
DIR30EX\1099

Scaling-up equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (SEG)

More equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (PCAs) is a critical element of the Global Biodiversity Framework's 30x30 target in terms of both social and conservation outcomes. Although some PCAs have improved their governance, very few countries have achieved success at scale. Focusing on five countries, this project will scale up action for more equitable governance and build capacity and enabling conditions so that scaling up continues post-project and equitable governance becomes a cornerstone of conservation policy and practice.

DIR30EX\1099

Scaling-up equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (SEG)

Section 1 - Contact Details

PRIMARY APPLICANT DETAILS

Name	Phil
Surname	Franks
Tel (Work)	[REDACTED]
Email (Work)	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]

GMS ORGANISATION


Type	Organisation
Name	International Institute for Environment and Development
Phone (Work)	[REDACTED]
Email	[REDACTED]
Website	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]


Section 2 - Title, Ecosystems, Approaches & Summary


Q3. Title:


Scaling-up equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (SEG)

Please upload a cover letter as a PDF document.

 [Covering letter for IIED-SEG project](#)

 18/09/2023

 14:19:21

 pdf 259.52 KB

Q4a. Is this a resubmission of a previously unsuccessful application?

Yes

Q4b. Previous application number if known.

DIR29EX_1077

Q5. Key Ecosystems, Approaches and Threats

Select up to 3 biomes that are of focus, up to 3 conservation actions that characterise your approach, and up to 3 threats to biodiversity you intend to address, from dropdown lists.

Biome 1

Tropical-subtropical forests

Biome 2

Savannas and grasslands

Biome 3

Shoreline systems

Conservation Action 1

Land / Water Management

Conservation Action 2

Legal & Policy Frameworks

Conservation Action 3

Livelihood, Economic & Moral Incentives

Threat 1

Agriculture & aquaculture (incl. plantations)

Threat 2

Biological resource use (hunting, gathering, logging, fishing)

Threat 3

No Response

Q6. Summary of Project

Please provide a brief non-technical summary of your project: the problem/need it is trying to address, its aims, and the key activities you plan on undertaking.

More equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (PCAs) is a critical element of the Global Biodiversity Framework's 30x30 target in terms of both social and conservation outcomes. Although some PCAs have improved their governance, very few countries have achieved success at scale. Focusing on five countries, this project will scale up action for more equitable governance and build capacity and enabling conditions so that scaling up continues post-project and equitable governance becomes a cornerstone of conservation policy and practice.

Section 3 - Title, Dates & Budget Summary

Q7. Country(ies)

Which eligible country(ies) will your project be working with?

Country 1	Kenya	Country 2	Tanzania
Country 3	Bolivia	Country 4	Nepal

Do you require more fields?

Yes

Country 5	Madagascar	Country 6	No Response
Country 7	No Response	Country 8	No Response

Q8. Project dates

Start date: 01 April 2024	End date: 31 March 2028	Duration (e.g. 2 years, 3 months): 4 years
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

Q9. Budget summary

Darwin funding request	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	Total request
(April - March)	£1,047,895.00	£1,094,671.00	£1,145,829.00	£842,996.00	£0.00	£4,131,391.00

Q10a. Do you have matched funding arrangements?

Yes

Please ensure you clearly outline your matched funding arrangement in the budget.

Q11. If you have a significant amount of unconfirmed matched funding, please clarify how you will deliver the project if you don't manage to secure this?

Total match funding is £ [REDACTED] of which £ [REDACTED] is from IIED and the balance from country partners.

All match funding is confirmed.

Q12. Have you received, applied for or plan to apply for any other UK Government funding for the proposed project or similar?

No

Section 4 - Problem statement

Q13. 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 multi-dimensional poverty.

For example, what are the causes of biodiversity loss, preventing conservation, and/or keeping people in multi-dimensional poverty that the project will attempt to address? Why are they relevant, for whom? How did you identify the need for your project? Please cite the evidence you are using to support your assessment of the problem.

The recent IPBES Global Assessment on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (1) concludes that weak environmental governance is a key driver of the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services and that “transformative change” will require governance innovation. This project will be at the forefront, nationally in five target countries and globally, in scaling up such innovation focusing on protected and conserved areas (PCAs).

Most PCAs are common pool resources (CPRs) vulnerable to downward spirals of degradation where management and governance systems are unable to prevent unsustainable resource use. Elinor Ostrom won a Nobel Prize for research on effective CPR management conditions, identifying eight “design principles for sustainable governance and management.

While there are many success stories of community-based approaches to manage PCAs, many that are not rooted in strong indigenous institutions are struggling with governance problems related to the Ostrom Conditions that are undermining both conservation and social outcomes. This is increasingly well documented from global and national perspectives (2).

The conventional ‘fortress conservation’ approach - still the mainstay of conservation in much of the global South - is based on state-backed policing. This is often at great cost to Indigenous Peoples and local communities as documented by numerous studies, including by IIED (3). Common negative impacts include loss of access to resources, damage to crops by wildlife, and abusive treatment by law enforcement agents. Moreover, it is increasingly clear that fortress conservation is in many places failing in conservation terms in the face of growing anthropocentric pressures. A recent global study of PCAs with natural forest cover found that 59% experienced significant deforestation over the period 2001-18 (4). Increasingly recognising the relevance of governance and equity to conservation, and the impossibility of expanding PCA coverage without equitable governance, CBD Parties have included “equitably governed” in the ‘30x30’ target of the UN Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) (13).

The IPBES assessment concludes that: “community-based, local governance regimes have often been effective, at times even more effective than established protected areas.” But despite growing recognition of the importance of equitable governance and widespread weaknesses that contribute to poorer conservation outcomes, few PCAs have invested in measures to improve governance at site level. Many traditionalists remain

unconvinced that more equitable governance will deliver better conservation, but evidence is growing of the benefits of doing so and weaknesses in management that have roots in governance. New research by IIED and partners based on review of 40 relevant papers concludes “evidence shows that changes to make conservation governance more equitable are commonly associated with positive ecological outcomes” (5).

In contrast to relatively little investment in PCA governance over the last 10 years there has been substantial investment in PA management effectiveness in more than 150 countries, notably using the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) (6). Until recently, there was no such possibility for PCA governance, but with the development of the SAGE tool for governance self-assessment and action there is now a real opportunity to change this, and this project lead this effort.

Section 5 - Darwin Objectives and Conventions

Q14. Biodiversity Conventions, Treaties and Agreements

Q14a. Your project must support the commitments of one or more of the agreements listed below. Please indicate which agreement(s) will be supported

- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
- Global Goals for Sustainable Development (SDGs)

Q14b. National and International Policy Alignment

Using **evidence** where available, please detail how your project **will contribute to national policy (including NBSAPs, NDCs, NAP etc.)** and in turn **international biodiversity and development conventions, treaties and agreements that the country is a signatory of**.

The new GBF commits all CBD Parties to halt the loss of biodiversity through two hugely ambitious proposals. First, to more than double the area of effective conservation measures on the planet from 16% of land and 7% of sea to 30% of each by 2030. Second, the condition that all such conservation measures should be equitably governed. Of the existing 266,000 PAs, many have a long way to go and change will be incremental. But for the additional area, social and political realities, and increasingly strong social safeguards on donor financing, will rightly ensure there is no place for inequitable approaches.

CBD Decision COP/DEC/15/5 of the last COP (December 2022) focuses on the monitoring framework for the GBF goals and targets (8). This is still under development but at this time the only indicator for the equitably governed element of the 30x30 target (target 3) is “The number of protected areas that have completed a site-level assessment of governance and equity (SAGE)”. CBD has singled out SAGE as the leading tool of its kind and this project is likely to make the biggest contribution to this measure of progress of any single initiative.

More broadly this project will make a major contribution to interpreting the meaning of equity in the context of the 30x30 target. During the period 2015-18, IIED led a global initiative on equity in PCA conservation, which generated the 3D framework of equity and ten principles of equitable governance that were endorsed by CBD Parties at CBD COP14 (9). A global-level process to adapt this framework to the new context of the 30x30 target is now underway, convened by the Governance, Equity and Rights Group of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, of which the leader of this project is a co-chair. This will produce guidance for endorsement by CBD Parties on both what equitable governance means and how to deliver real progress at scale, and the learning and evidence generated by this project will make a key contribution. More broadly, as indicated in our

theory of change, the evidence of the value of SAGE for improving PCA governance/equity and conservation generated by this project will help support strong provisions on equitable governance in decisions on implementation of the 30x30 target at COP16 in late 2024 and COP17 in late 2026.

At present there is no National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) that addresses equitable governance as the CBD strategy 2011-2020 only referred to equitable management of PCAs. Now that CBD COP15 has formalised the switch to equity in governance, this should start to be reflected in NBSAPs as they are revised post COP15. For our five target countries, having a programme of SAGE-based assessment and action to improve governance on their doorstep will give NBSAP planners and implementing agencies the means to fully operationalise the commitment to equitable governance that was agreed at COP15 and included in the GBF. This is also an important enabling condition for scaling up use of SAGE.

Section 6 - Evidence for Scaling

Q15. Evidence for Scaling

Darwin Initiative Extra projects should utilise and build on evidence from past activities (from Darwin Initiative and beyond) to demonstrate why the approach will deliver. Please provide evidence on how your proposed project will do this.

SAGE enables stakeholders and rightsholders at a site to assess the governance of their PCA, identify actions to improve, plan and implement priority actions, and monitor progress (see annex 1). More than 60 sites across 25 countries have now used SAGE, including each of our five target countries. Results have been very positive (11) and in most countries use of SAGE is gradually expanding, notably in Kenya with eight sites.

The main focus of this project is "Taking Action" (phase 3). This project is modelled on an action project in Zambia funded by the EU BIOPAMA programme with six sites and a further four starting over the next six months supported by other agencies (USAID and Legacy Landscapes Fund). See Q16.

From four PCAs/country in year one, use of SAGE will increase by four sites each year, reaching at least 88 sites by March 2028 (landscape scaling and replication scaling). Through site-level support and the community of practice, the project will build technical capacity for assessment and action (capacity scaling). In years 3-4, growing evidence of improved governance/equity and benefits for people and nature will influence policy towards fostering enabling conditions for further scaling up (system change scaling).

Section 7 - Method, Change Expected, Gender & Exit Strategy

Q16. Methodology

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

- how you have reflected on and incorporated **evidence and lessons** learnt from past and present similar activities and projects in the design of this project.
- the specific approach you are using, supported by **evidence** that it will be effective, and **justifying why you expect it will be successful** in this context.
- how you will undertake the work (activities, materials and methods).
- what will be the **main activities** and where will these take place.
- how will you **manage the work** (governance, roles and responsibilities, project management tools, risks etc.).

BUILDING ON EVIDENCE

This project builds on nine years of work by IIED and national partners on assessing PCA social impacts, governance and equity, and supporting actions to improve. The SAGE development team includes SAGE facilitators from 14 different countries. Over the last five years their feedback has greatly improved SAGE, and in June 2023 the SAGE v1 Users' Manual was published (10). This proposal is modelled on an existing IIED-led project in Zambia that employs the same combination of SAGE demonstration sites, capacity building and technical support for scaling up, and platforms for peer-to-peer interaction to enable further scaling up and improve quality.

PROPOSED APPROACH AND LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS

This project will extend this approach to five countries in which, based on their own experience with SAGE, partners and their government counterparts are convinced it can be similarly effective (see support letters). By the end of the project, we expect scaling up to have reached at least 88 PCAs across the five countries, with 70 of these sites showing significant improvements in one or more aspects of governance. For this to translate into better conservation and social outcomes always takes time but by the end of the project we expect to see such evidence in at least 50% of the 35 sites, and in at least 75% when the ex-post evaluation is done two years later.

There will be a phased scaling-up process starting with providing support for SAGE-based assessment and action to specific sites, and then from year three onwards facilitating capacity building more broadly through a community of practice at higher levels while relying on partners to fully support the SAGE process at site level. While our target is 88 PAs, the natural spread of a successful tool could result in the actual number being substantially more.

To maximise the chance of achieving a critical mass of SAGE usage within four years, the project focuses on countries where improvements in PCA governance are more likely to deliver better conservation and social outcomes within a relatively short period of time due to an enabling policy and many PCAs have substantial community engagement. Furthermore, the project builds on well-established collaborations with a strong set of national and international partners, notably IUCN and the conservation NGOs TNC, CI and FFI.

PROJECT OUTPUTS/COMPONENTS

1. Implementation of SAGE-based assessment and action for more equitable PCA governance in five countries. In the first year, four demonstration sites in each country (six in Madagascar) will receive full technical and financial support for SAGE-based assessment and action. In years two and three, an additional four sites per country will receive only technical support, on the assumption that, as we have seen in other countries, financial support for the SAGE assessment and subsequent actions to improve governance will be provided by existing PCA-support projects of government agencies and/or NGOs. In addition to support tailored to the needs of each site, there will be capacity building for actors at all sites on the governance principles of respect for actors and their rights, participation in decision making, transparency and accountability, equitable benefit-sharing, grievance redress mechanisms and leadership. All of these activities will be led by country partners.
2. Increasing capacity and motivation of site-level actors to plan, implement, monitor and learn from actions to improve PCA governance and equity. This component will build the capacity, and create the demand for, scaling-up SAGE-based assessment and action beyond the four demonstration sites of year one. Drawing on IIED's experience of supporting national Poverty and Conservation Learning Groups, the project will support a PCA Governance and Equity Community of Practice in each country. Building on existing institutions, these will provide a platform for SAGE facilitators and site-level actors to share their enthusiasm and experience, including collaboration with the IUCN Green List programme – a gold standard for PA management. Important learning will be captured in training modules and/or practical guidance documents.
3. Knowledge on equitable governance of PCAs co-created and communicated to policymakers and practitioners at all levels to accelerate scaling up and impact quantity and quality, focusing in particular on:
 - a) Conservation and social outcomes of using SAGE and impact pathways. At each PCA site we will use an

outcome harvesting approach to capture and document the changes in governance and management effectiveness, and conservation and social outcomes. To strengthen this work, IIED has joined the CROCUS consortium led by the University of Cambridge (see cover letter) which has a proposal shortlisted for funding by ESRC that includes this research topic.

b) Enabling conditions for SAGE scaling up. Using scaling up typology in Darwin Guidance as an analytical framework and scenario-based interviewing methods (14), we will compare and contrast the process of SAGE adoption beyond the core demonstration sites across the different landscapes within the five countries to identify enabling conditions and barriers.

Within each target country, the project will use the information generated to make the case for commitments to equitable PCA governance in national conservation policy and NBSAPs. In addition, the learning will inform further improvements to the tools and process of the SAGE's action phase.

At global level IIED, working in partnership with IUCN and its World Commission on Protected Areas, will use this evidence to support CBD negotiators and major conservation agencies advocating for more emphasis on equitable governance in further CBD negotiations on implementation and monitoring and financing of target 3 (30x30) of the GBF.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Implementation of outputs/components one and two of the project will be led by the country partners with support from IIED. The much smaller component three will be led by IIED with support from the country partners. IIED will be responsible for overall leadership and management of the project guided by a Project Management Committee (PMC) comprising one representative from each partner. The PMC will meet quarterly (online) to review achievements against the workplan and face-to-face once a year to review progress against targets and adapt strategies and plans as necessary.

Q17. Capability and Capacity

How will the project support the strengthening of capability and capacity of identified local and national partners, and stakeholders during its lifetime organisational or individual levels? Please provide details of what form this will take, who will benefit (noting GESI considerations), and the post-project value to the country.

Improving governance and equity at a PCA is usually an incremental process of a number of different actions by the site-level actors and the external actors supporting them. Unlike interventions to directly reduce poverty and improve conservation outcomes, such as problem animal control, governance interventions tend to require little, if any, material inputs, being focused mainly on sharing information and improving decision making, accountability and dispute resolution processes, and at times changing narratives and mindsets.

This project is mainly focused on capacity building in the follow areas:

a) Knowledge and skills of the facilitators of governance and equity assessment, planning and implementation of actions. Using SAGE training methods and materials already developed and used in around 25 countries, including the new SAGE Users' Manual, the project will train and mentor a cadre of SAGE facilitators in each country. Furthermore, at global level, IIED will establish a scheme to promote and recognise excellence in facilitating SAGE assessment and action (activity 2.4).

b) Knowledge and skills of representatives of different site-level actors (e.g. communities, local government, PA managers, tourism operators, NGOs) to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate, and adaptively manage their own programme of work to improve PCA governance and equity, and sustain this process without project support. This is where there is an important distinction between the demonstration sites where the project will ensure that the necessary capacity building of key actors takes place, and the additional sites where this becomes the responsibility of NGOs and/or government agencies organising SAGE at those sites. That said, actors at all sites and facilitators will have access to peer-to-peer capacity building through the national level community of practice that will be supported throughout the project, and to guidance developed by the

community of practice on country specific priorities (activity 2.2).

c) Knowledge and skills of the national partners to become not only SAGE experts, but more broadly centres of expertise on PCA governance and equity in their countries that can support other area-based conservation initiatives in the country. Over and above the bilateral training and mentoring carried out by IIED and the six national partners, partners will also greatly benefit from opportunities to be part of IIED's global PCA governance and equity research and learning programme centred on this flagship project, and the Governance, Equity and Rights Specialist Group in the IUCN World Commission of Protected Areas of which IIED is a co-chair (see support letter from IUCN-WCPA).

Across all three areas, IIED will provide technical support, including state-of-the-art approaches, in communications and diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI). Support on communications from an IIED communications expert will include social marketing, virtual learning platforms, use of social media, and development of policy briefs and training materials. Support on DEI will include applying gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) considerations across all phases of SAGE (see question 18), and the role of measures to promote more equitable governance of PCAs in empowering Indigenous Peoples and local communities and thereby changing power relations in conservation.

Q18. Gender equality and social inclusion

All applicants must consider whether and how their project will contribute to promoting equality between persons of different gender and social characteristics. Explain your understanding of how individuals may be excluded from equal participation within the context of your project, and how you seek to address this. You should consider how your project will proactively contribute to ensuring individuals achieve equitable outcomes and how you will engage participants in a meaningful way.

Compared to development agencies that have been addressing gender equality and social inclusion for over 20 years, conservation policy and practice has only recently moved from being 'gender blind' to aspiring to be at least gender sensitive and where possible 'gender responsive'. In terms of social inclusion, while the marginalisation/exclusion of Indigenous Peoples has long been recognised in conservation, recognition of and measures to address the marginalisation/exclusion of certain social groups within communities has generally received much less attention. Since both gender inequality and social exclusion are fundamentally governance issues, these are a core issues for this project.

It is important to clarify that equitable PCA governance does not imply equality with respect to gender or other social inclusion aspects in all governance aspects. Certainly the principle of equality is almost always applicable in the equity dimensions of recognition and procedure, but the distribution of conservation-related costs and benefits may be based on a number of considerations alongside equality, such as traditional norms of Indigenous Peoples, rewards for stewardship (e.g. benefits to men who contribute to law enforcement), or prioritising households whose wellbeing is most affected by negative social impacts like human-wildlife conflict (likely to be disproportionately female-headed households with less labour to protect crops).

The SAGE tool, from assessment to action, is designed to reveal and address gender inequalities in conservation as the assessment and progress monitoring is gender disaggregated. Day one of the SAGE assessment process involves different actor groups separately conducting the assessment from their perspective. Except where actors feel strongly that women are comfortable to voice their opinions in front of men (as with SAGE assessments in Greece), women always do the assessment separately from men and results often show substantial differences in opinion, triggering a discussion on how to reduce such differences.

Q19. Change expected

Detail the expected changes to both biodiversity and poverty reduction, and links between them, 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).

When talking about how people will benefit, please remember to give details of who will benefit, differences in benefits by gender or other layers of diversity within stakeholders, and the number of beneficiaries expected. The number of communities is insufficient detail – number of households should be the largest unit used.

The project aims to make a substantial contribution to the transformative change in biodiversity conservation approaches called for by IBPES through scaling up innovation in environmental governance. The project will show how this can be achieved through a bottom-up process that builds more equitable governance from the site level with enough scale of uptake to make a real difference from a national perspective.

Experience with SAGE in Zambia and the results from an evaluation of SAGE impact from 15 sites (11) provide solid evidence of improvements in governance from use of SAGE within 18 months. Most report improvement in mutual understanding and respect between actors. Some are also reporting specific outcomes such as stronger engagement of women and youth in decision making (Bolivia), improved FPIC process (Zambia) and information sharing on rights (Kenya).

Improved social outcomes (ie reduction in multi-dimensional poverty) and/or conservation outcomes are unlikely to be evident within 18 months. The project theory of change that such impacts will start to become evident towards the end of the project's four years. Regarding social outcomes, this assumption is supported by experience from our recently concluded Darwin-funded EEPAC project in Kenya and Uganda (round 24-4145) which identified a wide range of direct (e.g. increased income or access to assets) and indirect (e.g. protecting rights and voices in decision making) contributions to livelihoods of PA-adjacent communities. Although we were unable to do a household survey because of COVID-19, discussions with key informants indicated that our estimate of 600 households per site receiving direct contributions to their wellbeing was sound.

SHORT TERM IMPACT

By the end of four years, we expect at least 88 PCAs across the six countries to have initiated a programme of governance/equity assessment and action using SAGE. Of these, 22 demonstration sites and 22 scaling-up sites will have completed two years of their action phase. By this point we would expect to see evidence of indirect contribution to poverty reduction of an average of 2,000 women and 1,000 men per site (87,500 women and 43,750 men in total). We adopt this 2:1 ratio since experience suggests that actions to improve indirect benefits rightly tend to emphasise affirmative actions in favour of women. For direct benefits, we assume men and women will benefit equally with an average of 500 women and 500 men per site (24,500 men and 24,500 women across the whole project). In reality, there could be a large range from 2,500 or more in a densely populated area and/or large PCA with several active NGOs supporting actions, to 250 in a small PA with relatively low population density and few, if any, NGOs supporting actions to improve governance.

Assessing the conservation outcomes of improving PCA governance and equity is the primary objective of activity 3.1. While it is not realistic to expect change in ecological indicators such as abundance of key species within four years, we expect to see change in intermediate conservation outcomes, notably:

- Reduction in illegal resource harvesting with a target of at least a 20% reduction at 50% of the 44 sites that started in years one and two (indicator 0.5)
- Increase in hectares of habitat (PCAs) under sustainable management practices (indicator 0.6).

LONGER-TERM IMPACT

In terms of longer-term impact, we have estimated targets for December 2030, the date for achieving the 30x30 target. Post project, impact will be achieved both by further scaling up within the five target countries – assuming an additional four sites per year - and by similar initiatives being established in at least five more countries by April 2025, led by NGOs and/or government conservation agencies supported by major bilateral donors such the

German government, EU and USAID, who are now expressing substantial interest in SAGE. By December 2030, we expect the number of women experiencing indirect benefits (more influence over decision making) to have reached 150,000, and women and men experiencing direct benefits to have reached a total of 84,000.

However, the long-term impact post-2030 can be expected to be much greater than this, not only from further scaling up the use of SAGE-based assessment and action, but also, as demonstrated by the experience of the METT tool for management effectiveness, growing understanding of the importance of governance and equity in conservation and political and financial commitments to invest in this both at sites that are using SAGE and other sites that may not be using SAGE, ie across PCA systems as a whole. This project will be a global leader in this regard.

Q20. Pathway to change

Please outline your project's expected pathway to change. This should be an overview of the overall project logic and outline why and how you expect your Outputs to contribute towards your overall Outcome and, in the longer term, your expected Impact.

The project has a nested theory of change (ToC) with three levels: site, country and project. The site-level ToC assumes SAGE action plans are at least partially implemented resulting in improved governance/equity. This is well validated by a number of the 60 SAGEs conducted to date. Improved governance then brings about changes in management of the PCA and related activities (e.g. a benefit sharing scheme) that in turn lead to better social outcomes (increased and more fairly shared contributions to wellbeing) and better conservation outcomes. The former is very well validated but less so the pathway to better conservation, which is a knowledge generation priority of this project (activity 3.1).

The country-level ToC assumes that a fully supported SAGE process at four different PCAs (output 1) generates enough evidence of benefits to create, via the community of practice (output 2) and effective communication (output 3), substantial demand from other PCA sites that have the donor support to cover the costs, extending to a total of 15 other sites by the end of the project. We already see this form of scaling up in Kenya and Tanzania. To accelerate scaling up in country, output 3 includes applied research to identify enabling conditions for scaling up that could be encouraged by changes in policy of government and donors.

Beyond the five target countries we expect at least five other countries to start scaling up and strengthening SAGE-based action to improve governance/equity, encouraged by sharing learning and evidence from the project under output 3. There is already substantial scaling up of SAGE assessment. The key contribution of this project will be its contribution to boosting the action phase of SAGE in these other countries, supported by creating more enabling conditions at global level through influencing the policy of CBD and major donors.

Q21. Sustainable benefits and scaling potential

Q21a. How will the project reach a point where benefits can be sustained post-funding? How will the required knowledge and skills remain available to sustain the benefits? How will you ensure your data and evidence will be accessible to others?

After four years the project aims to reach, in each target country, a critical mass of SAGE uptake sufficient to drive further scaling up but also to sustain governance, conservation and social outcomes at sites where SAGE has been used without need for further financial support.

Therefore, project support for scaling up will be technical support only in years two and three and no support beyond the end of year three. From the start of year four, the project role will be limited to facilitating monitoring, evaluation and learning to enable improvement.





While further scaling up will not need project support, the national-level community of practice will benefit from ongoing support as a platform for peer-to-peer sharing of knowledge. In contrast to management effectiveness, governance is a relatively new topic in conservation, and much will be learnt over the next 10-15 years before reaching the maturity of management effectiveness practice.

Q21b. If your approach works, what potential is there for scaling the approach further? Refer to Scalable Approaches (Landscape, Replication, System Change, Capacitation) in the guidance. What might prevent scaling, and how could this be addressed?

From four PCAs/country in year one (six in Madagascar), SAGE use will increase by the same each year reaching at least 88 sites by March 2028 (landscape scaling and replication scaling). Through site-level support and the community of practice, the project will build technical capacity for governance assessment and action (capacitation scaling). Towards the end of the project, growing evidence of improvements in governance/equity and benefits for people and nature will be used to influence policy to foster enabling conditions for further scaling up (system change scaling).

Since the project will have reached no more than 20% of all PCAs in each target country by the end of year four, there is potential for further scaling up of impact, though this doesn't mean using SAGE at all PCAs as, at a point, similar types of PCAs can implement similar actions to improve governance without necessarily using SAGE at every site.

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

-  [IIED-SEG Annex 1 and references](#)
-  18/09/2023
-  17:14:59
-  pdf 279.68 KB

Section 8 - Risk Management

Q22. Risk Management

Please outline the 6 key risks to achievement of your Project Outcome and how these risks will be managed and mitigated, referring to the Risk Guidance. This should include at least one Fiduciary, one Safeguarding, and one Delivery Chain Risk.

Risk Description	Impact	Prob.	Gross Risk	Mitigation	Residual Risk
------------------	--------	-------	------------	------------	---------------

Fiduciary	Funds granted to IIED or sub-granted by IIED may be used for purposes that do not comply with the financial guidance of the Darwin Fund.	Major	Unlikely	Moderate	IIED has shared its organisational documents and financial reports as evidence of our financial responsibility. All IIED partners proposed in this project are known and will be contracted in accordance with our financial policy. There will be financial and activity monitoring throughout the project with an audit at project close.	Moderate
Safeguarding	Proposed action to address equity and governance issues at a protected and conserved area might restrict peoples' access to land or natural resources and impact upon their livelihoods, wellbeing and/or culture.	Possible	Moderate	Major	All actor groups will be included in action planning to address key governance and equity challenges. In this way, these actors will be able to highlight how actions might negatively impact on them and suggest other ideas to improve the situation.	Minor
Delivery Chain	Travel restrictions as a result of health outbreaks/epidemics/pandemics, political instability, natural disasters could prevent planned activities, delay the project and increase costs.	Possible	Moderate	Major	IIED is a predominantly remote-working organisation and has proven to be able to deliver and oversee the delivery of activities in this way. Travel and other restrictions relating to public health/safety in all countries of operation will be frequently monitored throughout the project with partners.	Major
Risk 4	Exchange rate fluctuation causing partners to receive less than expected funds and subsequently find it difficult to deliver workplans.	Possible	Moderate	Major	IIED has a Foreign Exchange policy to guide the management of grants. Budgets and contracts will be made in GBP and exchange rates monitored by the finance department, Project Manager and partners to minimise the impact of changes.	Moderate





Risk 5	Significant internal or external event leads to reputational damage with negative impact on relationships with funders and other stakeholders.	Possible	Moderate	Major	Existing strong reputation of IIED provides some defence; proactive communications through appropriate channels as damage limitation exercise; good crisis communications work when incident happens; identify ways of actively rebuilding IIED's reputation.	Minor
Risk 6	The use of assessment tools brings to the fore underlying conflict between groups of actors (eg communities vs government bodies), which could lead to open conflict (eg protest, damage to infrastructure, threats to individual's wellbeing).	Possible	Moderate	Major	Project partners will be required to use feasibility criteria (already established and tested) to assess the risk of conflict at a protected or conserved (PCA) area before beginning work. Where key risks are identified, feasibility criteria will not be met, and the PCA will not be included in the project	Moderate

Q23. Project sensitivities

Please indicate whether there are sensitivities associated with this project that need to be considered if details are published (detailed species location data that would increase threats, political sensitivities, prosecutions for illegal activities, security of staff etc.).

No

Please upload your Risk Register, with Delivery Chain Risk Map, here.


-  [11461 - Risk-Framework-IIED Governance and Equity - 2023](#)
-  15/09/2023
-  12:30:52
-  xlsx 110.68 KB


Section 9 - Workplan


Q24. Workplan

Provide a project workplan that shows the key milestones in project activities.

 [IIED-SEG workplan](#)

 18/09/2023

 15:25:49

 pdf 92.18 KB

Section 10 - Monitoring and Evaluation

Q25. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)

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

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

Darwin Initiative Extra Projects are required to commission an Independent Final Evaluation to report by the time that the project completes. The cost of this should be included in the project budget, and within the total project cost for M&E.

The logframe summarises the project M&E plan. This will be further elaborated into a more detailed M&E plan in the first three months of the project. Given the ambitious scaling-up targets and a theory of change and logframe that contain several critical assumptions, a crucial function of project M&E, in addition to monitoring progress, will be to monitor and review these assumptions and adapt project strategy if necessary. To support this, the project includes, in addition to normal M&E activities, important applied research on conservation and social outcomes and scaling up (activities 3.1 and 3.2).

Each country partner has at least 20% of a project officer on M&E supported by the IIED project manager for activity monitoring and financial monitoring (20%), the IIED Technical Support Officer for results monitoring (20%) backstopped by an IIED M&E expert (8%), and the project leader for compliance and context and risk monitoring (10%). Total 58%.

There will be two levels of M&E – at site and at country level led by the national partner and at international level led by IIED. The project will build capacity of national partners to perform their role and use M&E information for adaptive management.

Six of the outcome indicators (in green) are Darwin standard indicators including five core indicators (underlined).

For output indicators and outcome indicators 0.6-0.12, the M&E information will be relatively easy to collect or already available in reports produced for other purposes. Indicators 0.1-0.5 are more challenging. Monitoring indicator 0.1 (improvement in governance at site level) using outcome harvesting (12) is part of the SAGE process itself and the project will build capacity of site-level actors to collect and analyse this data.

Monitoring outcome indicators 0.2, 0.3 and 0.4 will use rapid household surveys conducted at two of the four demonstration sites early in year one (baseline) and mid-year four, plus focus groups for more in-depth discussions of key issues. To keep down the costs of the household surveys for both the project and the interviewees, we will use a rapid method that has recently been developed by IIED where around 100 men and 100 women can be interviewed by a team of 6-8 enumerators within 3-4 days, in interviews of around 15 minutes using the KOBO tools app on mobile phones.

Outcome indicator 0.5 (reduction in incidents of illegal activities within the PCA) is a proxy for conservation outcomes widely used where it is unlikely that there will be any measurable change in ecological indicators within the project lifetime. If PCA agencies are reluctant to release this data, we will use the outcome harvesting method where around six key informants per site will be interviewed on the topic of illegal activities to see if any trend has been observed, discuss the factors that may have contributed and determine the contribution of SAGE (if any).





All social M&E data will be disaggregated by gender, poverty status and ethnicity. For Darwin standard indicators disaggregation will follow the DI standard indicator guidance.

Independent Final Evaluation in GBP	██████████
Independent Final Evaluation (%)	█
Total project budget for M&E (£) (this may include Staff and Travel and Subsistence Costs)	████████████████████
Total project budget for M&E (%) (this may include Staff and Travel and Subsistence Costs)	█
Number of days planned for M&E	██████████

Section 11 - Logical Framework

Q26. Logical Framework (logframe)

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

-  [IIED-SEG logframe and ToC 2023 FINAL](#)
-  18/09/2023
-  17:19:36
-  pdf 551.97 KB

Impact:

Transformative change in PCA governance/equity at scale in at least ten countries contributing to better conservation and social outcomes, and systemic power shift towards Indigenous Peoples and local communities

Outcome:

At least 70 PCAs across five countries have improved governance/equity, at least 35 have benefits for people and nature, and greater emphasis on equitable governance in national- and global-level policy

Project Outputs

Output 1:

1. SAGE-based assessment and actions for more equitable PCA governance have been successfully implemented at a total of at least 44 sites

Output 2:

2. Increased capacity and motivation of site-level actors to plan, implement and evaluate actions to improve PCA governance and equity

Output 3:

3. Knowledge on equitable governance of PCAs co-created and communicated to policymakers and practitioners at all levels to accelerate scaling up and the quantity and quality of impact

Output 4:

No Response

Output 5:

No Response

Do you require more Output fields?

- Yes
 No

Activities

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

- 1.1. Provide training, technical and financial support for the SAGE preparation and assessment phases (steps 1.1-2.4) at four demonstration sites per country (six in Madagascar)
- 1.2. Provide training, technical support and limited financial support for the action phase of SAGE (steps 3.1-3.4) at four demonstration sites per country (six in Madagascar)
- 1.3. Provide training and technical support (but not financial support) for the use of SAGE (steps 1.1-3.4) at four additional sites (six in Madagascar)
- 1.4. Develop and test tools to improve SAGE, notably for action planning (step 3.2) and monitoring progress (step 3.4), and update the SAGE manual
- 1.5. Develop and deliver training on key governance and equity issues for actors at each site, e.g. respect for rights, participation in decision making, transparency/accountability and benefit sharing, grievance mechanisms, leadership
- 2.1. Facilitate a community of practice at national, regional or landscape level for peer-to-peer knowledge sharing and motivation, including thematic workshops, exchange visits, social media and other online knowledge sharing platforms and tools
- 2.2. Develop country-specific guides for addressing specific governance and equity issues of that country drawing on knowledge and learning emerging from the community of practice
- 2.3. Develop and promote innovative schemes to motivate site-level actors to improve governance and equity including showcasing success and linkage to IUCN Green List
- 2.4. Support a global scheme to promote and recognise excellence in improving PCA governance and equity, building on any existing schemes
- 3.1. Evaluate the conservation and social outcomes of using SAGE, and impact pathways, using outcome harvesting, process tracing and other relevant impact evaluation methods
- 3.2. Analyse processes of adoption of SAGE by sites additional to demonstration sites, including enabling

conditions and barriers, and apply this to accelerate uptake of governance assessment and action in each country


3.3. Generate and share at national, regional and global levels knowledge on improving PCA governance and equity at scale and pathways to conservation and social outcomes


Section 12 - Budget and Funding

Q27. Budget

Please complete the appropriate Excel spreadsheet, which provides the Budget for this application and ensure the Summary page is fully completed. Some of the questions earlier and below refer to the information in this spreadsheet.

 [IIED-SEG - Full Budget](#)

 18/09/2023

 17:28:49

 xlsx 96.44 KB

Q28. Alignment with other funding and activities

We expect projects to clearly demonstrate that they are additional and complementary to other activities and funding in the same geographic/thematic area or region.

Are you aware of any other organisations/projects carrying out or planning activities, or applying for funding for similar work in this geography or sector?

Yes

Please give details explaining similarities and differences, and explaining how your work will be additional, avoiding duplicating and conflicting activities and what attempts have been/will be made to co-operate with and share lessons learnt for mutual benefit.

This project builds on work from over the last eight years of IIED and partners in the development of the SAPA, GAPA and SAGE methodologies for assessing the social impacts, governance and equity of PCAs. This started with a project to develop governance assessment tools, supported by GIZ. This project developed the framework of equitable governance principles and themes, which forms the basis of the SAGE indicators/questions. Then there was a project funded by the Darwin Initiative (Round 23 #3843) that developed and tested the multi-stakeholder process as well as some of the governance indicators used by SAGE. Over the last three years, we have had a number of small- to medium-sized grants to support further development and scaling up of SAGE from UNDP/GEF, GIZ, IUCN and the EU BIOPAMA programme. Building on this foundation, this project is designed to both greatly scale up the use of SAGE and switch the emphasis of SAGE development and scaling up from the assessment itself (SAGE phases one and two) to taking action to improve PCA governance and equity (SAGE phase three).

Q29. Value for Money

Please demonstrate why your project is good value for money in terms of impact and cost-effectiveness of each pound spend (economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity). Why is it the best feasible project for the amount of money to be spent?

EFFICIENCY

Of the 12 main activities of this project, all but 2.4 and 3.3 are implemented by the national partners within the five target countries with IIED in a supporting role. These national partners are all national NGOs with relatively low operational costs, including Madagascar National Parks which is a non-State organisation with an NGO status.

In all five target countries, fieldwork is clustered in landscapes and project staff other than the project leader will be based in these landscapes thereby maximising engagement with fieldwork and minimising travel costs.

Working with six partners all doing similar activities (though in very different contexts generating different experiences and results) enables some economies of scale in terms of management of the project.

EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT

This project builds the foundation for a scaling-up process that begins during the project (reaching 88 PCAs) but will mainly take place post project. Of these 88 PCAs, we estimate 44 will have completed two years of action implementation by the end of the project, by which time benefits for people and PCA conservation should, we assume, start to be measurable.

Based on very crude conservative estimates of the number of households affected by PCAs (classically the number within 5km of the boundary), we arrive at 87,500 women and 43,750 men receiving an indirect contribution to wellbeing by the end of the project and 150,000 and 75,000 by December 2030. And in terms of direct contribution to wellbeing, 24,500 men and 24,500 women, and by the end of the project, and 42,000 respectively. This amounts to the number of beneficiaries increasing by at least 20% per year for the foreseeable future.

The ToC for this project is based on the actual experience with the somewhat similar METT tool for PA management effectiveness evaluation. METT was launched in 2002 and is now being used in 177 countries. For SAGE worldwide, we are assuming at least 1,000 sites by 2030. In Madagascar alone with over 4,000 PCAs the biggest conservation donor, KFW, is willing to fund scaling up to all 43 national parks.

More fundamentally, this project aims to be a leader of a global process of transformative change in PCA governance, just as METT has been for PCA management over the last 20 years with impact well beyond the specific sites that have used the METT tool as skills and evidence of the importance of management effectiveness spread across PCA systems and national and global policy increasing encouraged investment in PCA management effectiveness.

We are making the case that this is a unique project coming at a point in time where there is an unprecedented alignment of global conservation policy and funding in support of more equitable governance of all types of PCAs, and in particular approaches to PCA conservation that are genuinely community-led.

Q30. Capital items

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

Each national partner will be provided with laptops for each project funded staff member (max 2) and a printer. All these assets will be donated to the partners at the end of the project.

Section 13 - Safeguarding and Ethics

Q31. Safeguarding

All projects funded under the Biodiversity Challenge Funds must ensure proactive action is taken to promote the welfare and protect all individuals involved in the project (staff, implementing partners, the public and beneficiaries) from harm. In order to provide assurance of this, projects are required to have specific procedures and policies in place.

Please upload the following required policies:

- **Safeguarding Policy**: including a statement of commitment to safeguarding and a zero tolerance statement on bullying, harassment and sexual exploitation and abuse.
- **Whistleblowing Policy**: which details a clear process for dealing with concerns raised and protects whistle blowers from reprisals.
- **Code of Conduct**: which sets out clear expectations of behaviours – inside and outside the workplace – for all involved in the project and makes clear what will happen in the event of non-compliance or breach of these standards, including compliance with IASC 6 Principles.

If any of these policies are integrated into a broader policy document or handbook, please upload just the relevant or equivalent sub-sections to the above policies, with (unofficial) English translations where needed.

Please outline how (a) beneficiaries, the public, implementing partners, and staff are made aware of your safeguarding commitment and how to confidentially raise a concern, (b) safeguarding issues are investigated, recorded and what disciplinary procedures are in place when allegations and complaints are upheld, (c) you will ensure project partners uphold these policies.

If your approach is currently limited or in the early stages of development, please clearly set out your plans address this.

The project will have an inception workshop for key staff of all partners with session devoted to the concept of safeguards - partly as SAGE is itself a safeguard monitoring tool - and specifically the safeguard policies that apply to this project. Thereafter at all quarterly meetings of the Project Management Committee there will be a regular agenda item to check in on any safeguard issues. None of the data collection tools identify individuals

Q32. Ethics

Outline your approach to meeting the key principles of good ethical practice, as outlined in the guidance.

To ensure compliance with legal and ethical obligations in the UK and the five target countries, the project will be screened through IIED's research ethics and data protection review procedure under its policy on 'Integrity and Ethics in Research, Partnership and Policy Engagement'. This seeks to protect the health and safety of project staff; the rights, privacy and safety of informants and beneficiaries; and the credibility of research findings. To comply with data protection legislation, data will be anonymised. The project will not collect or commercially use any information collected through SAGE assessments. An ongoing free, prior and informed consent process will be conducted prior to the start of a SAGE process at a new PCA that is supported by the project, and all information collected by the assessment and subsequent progress monitoring will be communicated in summary form back to those who participated in the process and the people they represent. This is in fact a key element of the SAGE process that will help to institutionalise key ethical considerations.

Section 14 - British Embassy or High Commission Engagement

Q33. British embassy or high commission engagement

It is important for UK Government representatives to understand if UK funding might be spent in the project country/ies. Please indicate if you have contacted the relevant British embassy or high commission to discuss the project and attach details of any advice you have received from them.

Yes

Please attach evidence of request or advice if received.

No Response

Section 15 - Project Staff

Q34. Project staff

Please identify the core staff (identified in the budget), their role and what % of their time they will be working on the project.

Name (First name, Surname)	Role	% time on project	1 page CV or job description attached?
Phil Franks	Project Leader	30	Checked
Anita Sohal	Project Manager	50	Checked
TBC	Technical Support and Applied Research Officer	100	Checked
TBC	Communications officer	30	Checked

Do you require more fields?


Yes


Name (First name, Surname)	Role	% time on project	1 page CV or job description attached?
Teresa Morales	SAGE specialist ACEAA	100	Checked
Vincent Oluoch	Project Coordinator KWCA	40	Checked
Liliane Parany	Project Coordinator MNP	100	Checked
Pradeep Budhathoky	Project Coordinator RECOFTC Nepal	40	Checked
Daudet Andriafidison	Community conservation programme manager	15	Checked
Sam Shaba	Programmes manager	70	Checked
<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>	0	Unchecked

No Response	No Response	0	Unchecked
-------------	-------------	---	-----------

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

 [IIED-SEG CVs and JDs](#)

 18/09/2023

 17:38:09

 pdf 604.91 KB

Have you attached all project staff CVs?

Yes

Section 16 - Project Partners

Q35. Project Partners

Please list all the Project Partners (including the Lead Partner who will administer the grant and coordinate delivery of the project), clearly setting out their roles and responsibilities in the project including the extent of their engagement so far.

Lead partner name: International Institute for Environment and Development

Website address: <https://www.iied.org>

Why is this organisation the Lead Partner, and what value to they bring to the project?

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

IIED has a long history of applied research on natural resource governance. In the last 8 years this research has increasingly focused on the governance of protected and conserved areas (PCAs), and the related issue of equity, including the development of a framework of principles of equitable governance that was endorsed by CBD parties at COP14. Based on this set of principles IIED has developed the Site Assessment of Governance and Equity (SAGE) tool which the key actors of a PCA use to assess governance/equity and plan and implement actions to improve. This SAGE tool has now been used by 45 PCAs across 22 countries and with the success of this tool IIED has become recognised as a global leader on equitable governance of PCAs. With this profile IIED has not only the technical competence to lead this project but also strong convening and networking capability with both large international agencies and an increasing number of national NGOs that have been involved in development and testing of SAGE. IIED will be responsible for project leadership, coordination, monitoring & evaluation and training and mentoring of the eight national partners. In addition IIED will lead development of applied research activities to improve SAGE.

International/In-country Partner International

Allocated budget (proportion or value):



Represented on the Project Board (or other management structure) Yes

Have you included a Letter of Support from the Lead Partner? Yes

Do you have partners involved in the Project?

Yes

1. Partner Name: Bolivian Association for Research and Conservation of Andean-Amazonian Ecosystems (ACEAA)

Website address: www.conservacionamazonica.org.bo

What value does this Partner bring to the project?
(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

ACEAA is a Bolivian NGO that promotes a thriving Amazon, its holistic approach protects wild places, empowers people and innovates through science and technology. This living laboratory provides the conservation results, lessons learned, and tools that can be built out across the wider Amazon. ACEAA has extensive experience in protected areas and indigenous territories management in the Amazon region of the country. For this, ACEAA will be responsible for implementing the project in Bolivia, contributing to all three proposed outputs: SAGE implementation, including evaluation and monitoring actions, in five demonstration sites in Bolivia; Capacity building and continuous learning for SAGE implementation in Bolivia; and, contribution of SAGE to social and conservation outcomes to be communicated to policy makers, opinion leaders in conservation practice and donor agencies in Bolivia. ACEAA staff is familiar with all proposed areas in this project and has extensive experience to promoting planning processes and strengthening governance in protected areas and indigenous territories. Between 2020 and 2022, ACEAA supported IIED to implement SAGE into indigenous territories and protected areas, helping to complement the tool. ACEAA has supported SAGE at four sites to date.

International/In-country Partner	<input checked="" type="radio"/> In-country
Allocated budget:	██████████
Represented on the Project Board (or other management structure)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes
Have you included a Letter of Support from this partner?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes

2. Partner Name:	Honeyguide Foundation
Website address:	https://www.honeyguide.org

What value does this Partner bring to the project?
(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

Honeyguide has over 10 years experience working with Community Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) in Tanzania. A large part of Honeyguide’s work in partnership with WMAs is focused on strengthening WMA governance and management through training frameworks. Honeyguide is responsible for managing all SEGPA project activities in Tanzania including the planning, facilitation of the SAGE and the post-SAGE analysis, and outcomes. Honeyguide has conducted 7 SAGE in Tanzania thus far, utilizing SAGE as a tool for their work in WMAs, and is a member of the iied SAGE Development Committee. Honeyguide has invested in the governance strengthening programs team with full-time staff and consultants in place.

International/In-country Partner	<input checked="" type="radio"/> In-country
---	---

Allocated budget: ██████████

Represented on the Project Board (or other management structure) Yes

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

3. Partner Name: Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association (KWCA)

Website address: <http://www.kwcakenya.com>

What value does this Partner bring to the project?
(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

KWCA is the national representative body and voice for over 160 conservancies in Kenya working to secure wildlife space through an institutional approach that improve the governance and management of these conservancies reconciling the needs of people and wildlife. KWCA works and supports 12 landscape level conservancy associations to promote coordination, enhance learning, information exchange, harmonize conservancy practices and impact for conservancies to thrive. Our unique role is to convene, connect, inform and represent. Through the Scaling up Equitable Governance of Protected and Conserved Areas (SEG) project, KWCA will work with five of its landscape level conservancy associations; Northern Rangelands Trust, Laikipia Conservancies Association, Maasai Mara Wildlife Conservancies Association, Amboseli Ecosystem Trust and Taita Taveta Wildlife Conservancies Association to coordinate the SAGE assessment and support learning processes at the national and landscape levels.

International/In-country Partner In-country

Allocated budget: ██████████

Represented on the Project Board (or other management structure) Yes

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

4. Partner Name: Madagascar National Parks

Website address: www.parcs-madagascar.com

What value does this Partner bring to the project?

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

MNP is a non-state organisation registered in Madagascar as an NGO. All protected areas in Madagascar are co-managed by a lead management agency working in partnership with the other key stakeholders at site-level, with a shared governance model that should engage all key stakeholders in decision-making and other key aspects of governance. Madagascar National Parks manages a network of 43 protected areas and has the most experience in protected area management at the national level, with 30 years of experience to its credit. It is a key partner in the project. All the parks in the network are already established and have permanent management teams in site, and plan to use SAGE over the next 5 years. MNP and its donors, including KFW (the largest) are keen to support the kind of transformative change at scale in PA governance and equity that this project would (help to) spearhead. MNP is also in the process of establishing a new strategic plan for five or ten years and the project's achievements will provide significant input to the co-management part of this strategic plan. MNP also has funding available for the update of the Environmental and Social Management Plan links to this project.

International/In-country Partner

In-country

Allocated budget:

██████████

Represented on the Project Board (or other management structure)

Yes

Have you included a Letter of Support from this partner?

Yes

5. Partner Name:

Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC)

Website address:


www.recoftc.org

What value does this Partner bring to the project?

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

RECOFTC is the project partner in Nepal. RECOFTC is an international not-for-profit organization working towards a future where people live equitably and sustainably in and beside healthy, resilient forests. For more than 30 years, RECOFTC has supported local communities to secure their land and resource rights, stop deforestation, find alternative livelihoods and foster gender equity, building trusting relationships with partners at all levels. RECOFTC will contribute to implement the following key activities of the project:

Deliver training on key governance issues at each demonstration site Facilitate a “community or practice” at landscape or national levels for peer-to-peer knowledge and experience sharing to improve PCA governance and equity and motivate scaling up. Evaluate the conservation and social outcomes of SAGE and impact pathways based on information from outcome harvesting and other impact evaluation methods. Analyse processes of adoption of SAGE by sites additional to the 4-6 demonstration sites, including enabling conditions and barriers, to improve scaling up strategies, RECOFTC's national team in Nepal will lead the project implementation in the identified project sites. RECOFTC main office team, based in Bangkok, will provide technical and coordination backstopping.

International/In-country Partner	<input checked="" type="radio"/> In-country
Allocated budget:	
Represented on the Project Board (or other management structure)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes
Have you included a Letter of Support from this partner?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes

6. Partner Name:	Madagasikara Voakajy
Website address:	www.madagasikara-voakajy.org

What value does this Partner bring to the project?

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

Madagasikara Voakajy (MV) is a Malagasy association created in 2005 to consolidate the investment in capacity building through providing career opportunities for Malagasy biologists to become leaders in conservation. MV's mission is to promote the conservation and sustainable use of Madagascar's endemic and threatened species within their natural habitats, by mitigating key threats through applied research and targeted actions, in partnership with all key stakeholders. MV led the creation and the management of seven Protected Areas (PA) in Alaotra Mangoro Region and the creation of a new PA (Bobaomby) in DIANA Region. These PA are critical habitats for endemic and threatened species, including lemurs, bats, reptiles and amphibians. To date, we have not adopted a standard tool for assessing governance and equity and using SAGE tools to assess governance of these PA is one way to ensure successful conservation outcomes. We will then expand the SAGE tool to the Menabe region where we work with three community-based organisations to promote sustainable use of natural resources. Being a small NGO, MV has half the number of sites of other partners and hence roughly half the budget.

International/In-country Partner

- International
 In-country

Allocated budget:



Represented on the Project Board (or other management structure)

Yes

Have you included a Letter of Support from this partner?

Yes

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

No Response

Please provide a **combined PDF** of all letters of support.

[IIED - SEG supporting letters](#)

18/09/2023

16:58:35

pdf 3.01 MB

Section 17 - Lead Partner Capability and Capacity

Q36. Lead Partner Capability and Capacity

Has your organisation been awarded Biodiversity Challenge Funds (Darwin Initiative, Darwin Plus or Illegal Wildlife Trade Challenge Fund) funding before (for the purposes of this question, being a partner does not count)?

Yes

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

Reference No	Project Leader	Title
25-006	Phil Franks	Enhancing equity and effectiveness of protected area conservation
25-015	Dilys Roe	Why Eat Wild Meat? Developing effective alternatives to bushmeat consumption
28-017	Krystyna Swiderska	Establishing a biocultural heritage territory to protect Kenya's Kaya Forests
DIR29IN/1114	Phil Franks	A new tool for advancing locally led conservation
<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>
<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>	<i>No Response</i>

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

Yes

Section 18 - Certification

Q37. Certification

If this section is incomplete the entire application will be rejected.

Please note if you do not upload the relevant materials below your application may be made ineligible.

On behalf of the

Company

of

IIED

I apply for a grant of

£4,131,391.00





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

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

- I have enclosed CVs for key project personnel, cover letter, letters of support, a budget, risk register (inclusive of delivery chain risk map), logframe, theory of change Safeguarding and associated policies, and project workplan (uploaded at appropriate points in the application).

- Our last two sets of signed audited/independently verified accounts and annual report (covering three years) are also enclosed.

Checked



Name	Phil Franks
Position in the organisation	Principal Researcher
Signature (please upload e-signature)	 PES2  18/09/2023  17:07:07  jpg 32.61 KB
Date	18 September 2023

Please attach the requested signed audited/independently examined accounts.

 Trustees Report & Accounts 21-22  07/09/2023  16:39:10  pdf 911.8 KB	 Trustees Report & Accounts 20-21 (4)  07/09/2023  16:36:23  pdf 324.61 KB
--	---

Please upload the Lead Partner's Safeguarding Policy, Whistleblowing Policy and Code of Conduct as a PDF

 Code of Conduct  14/09/2023  13:24:24  pdf 147.28 KB	 Whistleblowing Policy  14/09/2023  13:24:19  pdf 413.15 KB
--	--

 Safeguarding Policy  07/09/2023  16:34:37  pdf 124.27 KB
--

Section 19 - Submission Checklist

Checklist for submission

	Check
I have read the Guidance, including the "Darwin Initiative Guidance", "Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Guidance", "Standard Indicator Guidance", "Risk Guidance", and "Finance Guidance".	Checked
I have read, and can meet, the current Terms and Conditions for this fund.	Checked
I have provided actual start and end dates for the project.	Checked
I have provided my budget based on UK government financial years i.e. 1 April – 31 March and in GBP.	Checked

I have checked that our budget is complete, correctly adds up and I have included the correct final total at the start of the application.	Checked
The application been signed by a suitably authorised individual (clear electronic or scanned signatures are acceptable).	Checked
I have attached the below documents to my application:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a cover letter from the Lead Partner. 	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> my risk register, including delivery chain risk map, as an Excel file using the template provided 	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> my completed logframe as a PDF using the template provided and using "Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Guidance" and "Standard Indicator Guidance". 	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> my 1 page Theory of Change as a PDF which includes the key elements listed in the guidance 	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> my budget (which meets the requirements above) using the template provided. 	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a signed copy of the last 2 annual report and accounts (covering three years) for the Lead Partner, or provided an explanation if not. 	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> my completed workplan as a PDF using the template provided. 	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a copy of the Lead Partner's Safeguarding Policy, Whistleblowing Policy and Code of Conduct (Question 31). 	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 page CV or job description for all the Project Staff identified at Question 34, including the Project Leader, or provided an explanation of why not, combined into a single PDF. 	Checked
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a letter of support from the Lead Partner and partner(s) identified at Question 35, or an explanation of why not, as a single PDF. 	Checked
I have been in contact with the FCDO in the project country(ies) and have included any evidence of this. If not, I have provided an explanation of why not.	Checked
My additional supporting evidence is in line with the requested evidence, amounts to a maximum of 5 sides of A4, and is combined as a single PDF.	Checked
(If copying and pasting into Flexi-Grant) I have checked that all my responses have been successfully copied into the online application form.	Checked
I have checked the Darwin Initiative website immediately prior to submission to ensure there are no late updates.	Checked
I have read and understood the Privacy Notice on the Darwin Initiative website.	Checked

We would like to keep in touch!

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

Checked

Data protection and use of personal data

Information supplied in the application form, including personal data, will be used by Defra as set out in the **Privacy Notice**, available from the [Forms and Guidance Portal](#).

This **Privacy Notice must be provided to all individuals** whose personal data is supplied in the application form. Some information may be used when publicising the Darwin Initiative including project details (usually title, lead partner, project leader, location, and total grant value).

Project Title: Scaling up equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (SEG)

	Activity	No. of months	Year 1 (24/25)				Year 2 (25/26)				Year 3 (26/27)				Year 4 (27/28)			
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Output 1																		
1.1	Provide training, technical and financial support for the SAGE preparation and assessment phases (steps 1.1-2.4) at four demonstration sites per country (six in Madagascar)	12																
1.2	Provide training, technical support and limited financial support for the action phase of SAGE (steps 3.1-3.4) at four demonstration sites per country (six in Madagascar)	36																
1.3	Provide training and technical support (but not financial support) for the use of SAGE (steps 1.1-3.4) at four additional sites (six in Madagascar)	39																
1.4	Develop and test tools to improve SAGE, notably for action planning (step 3.2) and monitoring progress (step 3.4), and update the SAGE manual	21																
1.5	Develop and deliver training on key governance and equity issues for actors at each site, e.g. respect for rights, participation in decision making, transparency/accountability and benefit sharing, grievance mechanisms, leadership	18																
Output 2																		
2.1	Facilitate a community of practice at national, regional or landscape level for peer-to-peer knowledge sharing and motivation, including thematic workshops, exchange visits, social media and other	39																

Project Title: Scaling up equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (SEG)

	Activity	No. of months	Year 1 (24/25)				Year 2 (25/26)				Year 3 (26/27)				Year 4 (27/28)			
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
	online knowledge sharing platforms and tools																	
2.2	Develop country-specific guides for addressing specific governance and equity issues of that country drawing on knowledge and learning emerging from the community of practice	36																
2.3	Develop and promote innovative schemes to motivate site-level actors to improve governance and equity including showcasing success and linkage to IUCN Green List	36																
2.4	Support a global scheme to promote and recognise excellence in improving PCA governance and equity, building on any existing schemes	39																
Output 3																		
3.1	Evaluate the conservation and social outcomes of using SAGE, and impact pathways, using outcome harvesting, process tracing and other relevant impact evaluation methods	30																
3.2	Analyse processes of adoption of SAGE by sites additional to demonstration sites, including enabling conditions and barriers, and apply this to accelerate uptake of governance assessment and action in each country	42																
3.3	Generate and share at national, regional and global levels knowledge on improving PCA governance and equity at scale and pathways to conservation and social outcomes	36																

Project Title: Scaling up equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (SEG)

Project Summary	SMART Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Impact: Transformative change in PCA governance/equity at scale in at least ten countries contributing to better conservation and social outcomes, and systemic power shift towards Indigenous Peoples and local communities</p>			
<p>Outcome: At least 70 PCAs across five countries have improved governance/equity, at least 35 have benefits for people and nature, and greater emphasis on equitable governance in national- and global-level policy</p>	<p>0.1 Number of PCAs with improved governance/equity - By March '26 at least 30 - By March '28 at least 70</p> <p>0.2 <u>Number of people with increased participation in local communities / local management organisations (DI-B05) = an indirect contribution to IPLC well-being:</u> <u>Target: 87,500 IPLC women and 87,500 men having more influence over PCA-related decision-making by end of project</u></p> <p>0.3 Number of households reporting improved livelihoods, disaggregated by household well-being status and ethnicity (DI-D16) = a direct contribution to well-being of IPLCs Target: 24,500 IPLC women and 24,500 men benefit from more effective mitigation of PCA-related negative social impacts or more equitable sharing of PCA-related benefits by end of project</p> <p>0.4 <u>Number of IPLC (people) with strengthened (recognised/clarified) tenure and/or rights (DI-B06)</u></p>	<p>0.1 Key informant interviews and outcome harvesting that are conducted by site-level actors as part of the SAGE process itself. Note: outcome harvesting retrospectively creates a baseline.</p> <p>0.2 <u>Rapid household survey conducted in two demonstration sites early in year one (creating the baseline) and three years later in mid-year four., plus focus group discussions.</u></p> <p>0.3 Household survey as for 0.2</p> <p>0.4 Household survey as for 0.2, plus key informant interviews with PCA managers and other relevant actors</p>	<p>Similar processes of scaling up SAGE-based assessment and action take place in at least 5 other countries by end of project and many more thereafter.</p> <p>CBD parties support strong equitable governance provisions in future decisions on implementation of target 3/30*30 target</p> <p>Usage of SAGE continues to be an indicator in the monitoring plan of the Global Biodiversity Framework.</p>

Project Title: Scaling up equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (SEG)

	<p>0.5 At least a 20% reduction in incidents of illegal activities at 50% of the 44 sites that started in years one and two</p> <p>0.6 <u>Increase in hectares of habitat (in this case PCAs) under sustainable management practices (DI-D01).</u></p> <p>0.7 National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans of at least 3 countries include measures for more equitable PCA governance</p> <p>0.8 GBF monitoring framework for target three has an indicator for equitable governance strongly influenced by this project's contribution to IIEDs advocacy work on the GBF.</p> <p>0.9 By March 2028, at least 50 PCAs expressing interest in using SAGE in addition to the 88 that will have started using it.</p> <p>0.10 Funding for SAGE assessment and action in each country from sources other than Darwin</p> <p>0.11 <u>Number of people from key national and local stakeholders completing structured and relevant training (DI-A01)</u></p> <p>0.12 <u>Number of local/national organisations with improved capability and capacity as a result of project (DI-A03)</u></p>	<p>0.5 a) Review PCA law enforcement records for the site in year 1 (baseline) and year 4, and b) outcome harvesting on a 20% sample of sites which retrospectively creates a baseline.</p> <p>0.6 <u>For each site review PCA management records and analyse remote sensing data for a time just before SAGE was started (baseline) and in the last 6 months of the project.</u></p> <p>0.7 Review of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans of each country created or modified after the start of the project</p> <p>0.8 Review of decisions and guidance approved by CBD Parties from year 2 of the project</p> <p>0.9 Review email of partners to identify organisations interested in using SAGE where they work</p> <p>0.10 Key informant interviews in years 2 and 4 to identify funding that has been secured for SAGE in addition to that of the project.</p> <p>0.11 <u>Reports by project staff from every training event supported by the project during project lifetime</u></p> <p>0.12 <u>Interviews with key informants from every site six months after an assessment has been done</u></p>	
<p>Outputs:</p>	<p>1.1 By month 48, all 3 phases of SAGE (preparation, assess</p>	<p>Note that baseline level is zero for all output level indicators unless indicated otherwise.</p>	<p>For the scaling up of SAGE to new PCA sites in years two and three the project will provide capacity building</p>

Project Title: Scaling up equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (SEG)

<p>1. SAGE-based assessment and actions for more equitable PCA governance have been successfully implemented at a total of at least 44 sites</p>	<p>ment, taking action) successfully implemented in at least 44 sites</p> <p>1.2 By month 24, other agencies at 22 sites across five countries have started a SAGE process that they are themselves funding</p> <p>1.3 By month 24, at least 4 people per country certified by IIED as having knowledge and skills to lead all three phases of SAGE - preparation, assessment, action</p> <p>1.4 A new edition of SAGE manual by month 24</p>	<p>1.1 Review assessment reports, actions plans and progress reports from each site</p> <p>1.2 Key informant interviews with actors receiving technical support</p> <p>1.3 Review IIED's SAGE facilitators database for facilitators in the projects five countries.</p> <p>1.4 Review SAGE manual and download data for the manual</p>	<p>and technical support without charge but other agencies working at these sites will cover the field costs of all three phases of SAGE</p> <p>Scaling up to new PCA sites in year four will take place without the project providing any financial, capacity building or other technical support.</p> <p>Changes in NBSAP and /or other national policy enable SAGE scaling up and better conservation and social outcomes</p>
<p>2. Increased capacity and motivation of site-level actors to plan, implement and evaluate actions to improve PCA governance and equity</p>	<p>2.1. In each country, 10 men and 10 women engaged in peer-to-peer knowledge sharing by end year 1, and 25 + 25 by end of year 3</p> <p>2.2. At least 400 peer-to-peer posts in each country on social media and other learning platforms on improving PCA governance/</p> <p>2.3. In each country at least ten requests by actors from other PCAs and national level to visit PCAs where SAGE is used</p> <p>2.4. Four guides per country for improving PCA governance and equity on four specific themes</p>	<p>2.1. Reporting of knowledge sharing activities in project progress reports</p> <p>2.2. Survey of participants in PCA governance and equity community of practice</p> <p>2.3. Project reports</p> <p>2.4. Review the guides and download data</p>	<p>Existing national policy related to PCAs is not changed in a way that adversely affects the project.</p> <p>Influential conservation organisations in each country encourage the use of SAGE</p> <p>Knowledge and evidence generated by this project is used by IIEDs Conservation, Communities and Equity programme, and global partners – notably the Human Rights and Biodiversity Working Group, and IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas – to strengthen global level policy on equitable governance in the area-based conservation (ie PCAs)</p>
<p>3. Knowledge on equitable governance of PCAs co-created and communicated to policymakers and practitioners at all levels to accelerate scaling up</p>	<p>3.1. Number of other publications produced by country partners and IIED (DI-C19)</p> <p>3.2. Country partners' publications for a national audience on impact of SAGE on PCA governance, equity, social and</p>	<p>3.1. Review publications and their download data</p> <p>3.2. As for 3.1</p>	

Project Title: Scaling up equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (SEG)

<p>and the quantity and quality of impact</p>	<p>conservation outcomes, and policy recommendations</p> <p>3.3. Presentations of project results and experience at relevant national, regional and global events and audience reaction</p> <p>3.4. IIED-led publications for regional and global audiences including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IIED working paper on scaling up SAGE - IIED research report on conservation and social outcomes of improving equity - Four IIED policy briefings - Peer-reviewed journal paper <p>3.5. Reference to SAGE in submissions to CBD and CBD decisions, and publications of major international agencies (e.g. IUCN, UNEP, GEF)</p>	<p>3.3. Review presentations, meeting reports and interviews of participants</p> <p>3.4. Review the publications and their download data</p> <p>3.5. Review relevant documents</p>	
---	--	--	--

Project Title: Scaling up equitable governance of protected and conserved areas (SEG)

Activities

- 1.1. Provide training, technical and financial support for the SAGE preparation and assessment phases (steps 1.1-2.4) at four demonstration sites per country (six in Madagascar)
- 1.2. Provide training, technical support and limited financial support for the action phase of SAGE (steps 3.1-3.4) at four demonstration sites per country (six in Madagascar)
- 1.3. Provide training and technical support (but not financial support) for the use of SAGE (steps 1.1-3.4) at four additional sites (six in Madagascar)
- 1.4. Develop and test tools to improve SAGE, notably for action planning (step 3.2) and monitoring progress (step 3.4), and update the SAGE manual
- 1.5. Develop and deliver training on key governance and equity issues for actors at each site, e.g. respect for rights, participation in decision making, transparency/accountability and benefit sharing, grievance mechanisms, leadership
- 2.1. Facilitate a community of practice at national, regional or landscape level for peer-to-peer knowledge sharing and motivation, including thematic workshops, exchange visits, social media and other online knowledge sharing platforms and tools
- 2.2. Develop country-specific guides for addressing specific governance and equity issues of that country drawing on knowledge and learning emerging from the community of practice
- 2.3. Develop and promote innovative schemes to motivate site-level actors to improve governance and equity including showcasing success and linkage to IUCN Green List
- 2.4. Support a global scheme to promote and recognise excellence in improving PCA governance and equity, building on any existing schemes
- 3.1. Evaluate the conservation and social outcomes of using SAGE, and impact pathways, using outcome harvesting, process tracing and other relevant impact evaluation methods
- 3.2. Analyse processes of adoption of SAGE by sites additional to demonstration sites, including enabling conditions and barriers, and apply this to accelerate uptake of governance assessment and action in each country
- 3.3. Generate and share at national, regional and global levels knowledge on improving PCA governance and equity at scale and pathways to conservation and social outcomes