Darwin Initiative Innovation Annual Report

To be completed with reference to the "Project Reporting Information Note":
(https://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/resources/information-notes/)

It is expected that this report will be a maximum of 20 pages in length, excluding annexes)

Submission Deadline: 30th April 2024

Submit to: BCF-Reports@niras.com including your project ref in the subject line

Darwin Initiative Project Information

Project reference	DARNV011
Project title	A new tool for advancing locally led conservation
Country/ies	Nepal, Philippines, Uganda, Kenya
Lead Partner	International Institute for Environment and Development
Project partner(s)	RECOTFC Nepal, Bukidnon University, Philippines CORDIO, Kenya Makerere University, Uganda
Darwin Initiative grant value	£200,000
Start/end dates of project	April 1st 2023-March 31st 2025
Reporting period (e.g. Apr 2023 – Mar 2024) and number (e.g. Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	AR1
Project Leader name	Phil ▮▮▮▮
Project website/blog/social media	https://www.iied.org/site-level-assessment-governance-type-sage-gt
Report author(s) and date	Phil ▮▮▮▮

1.   Project summary

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

The tool that is being developed to assess the balance of power in conservation of protected/ conserved areas between community actors and non-community actors - the extent to which conservation is really led by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IP&LCs) - is the first of its kind. Most importantly the tool enables site-level actors to shift the balance of power towards IP&LCs where there is the political will to do so, in so doing closing all-too-common "implementation gaps" between the level of IP&LC empowerment provided for in law and policy and the reality at site level.

It is innovative and novel both in the analytical framework which is based on a typology of power balance and framework of power dimensions that was developed at the IP&LC-led governance workshop co-sponsored by the project in June 2023, and in the multistakeholder self-assessment process that is adapted from the SAGE tool.

Academic research is increasing generating evidence that sites with stronger empowerment of IP&LCs delivers better conservation as well as social outcomes. Some of the most compelling evidence to date was published only last week[1] in a paper which uses a very similar typology of power balance. Thus, it may be assumed that use of a tool that empowers IP&LCs at certain conservation areas (but not all) should improve conservation outcomes.

In the many situations where IP&LCs have been alienated from their ancestral lands the tool responds to the challenge of failure to meet the governance conditions for sustainable management of common pool resources and on the one hand, the social injustice of this alienation. But it also responds to opportunities presented by growing political and financial support for the notion of IP&LC-led conservation.

Though use of the tool will in some cases contribute to reducing economic poverty, for example, where it leads to more financing for conservation reaching organisations of IP&LC's or increased fish catch – its benefits for people will be as much an indirect contribution to human well-being as reflected in the project's M&E indicators on decision making and information access, and increasing recognition of, and respect, for the contribution of IP&LCs.

The project focuses on four countries – Nepal, Philippines, Kenya and Uganda. Partners in each country will pilot the tool at two protected/conserved areas where there is a gap in one or more dimensions (management, governance, rights and duties, knowledge and values and financing) between the level of authority/influence of IP&LCs that is provided for in policy and the reality on the ground, i.e. potential for IP&LC empowerment.

2.   Project stakeholders/partners

The partners in this project are listed in the table on the first page. They are all organisations that have been working with IIED to develop tools for improving governance for more than two years and in the case of Uganda and the Philippines, nearly 10 years. To date this work has focused on improving the quality of governance. In the world of environmental governance, it is well known that a key enabling condition is IP&LC empowerment, and when we said to these partners that we were developing a tool to assess and change the balance of power in conservation all expressed interest.

The focus on partner engagement in this project is not so much in developing the workplan which is a relatively straightforward process of developing a prototype tool and two rounds of

---

[1] Dawson, N.M., Coolsaet B., Bhardwaj A., Booker F., Brown D., Lliso B., Loos J., Martin A., Oliva M., Pascual U., Sherpa P., Worsdell T. (2024). Is it just conservation? A typology of Indigenous Peoples' and local communities' roles in conserving biodiversity, One Earth. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2024.05.001

piloting, reflection and revision, but rather in the development of the tool itself over the first 18 months of the project. This tool development process is genuinely a joint venture of the four partners and IIED which started with the project meeting at the end of June 2023.

Stakeholders in piloting the tool at a site level are determined by stakeholder analysis. Each pilot starts with an introductory meeting for all key stakeholder groups which are asked if they are willing to proceed with the process. Then it is carefully selected representatives of IP&LCs and other key stakeholders at the site who themselves conduct the assessment and then collectively plan actions to empower IP&LCs where there is potential to do so. If this is viewed as a form of action research, then it is the stakeholders who are leading the research and the action, facilitated by the project partner agency. All four assessments, one per country, planned for year one have been conducted in this way.

3.   Project progress

At the time of writing the half year report the project was running four months behind schedule, primarily due to the process of developing the analytical framework for the tool (indicators in five dimensions of power balance and typology of power balance) breaking new ground and thus having more iterations of drafts and review than expected. In addition, competing demands of other elements of IIEDs engagement in supporting implementation of the 30x30 target of the Global Biodiversity Framework, including the submission of a Darwin Extra proposal.

The revised plan to conduct the first pilots in December 2023 and January 2024 was further delayed by our desire for a member of the IIED team to be physically present for each assessment both to provide support and capture as much learning as possible. In the end the assessments took place over the period February/March apart from Uganda which could not be completed until after Easter (mid-April). Accordingly, activities 2.2 and 3.1 which should have started in January 2024 will now start in July 2024. To catch up we propose to reduce the timeframe for the applied research from nine months to six months and have brought forward the start of developing a roll-out strategy and exploring funding for this to April 2024. Thus, the project should still complete the workplan by March 31st 2025.

Delays in implementation of a complex process of innovation are only to be expected. As outlined above, we are proposing to modify the workplan to catch up and will shortly submit a change request for this.

The good news is that extending the time taken to develop the first version of the tool (Beta version) and prepare for the first round of pilots has meant that the tool is more developed than would otherwise have been the case after the first round of pilots (compared to the development process for our SAGE tool, for example), and we now expect that it will be good enough to start a scaling up process after the reflections on the second pilot at the 2-3 day workshop of the IPLC-led governance working group which is now scheduled for September 2024 (rather than June 2024) which will, in turn, inform the Policy Brief that will be published at CBD COP16 in mid-October 2024 (Activity 3.5 funded by GIZ).

3.1   Progress in carrying out project Activities

In this section we report progress on activities planned for the first year – some to be completed in year one and some to continue into year two – as per the plan on the following page.

Output 1: A prototype tool created, tested at one site in each country, and improved

1.1   From the membership of the WCPA/CEESP Governance Type Task Force (GTTF) identify 4 countries and collaborators in each with interest and capacity to field test the tool, and establish a Whatsapp group of these collaborators for sharing experience

The Task Force was established in April 2023 but as the "IPLC-led Governance Working Group" of the WCPA and CEESP Commissions of IUCN. This was in response to initial discussions with core members who felt that the group need to be framed in terms of its objective rather than just the notion of a group to work in Protected Area Governance Type. A second consideration was that GIZ and UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre offer to

help co-finance the first workshop of the group (activity 1.2) so that it could be fully in person rather than hybrid. The workshop was held at the end of June in Cambridge and exceeded our expectations in terms of diversity of participants, key insights and proposed next steps for the working group which include processes and publications supported by GIZ as well as development and testing of the tool that is the focus on this project.

Activities	Apr-June 2023	Jul-Sept 2023	Oct-Dec 2023	Jan-Mar 2024	Apr-Jun 2024	Jul-Sept 2024	Oct-Dec 2024	Jan-Mar 2025
1.1 From the membership (c 20 people) of the WCPA/CEESP Governance Type Task Force (GTTF) identify 4 countries and collaborators in each with interest and capacity to field test the tool, and establish a Whatsapp group of these collaborators for sharing experience	X							
1.2 Hold a hybrid workshop of GTTF to develop the first prototype tool (indicators and process) and refine the projects monitoring, evaluation and learning system – 3 days in person for the four field-testing collaborators, virtual participation for others.	X							
1.3 Collaborators field-test the tool at one site in each country (round 1 field testing)		X						
1.4 Hold a virtual workshop of the GTTF to reflect on the field-testing experience and modify the tool as necessary to produce Beta version – core group two days, other members up to one day.			X					
1.5 Develop a draft users' manual for the Beta version of the new tool to support round 2 field testing			X					
2.1 Plan round 2 field-testing for at least two additional sites per country			X					
2.2 Collaborators conduct round 2 field-testing in at least two additional sites per country				X	X			
2.3 Hold an in-person workshop of the whole GTTF (20 people) to reflect on experience to date (June 2024) and make further adaptations to the tool (indicators and process) to create version 1.					X			
2.4 Develop a users' manual and virtual training package for version 1 of the tool that will be rolled out post project					X	X		
2.5 Develop a strategy for rollout and engage donors to secure funding for a technical support facility						X	X	X
3.1 Conduct applied research on impact pathways and enabling conditions for roll out based on focus groups and key informant interviews with actors at testing and other adopting sites, and higher levels				X	X			
3.2 Prepare an IIED Working Paper and Briefing on experience and results that validate the tool, make recommendations for enabling roll out, and support advocacy on the importance of PCA governance type and quality for conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting IPLC-led conservation					X	X	X	
3.3 Prepare and update a communication plan including plan for the World Parks Congress 2024	X	X	X	X	X			
3.4 Prepare a WCPA publication on the revised framework of PCA governance type, PCA governance quality and their inter-relationship illustrated with results from using the new tool for governance type and SAGE for governance quality.					X	X		
3.5 Prepare and publish a policy brief on why IPLC-led conservation needs attention to PCA governance type and governance quality alongside financing					X	X		
3.6 Events at the World Parks Conservation Congress 2024 and CBD COP16					X	X		

xxx

1.2   Hold a hybrid workshop of GTTF to develop the first prototype tool (indicators and process) and refine the projects monitoring, evaluation and learning system – 3 days in person for the four field-testing collaborators, virtual participation for others.

In early July immediately after the Cambridge workshop we held a two-day meeting of the project partners to start the process of designing the tool that the project will pilot. The output is a first draft of the multi-stakeholder process that will be used for the assessment. The other key piece of the tool is the analytical framework – a set of indicators under five dimensions of authority/power - that was developed at the workshop – management, governance structure/process, rights and duties, financing and knowledge and values.

1.3   *Collaborators field-test the tool at one site in each country (round 1 field testing).*

At the site in Kenya – Munje Beach Management Unit the assessment was successfully completed at the end of February. In Nepal at Gaurishankar Conservation Area the assessment was completed in early March. At Mount Kitanglad National Park in the Philippines it was completed at the beginning of April and finally at Echuya Forest reserve in Uganda in mid-April. In all cases the partner and IIED mentor/observer reported that the process generally went well but there challenges and many suggestions for improvements

1.4   *Hold a virtual workshop of the GTTF to reflect on the field-testing experience and modify the tool as necessary to produce Beta version – core group two days, other members up to one day.*

Not surprisingly it has taken more time than expected organise meetings that all could attend across the different time zones. This activity is ongoing at the time of writing as two two-hour sessions separated by two weeks. The second session is planned for May 16th. It is a real privilege to work with four such competent and experienced people – two being academics and two being practitioners making such a major contribution to the development of this tool.

1.5   *Develop a draft users' manual for the version of the new tool to support round 2 field testing.*

In fact, we developed and completed in late January a fairly comprehensive manual for the first version as this was the best way to discuss and reconcile different suggestions for the process and analytical framework. We are currently (mid-May) improving this informed by all the feedback from the first round ready for the second round of pilots scheduled for July/August. An excel based tool for date entry and analysis has also been developed.

Output 2. A further improved tool developed through testing, learning and adapting in at least two more sites in each country, and a strategy and supporting materials for roll-out

2.1   Plan round 2 field-testing for at least two additional sites per country.

This activity was planned to start in October 2023 but has been delayed and is only now starting in April 2024 for the reasons outlined earlier.

2.2   Collaborators conduct round 2 field-testing in at least two additional sites per country.

As above this activity has been delayed by 6 months. The first assessment (in Kenya) will start early July, and all will be completed by mid-September 2024, i.e. all to be completed in 3 months rather than the 6 months in the original plan.

2.3   Hold an in-person workshop of the whole GTTF (20 people) to reflect on experience to date (June 2024) and make further adaptations to the tool (indicators and process) to create version 1.

As above the workshop will be 3 months later than originally planned, ie late September rather than late June. An important recent development (May) is that WCPA and CEESP have agreed that the ad hoc task force established by this project should be formalised as an official Task Force of the two commissions entitled: *Advancing Indigenous and community-led governance of PCAs*, and under this project, IIED will host the first meeting (in Kenya). Planning has started including exploring sources of additional funding so that all members of the Task Force who attended the June 2023 meeting in Cambridge can attend in person.

2.4 Develop a users' manual and virtual training package for version 1 of the tool that will be rolled out post project. Postponed to November/December 2024.

2.5 Develop a strategy for rollout and engage donors to secure funding for a technical support facility. Two donors have been identified that are interested to fund pilots in additional countries and one of these is also interested in supporting rollout. We have produced a concept note covering both which is currently under review. This activity will become higher priority with effect from July 2024 (as planned).

Output 3: Evidence of the tools' potential for enhancing conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting locally-led conservation has been co-produced and effectively communicated at national and global level

3.1 Conduct applied research on impact pathways and enabling conditions for roll out based on focus groups and key informant interviews with actors at testing and other adopting sites, and higher levels.

In the original plan, design of this applied research was to have started in January 2024 but since the first pilots have been delayed by six months, this activity has been rescheduled to start in July 2024 and will be concluded within 6 months rather than 9 months, ie by the end of December 2024.

3.2 Prepare an IIED Working Paper and Briefing on experience and results that validate the tool, make recommendations for enabling roll out, and support advocacy on the importance of PCA governance type and quality for conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting IPLC-led conservation Not yet started.

The remaining four activities of the project – see below - are dependent on additional funding being secured. In October 2024 GIZ confirmed that would fund these activities as part of a larger programme of support (euros 100k) for the activities of the Task Force.

3.3 Prepare and update a communication plan including plan for the World Parks Congress 2024. Pending the recruitment of a Communications Officer who will allocate 10% time to this project funded by GIZ. Note that the Parks Congress has been deferred to 2026 but in October there will be the equally important World Conservation Congress.

3.4 Prepare a WCPA publication on the revised framework of PCA governance type, PCA governance quality and their inter-relationship illustrated with results from using the new tool for governance type and SAGE for governance quality. Not yet started.

3.5 Prepare and publish a policy brief on why IPLC-led conservation needs attention to PCA governance type and governance quality alongside financing. Not yet started.

3.6 Events at the World Parks Conservation Congress 2024 and CBD COP16.

CBD COP16 is taking place in October 2024 in Colombia. The GIZ funding will support an side event at this COP which features the tool being developed by this project. The tool will also get a brief mention at a side event at SBSTTA 26 in Nairobi in mid-May 2024.

3.2 Progress towards project Outputs

The following sections cover the three different outputs. As is common at output level, for all indicators the baseline is zero.

Output 1: A prototype tool created, tested at one site in each country, and improved.

This output and the specific targets in the indicators will be achieved by the end of June 2024 rather than end of March. That said, the longer, more in depth tool design process has produced a first prototype that is more developed than would otherwise have been the case and partners and stakeholders at all four sites have given very positive feedback. However the better process, including a pre-meeting with IP&LCs to enhance their influence in the assessment (addressing a weakness in SAGE) has resulted in the cost of the assessment being, on average, more like £7500 than the £6000 that was budgeted.

Output 2. A further improved tool developed through testing, learning and adapting in at least two more sites in each country, and a strategy and supporting materials for roll-out

The project is on track to achieve all element of this output except for indicator 2.4 (for the same reasons as 1.4) and the fact that the cost being higher than expected means that it will not be possible to conduct a further two assessments in each country. In terms of methodology development, the reason for planning two assessments in round 2 rather than just another one was to mitigate risks of external factors such as poor organisation or last minute postponement due to local politics (as happened in Kenya) undermining the quality of the pilot. We will find another way approach to mitigate this risk – see section 10.

Output 3: Evidence of the tools' potential for enhancing conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting locally-led conservation has been co-produced and effectively communicated at national and global level

With the formalisation of the Task Force by the WCPA and CEESP commissions and financial support from GIZ, it is possible that achievement of this third output will be greater than expected when the project was designed despite the delays in implementation. That said, since the World Conservation Congress of 2025 has replaced the World Parks Congress of 2024 indicator 3.2 need to be adjusted accordingly and a change request will be submitted for this and other changes proposed in this report.

3.3   Progress towards the project Outcome

Project outcome statement: *Proof of concept for an effective and readily replicable tool for assessing PCA governance type in both terrestrial and marine contexts, including early indications of conservation becoming more IPLC-led*.

Based on the feedback from the first round of pilots we (Partners and IIED) believe that we already have proof of concept. However the target in the indicators, including early evidence of conservation becoming more IPLC-led, are all end-of-project targets which cannot be measured until then. Since each country will have done only two assessments rather than three it is likely that achievement will be one third less than expected. However, we are actively exploring interest and funding options to extend the second round of pilots to up to 4 additional sites in two additional countries and if successful should no longer have this shortfall.

The impact evaluation methods designed to collect this information will be used at the end of the project, ten months after the first round of pilots, and five months after round two. Since both methods measure change over the life of the project as a consequence of the project none requires a pre-project baseline.

3.4   Monitoring of assumptions

There are three assumptions that are crucial for the project to achieve its goals and targets.

- *Two additional countries added to the portfolio with support from IUCN-WCPA members and other donors*
  There is no shortage of partners and sites interested to pilot the tool. The key is donor support and we are in discussion with two donors that are interested. We have a lot of influence over this assumption and monitoring is very straightforward.
- *GIZ supports activities 3.3-3.7.*
  This is no longer an assumption as GIZ has confirmed their support.

- *Actors at 50% of the 12 sites are motivated by the assessment results to take some action towards making governance more locally led. We see this in our work with our SAGE tool and so believe it to be a fair assumption.*

    This is the most important assumption which we will monitor using the outcome/impact evaluation methods that will be used for outcome indicators 0.2 and 0.3, ie outcome harvesting and focus groups 5-10 months after the assessments.

These assumptions still hold true.

3.5   Impact: achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty reduction

Since the first round of pilots has only just been completed it is premature to comment on impact on biodiversity and poverty reduction/well-being, but at this point we have no reason to doubt the logic in our theory of change.

4.   Project support to the Conventions, Treaties or Agreements

Since the first round of pilots has only just been completed it is premature to comment on impact on the contribution to national policy. Interaction with CBD focal points will commence in year 2 when we have something to show.

However, the conceptual work that has been done over the last year, first at the Task Force workshop in June 2023 and since then in developing the analytical framework for the tool, is already contributing to discussions at international level around how to advance the equitable governance element of the 30x30 target and IPLC-led conservation. This includes through a new publication of IUCN WCPA which will be published and presented at a side event on May 15th at the CBD SBSTTA 26 meeting in Nairobi.

5.   Project support for multidimensional poverty reduction

Since the first round of pilots has only just been completed it is premature to comment on impact on poverty reduction/well-being, but at this point we have no reason to doubt the logic in our theory of change.

6.   Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI)

Please quantify the proportion of women on the Project Board[2].	Project Management Committee comprises 2 women and 4 men.
Please quantify the proportion of project partners that are led by women, or which have a senior leadership team consisting of at least 50% women[3].	CORDIO, RECOFTC and Bukidnon University (ie 75%)

GESI Scale	Description	Put X where you think your project is on the scale
Not yet sensitive	The GESI context may have been considered but the project isn't quite meeting the requirements of a 'sensitive' approach	
Sensitive	The GESI context has been considered and project activities take this into account in their	

[2] A Project Board has overall authority for the project, is accountable for its success or failure, and supports the senior project manager to successfully deliver the project.

[3] Partners that have formal governance role in the project, and a formal relationship with the project that may involve staff costs and/or budget management responsibilities.

	design and implementation. The project addresses basic needs and vulnerabilities of women and marginalised groups and the project will not contribute to or create further inequalities.	
Empowering	The project has all the characteristics of a 'sensitive' approach whilst also increasing equal access to assets, resources and capabilities for women and marginalised groups	
Transformative	The project has all the characteristics of an 'empowering' approach whilst also addressing unequal power relationships and seeking institutional and societal change	X

The purpose of the project is to develop and validate a tool that will change the balance of power between community actors (organisations and networks) and the dominant non-community actors (government agencies in all cases). The assessment is conducted by these actor groups with community actors disaggregated into men and women, and where there are IPs they form a third group (IP men and women together). The assessment often reveals differences in how these different groups in the community perceive the balance of power, ie marginalisation of certain groups – usually women and IPs – and the action plan will include affirmation actions to address this. A prime example of this is the assessment in Nepal where the list of suggested actions to empower IPs&LCs include 14 actions designed to empower women – see the GTA report for Nepal which is included with this annual report where the 14 affirmative actions are highlighted.

7.   Monitoring and evaluation

At this point in the project when the first round of pilots has only just been concluded the main source of information and data for M&E is the reports of the assessments which are themselves an output indicator (2.2) but also contain much information on the activities completed and the experience of the pilot which is informing improvement of the assessment methodology. We are submitting three of the four reports with this annual report. The fourth for the Uganda assessment which ended in mid-April is just being finished and will be submitted within a week.

These reports provide strong evidence of achievement of the first part of the outcome: *Proof of concept for an effective and readily replicable tool for assessing PCA governance type in both terrestrial and marine contexts.*

As noted earlier the achievements at outcome level will be evaluated just before the end of the project using a combination of outcomes harvesting and focus group discussions.

As noted earlier indicators 1.4 and 2.4 need to be changed in terms of timeframe, delaying the date for achievement of each target by six months.

Each country level partner is responsible for the M&E of their work with technical support from IIED particularly for outcome level M&E.

8.   Lessons learnt

• What worked well, and what didn't work well, this past year?

Although there has been a significant delay in the start of the fieldwork (ie first pilot assessments) we are very satisfied with progress to date in terms of the quality of the prototype methodology and learning by the country teams that is now contributing to improving the methodology in preparation for the second round of pilots.

We are also very pleased at the way the Task Force for IPLC-led conservation initiated by this project has been formerly adopted as Task Force of the WCPA and CEESP commissions of IUCN, in so doing reviving the collaboration of these two commissions that was one strong.

- If you had to do it again, what would you do differently?

Nothing significant comes to mind here other than better time management of the development process in the first nine months to have reduced the delay in the start of the pilots by 3 months.

- What recommendations would you make to others doing similar projects, for example tackling the same issues or working in the same geographical area?

There are no similar projects as far as we know.

- How are you going to build this learning into the project and future plans?

Learning is at the core of this project both on an ongoing basis to inform the improvement of the methodology and in the action research activity of activity 3.1 which has not yet started. This learning will be captured and documented in the IIED Working paper (activity 3.2) that will be published in the last quarter.

- Are you going to change your plan next year as a result of this learning? Do you plan to submit a Change Request?

Yes. As noted in earlier sections our efforts to improve the quality of the assessment process (compared to SAGE) make the assessment a little more costly than SAGE which means that there can only be one assessment per country in the second round of pilots. We will be submitting a change request for this.

9. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)

Not relevant for this first year report.

10. Risk Management

- Have any new risks arisen in the last 12 months that were not previously accounted for?

Nothing significant.

- Has the project made any significant adaptations to the project design this year to address risk?

As noted earlier, in reducing the number of pilot assessments in the second round to one per country we expose the project in increased risk of the second round assessments not going according to plan for reasons outside of the control of the project. To mitigate this year 2 risk we will need to be particularly careful and rigorous in applying the feasibility criteria that are used to determine whether a proposed site is appropriate.

- Please submit an updated version of your risk register with your Annual Report. The template can be found on the Darwin Initiative website.

There is no change from the one submitted with the proposal.

11. Sustainability and legacy

- What evidence is there for increasing interest and capacity resulting from the project?

The in country partners have deliberately kept the project profile low in year one partly because we are still at proof of concept stage and partly because the theme of this project – essentially assessing and changing the balance of power between IP&LCs and government agencies – is sensitive and the messaging needs to be carefully crafted and communicated. This will become a key activity in year two following completion of the second pilots.

At the international level there is great interest but again we are resisting the temptation to publicise the work of the project until after the second pilots have been completed. At this point the work of the project will be presented to the WCPA-CEESP Task Force (late Sept) and at a side event at CBD COP16 (late October).

- Please describe any action you have taken as part of the project's open access plan.

  None yet.

- Is the project generating interest from other organisations and institutions? Very much so in the international arena but we are deliberately holding back until the results are presented to the WCPA-CEESP Task Force in late September and COP16 in October.

- Are the intended benefits post-project still valid given the project is now running, or have you, or are you, planning to make changes to what was originally proposed? How will you ensure the innovation is mainstreamed into "business as usual" to continue to deliver benefits?

  Activity 2.5 - *develop a strategy for rollout and engage donors to secure funding for a technical support facility* – is about the first step of mainstreaming, moving from a few pilots to usage of the tool at significant scale. We are modelling this approach on that of our SAGE tool where uptake went from the initial pilots to around 50 sites across 20 countries within three years (but this was during COVID and we believe the timeframe for this first phase of scaling up can be reduced to two years). This first phase will need significant donor support. Then, mirroring the scaling up of SAGE, the strategy will switch to scaling up within selected target countries to the point where the tool is being widely used across the PA system of that country. With SAGE we are just embarking on this second phase of scaling up with a new project funded by Darwin Extra.

12. Darwin Initiative identity

In the first year the project has deliberately maintained a low profile for reasons outlined above, but this will change in year two.

13.   Safeguarding

Has your Safeguarding Policy been updated in the past 12 months?	No
Have any concerns been reported in the past 12 months	No
Does your project have a Safeguarding focal point?	Yes Phil ██████, Project Leader
Has the focal point attended any formal training in the last 12 months?	No but has a lot of experience on safeguards
What proportion (and number) of project staff have received formal training on Safeguarding?	None. This is handled by the project Leader

Has there been any lessons learnt or challenges on Safeguarding in the past 12 months? Please ensure no sensitive data is included within responses.

Not yet

Does the project have any developments or activities planned around Safeguarding in the coming 12 months? If so please specify.

In a sense the entire project is designed to support safeguarding in promoting empowerment of IP&LCs.

Please describe any community sensitisation that has taken place over the past 12 months; include topics covered and number of participants.

Nothing specific

Have there been any concerns around Health, Safety and Security of your project over the past year? If yes, please outline how this was resolved.

None

14. Project expenditure

Please expand and complete Table 1. If all receipts have not yet been received, please provide indicative figures and clearly mark them as Draft. The Actual claim form will be taken as the final accounting for funds.

Table 1: Project expenditure <u>during the reporting period</u> (1 April 2023 – 31 March 2024)

Project spend (indicative) since last Annual Report	2023/24 Grant (£)	2023/24 Total Darwin Initiative Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)				DRAFT
Consultancy costs				DRAFT
Overhead Costs				DRAFT
Travel and subsistence				DRAFT
Operating Costs				
Capital items (see below)				
Others (see below)				
TOTAL	102600	85904.86		

Highlight any agreed changes to the budget and **fully** explain any variation in expenditure where this is +/- 10% of the budget. Have these changes been discussed with and approved by Darwin Initiative?

Table 2: Project mobilised or matched funding during the reporting period (1 April 2023 – 31 March 2024)

	Secured to date	Expected by end of project	Sources
Matched funding leveraged by the partners to deliver the project (£)			
Total additional finance mobilised for new activities occurring outside of the project, building on evidence, best practices and the project (£)			

15. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

.

16.   OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements or progress of your project so far (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes

I agree for the Biodiversity Challenge Funds to edit and use the following for various promotional purposes (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here).

Annex 1:   Report of progress and achievements against logframe for Financial Year 2023-2024

Project summary	Progress and Achievements April 2023 - March 2024	Actions required/planned for next period
Impact **By end of 2030):** At least 500 PCAs across 20 countries have used the tool and 40% reporting significant shifts in the balance of power towards IPLCs and corresponding benefits for people and nature	None yet visible	
Outcome **By end of project):** Proof of concept for an effective and readily replicable tool for assessing PCA governance type in both terrestrial and marine contexts, including early indications of conservation becoming more IPLC-led		
Outcome Indicator 0.1-0.4	Based on the feedback from the first round of pilots we (Partners and IIED) believe that we already have proof of concept. However the target in the indicators, including early evidence of conservation becoming more IPLC-led, are all end-of-project targets which cannot be measured until then.	Impact evaluation in the last quarter of the project using outcome harvesting and focus group discussions
Output 1 A prototype tool created, tested at one site in each country, and improved.		
Output indicators 1.1-1.4 1.1 First prototype tool developed and basic manual 1.2. First prototype tested at 1 site in each country and 4 site reports produced 1.3. Second prototype of the tool developed and a revised users' manual 1.4. At least 200 peer-to-peer messages on the Whatsapp group in the first year	This output and the specific targets in the indicators will be achieved by the end of June 2024 rather than end of March. That said, the longer, more in depth tool design process has produced a first prototype that is better developed than would otherwise have been the case and partners and stakeholders at all four sites have given very positive feedback.	
Output 2. A further improved tool developed through testing, learning and adapting in at least two more sites in each country, and a strategy and supporting materials for roll-out		

Output indicators 2.1-2.4	Nothing to report as activities have not yet started.	Activities 2.1-2.5
2.1 Second prototype tool tested in at least 2 sites in each of the 4 countries 2.2 Version 1.0 of the tool, users' manual and virtual training package developed 2.3 Roll-out strategy and supporting materials developed 2.4 At least 400 peer-to-peer WhatsApp messages in the second year		
Output 3. Evidence of the tools' potential for enhancing conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting locally-led conservation has been co-produced and effectively communicated at national and global level		
Output indicator 3.1-3.2	Nothing to report as activities have not yet started.	Activities 3.1-3.6

3.1. Number, type and quality of communications materials produced by IIED, in country collaborators and GTTF
   - at least 3 blogs
   - at least 2 articles in WCPA and/or other relevant newsletters
   - IIED working paper and Briefing
3.2. Number of mentions of the tool in descriptions of events at the World Parks Congress 2024		

Annex 2: Project's full current logframe as presented in the application form (unless changes have been agreed)

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

2. A further improved tool developed through testing, learning and adapting in at least two more sites in each country, and a strategy and supporting materials for roll-out.	2.1 Second prototype tool tested in at least 2 sites in each of the 4 countries 2.2 Version 1.0 of the tool, users' manual and virtual training package developed 2.3 Roll-out strategy and supporting materials developed 2.4 At least 400 peer-to-peer WhatsApp messages in the second year	2.1 Peer review of site reports from collaborators 2.2 Peer review of version 1, manual and virtual training package 2.3 Review strategy and materials 2.4 Review WhatsApp communication of year 2	Actors at 50% of the 12 sites are motivated by the assessment results to take some action towards making governance more locally led. We see this is our work with our SAGE tool and so believe it to be a fair assumption.

3. Evidence of the tools' potential for enhancing conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting locally-led conservation has been co-produced and effectively communicated at national and global levels.	3.1. Number, type and quality of communications materials produced by IIED, in country collaborators and GTTF
	   - at least 3 blogs
	   - at least 2 articles in WCPA and/or other relevant newsletters
	   - IIED working paper and Briefing
	
	3.2. Number of mentions of the tool in descriptions of events at the World Parks Congress 2024
		3.1 Review of communication materials
		
		3.2 Search for the name of the tool in programmes for the 2024 World Parks Congress	

1.1 From the membership (c 20 people) of the WCPA/CEESP Governance Type Task Force (GTTF) identify 4 countries and collaborators in each with interest and capacity to field test the tool, and establish a Whatsapp group of these collaborators for sharing experience

1.2 Hold a hybrid workshop of GTTF to develop the first prototype tool (indicators and process) and refine the projects monitoring, evaluation and learning system – 3 days in person for the four field-testing collaborators, virtual participation for others.

1.3 Collaborators field-test the tool at one site in each country (round 1 field testing)

1.4 Hold a virtual workshop of the GTTF to reflect on the field-testing experience and modify the tool as necessary to produce Beta version – core group two days, other members up to one day.

1.5 Develop a draft users' manual for the Beta version of the new tool to support round 2 field testing

2.1 Plan round 2 field-testing for at least two additional sites per country

2.2 Collaborators conduct round 2 field-testing in at least two additional sites per country

2.3 Hold an in-person workshop of the whole GTTF (20 people) to reflect on experience to date (June 2024) and make further adaptations to the tool (indicators and process) to create version 1.

2.4 Develop a users' manual and virtual training package for version 1 of the tool that will be rolled out post project

2.5 Develop a strategy for rollout and engage donors to secure funding for a technical support facility

3.1 Conduct applied research on impact pathways and enabling conditions for roll out based on focus groups and key informant interviews with actors at testing and other adopting sites, and higher levels.

3.2	Prepare an IIED Working Paper and Briefing on experience and results that validate the tool, make recommendations for enabling roll out, and support advocacy on the importance of PCA governance type and quality for conservation effectiveness and equity and promoting IPLC-led conservation
3.3	Prepare and update a communication plan including plan for the World Parks Congress 2024
3.4	Prepare a WCPA publication on the revised framework of PCA governance type, PCA governance quality and their inter-relationship illustrated with results from using the new tool for governance type and SAGE for governance quality.
3.5	Prepare and publish a policy brief on why IPLC-led conservation needs attention to PCA governance type and governance quality alongside financing
3.6	Events at the World Parks Conservation Congress 2024 and CBD COP16

Annex 3: Standard Indicators

This was not a requirement at the time we submitted the proposal in Round 29. However the M&E that is planned for year 2 will provide relevant information for a number of the Darwin Initiative standard indicators.

Checklist for submission

	Check
Different reporting templates have different questions, and it is important you use the correct one. Have you checked you have used the **correct template** (checking fund, type of report (i.e. Annual or Final), and year) and **deleted the blue guidance text** before submission?	X
Is the report less than 10MB? If so, please email to BCF-Reports@niras.com putting the project number in the Subject line.	X
Is your report more than 10MB? If so, please discuss with BCF-Reports@niras.com about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	
Have you included means of verification? You should not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	X
If you are submitting photos for publicity purposes, do these meet the outlined requirements (see section 16)?	X
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	X
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	X
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	