facilitation teams and monitoring staff of PA agencies in Kenya and Uganda	3											
1.2 Conduct assessments in 4 sites per country with targeted hands-on technical support for site 1 and remote technical support for all other sites	12											
1.3 Communicate key results of assessments to site-level and national stakeholders through brief reports for each site with substantial use of maps and graphics.	12											
1.4 Facilitate a follow-up meeting at each site to prioritise actions and assign responsibilities,	12											
1.5 Support facilitation teams to engage in action planning processes of key stakeholders at each site to encourage and plan responses to key assessment findings	27											
1.6 Learning event for 2 facilitation teams from Kenya and 2 from Uganda to share experience and results (2 days combined with activity 3.2)	3											
Output 2												
2.1 First national workshop (inception) with staff of PA agencies, relevant conservation and development NGOs and other key stakeholders for project introduction, including "understanding equity" (1 day)	3											
2.2 Capacity building and technical support for planning, research and monitoring units of PA agencies in Kenya and Uganda to manage a social equity assessment database, conduct analysis, produce summary reports of results and apply results through annual plans and PA management plans.	24											
2.3 Produce a policy brief for each country aiming to support policy development to enable more equitable PA management and increase political support	3											
2.4 Second national workshop with staff of PA agencies, relevant conservation and development NGOs and other key stakeholders to present and review social equity assessment results from the first 2 sites (1 day)	3											
2.5 Facilitate effective linkages with related processes in focal countries (IUCN Green	21											

list certification, PA system-level governance assessment)													
Output 3													
3.1	Organise cross visits for peer to peer learning between learning group countries (Kenya, Uganda, Liberia, Malawi)	3											
3.2	Organise a capacity building event for the PA social equity assessment learning group (2 days in Nairobi)	3											
3.3	Develop and publish IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidelines for assessing equity in PA management and governance (similar to WCPA BPG #14 on effectiveness)	24											
3.4	Conduct synthesis of results from 10 PA sites and basic PA management effectiveness and ranger-based monitoring data from same sites and produce a report for launch at World Conservation Congress	9											
3.5	Develop policy brief to inform international policy development including for use at CBD COP15	6											
3.6	Facilitate inclusion of sessions on social equity assessment in relevant regional and sub-regional events organised by CBD Secretariat and IUCN	24											
3.7	Organise capacity building events/side events at World Conservation Congress (Sept 2020) and CBD COP15 (Dec 2020)	6											

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)

Project M&E will be the responsibility of the project leader with support from IIED's M&E unit. The M&E system will have five main elements:

- **Output level.** Progress versus the 10 output level indicators will be reviewed on biannual basis. These are largely quantitative but several have important qualitative elements. Indicator 1.2 requires a short assessment users' survey.
- **Outcome level.** Progress to be reviewed on an annual basis except for the two indicators which will require specific data collection activities that will be conducted at the project end.
 - 0.3 requires a short survey of key informants using an outcome harvesting methodology (http://betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/outcome_harvesting) and case studies to further investigate outcome quality causality. These will identify change in behaviour and other actions that have taken place since the equity assessment that may be at least partially attributable to the assessment.
 - 0.4 requires the use of selected participatory methods for impact and attribution assessment with focus groups in up to 5 sample communities per PA. the attribution assessment will explore the relative significance of the 5 pathways to poverty reduction specified in section 15 and other pathways which may not have been anticipated. See http://fic.tufts.edu/assets/PIA-guide_revised-2014-3.pdf.
- **Impact level.** Although no indicators at impact level are specified, indicators 0.4 and 0.5 and their respective means of verification could be used by PA managers for this purpose. Targets at this level are at least a 30% reduction in poaching (compared to 15% by the end of the project) and at least 6000 households seeing poverty alleviation impact five years after the start of the project (june 2023).
- **Assumptions.** The validity and robustness of all the important assumptions listed in column 4 of the logframe will be reviewed on an annual basis. In some cases the outcome indicators will be all the information that is needed, but where this is not the case additional key information interview will be conducted.

As with the equity assessment itself, all M&E information will wherever possible be disaggregated by key social variables, notably to explore differences by gender, by well-being status of households, and by ethnicity and other potential dimensions of social marginalisation.

The annual review of M&E information will inform an annual review of the workplan and where there is an indication of a need to adjust the workplan these adjustments will be proposed to Darwin as part of the annual reporting process.

Number of days planned for M&E	30 at international level, 30 in Uganda and 30 in Kenya
Total project budget for M&E	£25000
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 total project budget is £425,410 of which 339,747 is requested from the Darwin Initiative and £85,663 represents match funding of which 34% have already been secured. Match funding in IIED's case will supplement days needed to complete the work, travel and subsistence, publication costs, and overheads. Partners' contribution towards match funding covers staff costs, operating costs and overheads. Staff funded days have been kept to a minimum and budgeted for each activity based on the detailed activity plan. Overheads being claimed are based on IIED and partners actual overheads and appropriately apportioned between all activities or projects operated by each organisation.

Other specific measures to enhance efficiency of project implementation:

- Savings from piggy-backing project activities to reduce travel costs (and carbon footprint)
- Use of the Open Data Kit whereby field data is entered on mobile phones in the field and automatically uploaded to an on line database via mobile networks. This eliminates the cost of data entry and also substantially reduces costs of data cleaning and analysis.

This project has huge potential to leverage additional impact beyond that specified in the logframe through the social and governance assessment projects of IUCN's Global Protected Areas Programme that will draw substantially on the experience of this project. Furthermore, a major German conservation donor, KFW, has provisionally selected our social equity assessment methodology for voluntary use across its portfolio of investments in PA conservation which includes more than 300 PAs, subject to a final decision in February 2018.

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)

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:

KWS – staff time worth £X,XXX for each of the 4 sites where the assessment will be supported by the project, assuming each site requires an average of one month of time input from one mid-level staff and two junior staff, plus management oversight. Total £X,XXX (\$XX,XXX) in kind contribution which KWS has confirmed as realistic and acceptable.

UWA – staff time worth £X,XXX for each of the 4 sites where the assessment will be supported by the project, assuming each site requires an average of one month of time input from one mid-level staff and two junior staff, plus management oversight. Total £X,XXX (\$XX,XXX) in kind contribution has confirmed as realistic and acceptable.

IIED – £X,XXX over the life of the project.

FFI - £XX,XXX for an assessment in

Liberia

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
Jan 2018	Moore Foundation	£XX,XXX	Support for development and publication of the IUCN-WCPA Best Practice Guidelines
Jan 2018	Moore Foundation	£X,XXX	To support a launch event for the Best Practice guidelines at CBD COP15
Jul 2018	??	£XX,XXX	Funding for equity assessment at one PA in Malawi

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)

External risks: Both KWS and UWA are highly dependent on tourism revenue. A major downturn in tourism could affect their capacity to institutionalise the project and extend the assessments to further PA sites. Project funding will be channelled through the country programmes of the international NGO FFI which has a high standard of financial control.

Internal risks: These relate to the critical assumptions in the project design which have been comprehensively analysed and are summarised in column 4 of the log-frame. While we have confidence in these assumptions, most cannot be taken for granted and the project will need to include regular review of the robustness of these assumptions as an integral part of its M&E.

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 International Institute for Environmental and Development

(*delete as appropriate)

I apply for a grant of £339,747 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:

29/1/18

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

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.