
DIR30IN\1073

Applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict

Conflicts over the management of wildlife, often referred to as “human-wildlife conflict”, continue to be a growing concern for human wellbeing and biodiversity conservation. The Global Biodiversity Framework and conservation experts have highlighted the need for rights-based approaches to manage and resolve these conflicts. However, what this looks like in practice remains unclear. This project will consider what it means to apply a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict, producing international guidance as well as an adaptable site-level tool.

DIR30IN\1073

Applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict

Section 1 - Contact Details

PRIMARY APPLICANT DETAILS

Name Ruth
Surname Pinto
Organisation International Institute for Environment and Development
Tel (Mobile) [REDACTED]
Email (Work) [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

GMS ORGANISATION

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


Section 2 - Project Summary, Ecosystems, Approaches and Threats


Q3. Title


Applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict

Please attach a cover letter as a PDF document.

 [IIED-cover-letter Applying-HRBA-to-HWC](#)

 23/10/2023

 21:20:46

 pdf 116.59 KB

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

No

Q5. Key Ecosystems, Approaches and Threats

Please 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

Polar-alpine

Biome 3

No Response

Conservation Action 1

Land / Water Management

Conservation Action 2

Legal & Policy Frameworks

Conservation Action 3

No Response

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. Please note that if you are successful, this wording may be used by Defra in communications e.g. as a short description of the project on the website.

Conflicts over the management of wildlife, often referred to as “human-wildlife conflict”, continue to be a growing concern for human wellbeing and biodiversity conservation. The Global Biodiversity Framework and conservation experts have highlighted the need for rights-based approaches to manage and resolve these conflicts. However, what this looks like in practice remains unclear. This project will consider what it means to

apply a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict, producing international guidance as well as an adaptable site-level tool.

Section 3 - Dates & Budget Summary

Q7. Country(ies)

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

Country 1	India	Country 2	Indonesia
Country 3	No Response	Country 4	No Response

Do you require more fields?

No

Q8. Project dates

Start date:	End date:	Duration (e.g. 1 year, 8 months):
01 April 2024	31 March 2026	2 years

Q9. Budget Summary

Darwin Funding Request	2024/25	2025/26	Total request
(Apr - Mar) £	£104,543.00	£94,697.00	199,240.00

Q10. Do you have proposed 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 fund the project if you don't manage to secure this?

£ [REDACTED] of matched funding is currently unconfirmed. This amount is solely to cover IIED staff costs and associated overheads. We are unable to confirm this matched funding at this stage due to IIED's internal frame funding processes, which restrict frame funding applications to the financial year in which the funds will be

spent. We have discussed this internally at IIED and feel confident that these funds will be secured at the start of the next two financial years.

All other matched 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 - Darwin Objectives and Conventions

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 (references can be listed in your additional attached PDF document).

Conflicts over the management of wildlife, often referred to as “human-wildlife conflict”, continue to be a growing concern for human wellbeing and biodiversity conservation (Abrahms et al. 2023, IUCN 2023). Wildlife can pose direct and indirect threats to people’s lives, livelihoods, and wellbeing. The impacts they have on livelihoods and wellbeing can often keep people in situations of multi-dimensional poverty. People who reside close to or within area-based conservation interventions are rarely involved in decision-making related to the intervention, often resulting in them feeling alienated from conservation action. Negative social impacts from conservation can therefore amplify social conflicts between those asserting conservation interests and those negatively impacted by wildlife and efforts to conserve them. At times, these conflicts can also result in the violation of people’s human rights (eg the right to a safe and healthy environment, right to food, right to life). Furthermore, these conflicts can have a negative effect on conservation efforts, sometimes resulting in biodiversity or species loss (IUCN 2023).

Experts in conservation, health and sustainable development have highlighted the need for rights-based approaches and multi-stakeholder dialogue interventions to manage and resolve these conflicts (eg Garnier et al. 2020, Gross et al. 2021, IUCN 2023). As outlined by Newing and Perram (2019), advancing a human rights-based approach to conservation should involve ensuring conservation actions are morally responsible and compatible with international law alongside building trust and common interests between stakeholders while also engaging in honest dialogue about any conflicts of interest. A rights-based approach requires human rights principles to guide conservation action and focus on developing the capacities of ‘duty-bearers’ to meet their obligations, and rightsholders to claim their rights. In a conservation context, ‘duty-bearers’ can include state as well as non-state actors, including conservation organisations and their donors, and private businesses and their investors (Jonas et al. 2014, Jonas et al. 2016).

The importance of a human rights-based approach to conservation has been highlighted in the Global Biodiversity Framework (CBD 2022). Additionally, the need for practical guidance and tools on how to apply a human rights-based approach to conservation has also been voiced by those most affected by human-wildlife conflict – Indigenous Peoples and local communities – at the most recent CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice meeting. In response to interest from both rightsholders and potential duty-bearers in conservation, this project will explore what it means to apply a rights-based approach to human-

wildlife conflict, producing generalisable international guidance as well as an adaptable site-level multi-stakeholder tool. At the moment, no such guidance or tool specific to human-wildlife conflict exists. The project will also test the tool in different contexts with varying levels of conflict and diverse potential duty-bearers. The overall aim of the project is to provide the international conservation community with practical ways to manage conflicts over wildlife more effectively while respecting the rights and duties of different stakeholders. The ultimate goal of such an approach is to reduce conflicts and deliver increased benefits for people and nature.

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)
- 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, NAPs etc.) and in turn international biodiversity and development conventions, treaties and agreements that the country is a signatory of.

We anticipate this project making a significant contribution to the CBD Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) and in turn NBSAPs by illustrating in practical terms what it means to apply a rights-based approach to one of the most important negative social impacts of conservation. We will achieve this through engagement with 1) indicator development for Target 4 and 2) the Human Rights and Biodiversity Working Group which aims to advance a human rights-based approach in implementation of the GBF.

Target 4 states that countries must “ensure urgent management actions to...effectively manage human-wildlife interactions to minimize human-wildlife conflict for coexistence” The development of an indicator for this element of the target is being led by the IUCN SSC Human Wildlife Conflict and Coexistence Specialist Group. This project includes members of the Specialist Group and others have been invited to apply to join, in particular because of the activities proposed in this project. The activities of this project, as well as the guidance and tool it develops, will inform and be informed by participation in this working group.

There is currently no guidance or tool for managing human-wildlife conflict using a rights-based approach, which is integral to the implementation of the GBF. By the end of this project, we will have clear guidance and proof of concept for such a tool. The guidance on which the tool is based, will enable national and international policy-makers to better understand what the application of a rights-based approach can look like and how such conflicts can be better managed through international guidance and an adaptable site-level tool. At the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice meeting last week, representatives of Indigenous Peoples and local communities also requested more guidance and tools on human rights-based approaches – this project will provide exactly this.

Section 5 - Method, Innovation, Capability & Capacity

Q15. 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 the **main activities** will be and where these will take place.
- how you will **manage the work** (governance, roles and responsibilities, project management tools, risks etc.).

All project partners have been involved in initiatives on conflicts over wildlife and/or rights-based approaches. These include work on human rights standards in conservation (eg Jonas et al. 2014, Jonas et al. 2016), developing multi-stakeholder tools (eg SAPA, SAGE), designing and implementing human-wildlife conflict mitigation projects and involvement in the IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict and Coexistence Specialist Group.

Drawing on learnings from these initiatives, this project will consider what it means to apply a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict. The outcome will be proof of concept for applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict through the development of international guidance and a site-level adaptable tool.

Project outputs:

1. Guidance on applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict developed and shared with key stakeholders

This guidance will be aimed at enabling more effective management of human-wildlife conflicts and improving accountability in instances involving human rights violations. We will review literature and consult experts on relevant laws, conventions and approaches to conflicts over wildlife to understand when cases of human-wildlife conflict might involve rights violations, and how to identify rightsholders, duty-bearers (eg, government agencies, NGOs, businesses, donors and investors) and their responsibilities. We will conduct audience mapping to identify opportunities and methods to effectively advocate for integration of the guidance into existing international and institutional frameworks and standards.

2. A novel and adaptable tool to assess human-wildlife conflict from a rights perspective is developed

We will develop a site-level tool with four key elements: diagnostic, dialogue, action planning and progress monitoring. These elements will build on Output 1 and existing tools and guidelines on social impact assessments, social safeguards and conflict resolution processes (eg, IUCN 2016, Franks et al. 2018, Emini et al. 2023, IUCN 2023). The value of a multi-stakeholder approach that includes such elements is well recognised in addressing human-wildlife conflict (IUCN 2023). However, no such tool currently exists. Further, applying a rights lens will enable new approaches to addressing human-wildlife conflict, for example through outlining the rights and responsibilities stakeholders have in preventing and resolving conflicts.

3. New tool is tested and a beta-version user manual produced

The tool will be tested at a minimum of four sites in two countries and will include a 6-month progress evaluation of the action plans. These sites will cover a diversity of types and levels of conflict (Zimmermann et al. 2020) as well as potential rightsholders and duty-bearers. Exchange visits between project partners will take place during testing to maximise learnings. ZSL has committed to testing the tool in two more sites (to be identified in Q2 based on tool-testing needs). These sites will be in eligible countries where ZSL has long-term projects and in-country staff. We will produce a beta-version manual with the intention of securing further funding to publish a publicly-available, user-friendly version.

IIED will lead the project, including its management and reporting. All partners will participate in all project

activities and meet on a routine basis, alongside one in-person and four virtual workshops to review progress and integrate learnings.

Q16. Innovation

Please specifically outline how your approach or project is innovative.

Is it the application of a proven approach in a distinctly different geography/issue/stakeholder (novel to the area), or in a different sector (novel to the sector), or an unproven approach in any sector (novel to the world)?

The importance of rights-based approaches in conservation has been argued by many – including at IIED and partners – and recently recognised in the GBF. However, much of the work on rights in conservation focuses on rights to land, territories and resources, procedural rights and free, prior informed consent. This includes ongoing work at IIED, ZSL and WALHI. While this work is incredibly important, there is a lack of discussion of human rights in addressing negative social impacts from conservation, such as human-wildlife conflict. In our extensive work on rights in conservation, and separately on human-wildlife conflict, we have not come across serious consideration of what such an approach could look like nor how to implement it. Furthermore, in order to meet Target 4 of the GBF, there is a pressing need to explore what it means to apply a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict, and develop practical methods.

Our project will be the first to engage with the intellectual as well as the practical aspects of this need. It will initiate this process by reviewing literature and engaging with relevant experts in the fields of human rights law, conflict management and resolution, social safeguards, social impact assessments, human-wildlife conflict and multi-stakeholder accountability mechanisms. We will produce practical guidance for conservation organisations, donors and governments to better understand and integrate such a rights-based approach into existing standards and processes with the aim of achieving Target 4, while also developing and testing an easily adaptable site-level tool for managing such conflicts.

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 at organisational or individual levels? Please provide details of what form this will take, who will benefit (noting any Gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) considerations), and the post-project value to the country.

The project will engage partners in at least two countries with between 2-5 staff from each being involved in all project activities. Each of the partners brings different expertise to the project which has been crucial in the development of the proposal. The sharing of their knowledge and skills will be beneficial to all project partners, providing value to their conservation efforts beyond this project. This exchange of knowledge and skills will be facilitated through an in-person workshop, regular meetings throughout the project and exchange visits during the testing of the tool. Project partners will also participate in a working group to develop a Target 4 indicator for the GBF monitoring framework, providing them with exposure to the growing community of conservation practitioners and academics working on this topic. The tool development process of this project is considered to be at the cutting edge of work related to the implementation of the GBF. Testing of the tool will also build the capacity of project staff and site-level stakeholders engaged in the process, enabling them to develop a more nuanced understanding of rights-based approaches to conservation. Overall, the project will position project partners at the forefront of this approach in their countries of work, building their individual and organisational capacities.

Through routine engagement with the IUCN SSC Human Wildlife Conflict and Coexistence Specialist Group, our outputs and learnings will encourage the building of members' capacity on this topic. In Year 2 of the project, we

will actively engage with conservation organisations, donors and governments sharing the guidance we develop and providing further exposure for partners alongside a mechanism for self-capacity development for those we engage with. Post-project, we will work to finalise the tool, producing a user-friendly manual and enabling other organisations to strengthen their ability to manage such conflicts.

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

 [HR+HWC References](#)
 23/10/2023
 21:09:42
 pdf 156.93 KB

Section 6 - Gender, Awareness, Change Expected & Exit Strategy

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.

Within rural communities, there are very often differentiated impacts related to instances of human-wildlife conflict and more broadly within conservation practices. These impacts are commonly more intensely felt by more marginalised groups within rural communities. These impacts intersect with existing structural inequalities faced by women, young people, children, disabled and displaced people, people living in poverty, Indigenous Peoples, and others marginalised on the basis of their gender, age, caste, race, ethnicity, religion, wealth and how able-bodied they are. We will pay attention to these differences when reviewing literature and existing tools as well as consulting experts to develop the guidance and tool.

The tool will be designed to reveal and address inequalities related to human-wildlife conflict. When designing the tool, we will consider the needs of those marginalised because of their gender and other social characteristics to ensure they are able to fully and effectively participate in all elements (diagnostic, dialogue, action planning, and progress monitoring). The tool will emphasise the devolution of decision-making around resolving conflicts to key stakeholders at the site-level, in particular giving local institutions and different groups within communities the space to air their grievances, inform the planning of actions to better manage these conflicts, and hold those leading on action implementation accountable.

When evaluating the tool and sharing learnings from its testing, we will specifically explore – and disseminate conclusions on – the perspectives of persons of different genders, ages, and other social characteristics.

Q19. Change expected

Detail the expected changes to both biodiversity and multi-dimensional poverty reduction, and links between them, that this work will deliver. You should identify what will change and who exactly will benefit a) in the short-term (i.e. during the lifetime 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.

By the end of the project our guidance on applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict will be shared with at least ten international conservation donors and organisations and a site-level tool for initiating dialogue and producing effective management plans will have been used at at least four sites with different levels of conflict.

In the short term, we expect that at least two of the ten donors and organisations will have endorsed the guidance by the end of the project. To deliver on this, we will seek feedback from experts to ensure the guidance is scientifically robust yet practical and also develop a communications and advocacy strategy that will involve leveraging the influence of all partners within our international networks.

At the tool-testing sites, we anticipate changes in how stakeholders view the issue of human-wildlife conflict. We expect this change based on IIED's extensive experience using multi-stakeholder approaches that bring key stakeholders together to share their perspectives on conservation challenges. We also anticipate an increase in local community participation in decision-making and access to information about their rights in relation to conflicts over wildlife (at least 200 men and women across the four tool-testing sites). These changes will be facilitated by the tool itself through the diagnostic, dialogue and action planning elements.

While this project will not fund the implementation of actions planned using the tool, we expect identified duty-bearers who are well-resourced to undertake some of the short-term planned actions. The tool includes a progress monitoring element which will be tested 6 months after action planning to better understand what short-term actions are feasible and if using a rights-based approach enhances accountability at the site-level.

We also expect to build local and national level capacities in at least two countries where the tool will be tested. Specifically, we anticipate at least two local or national environmental organisations and at least eight tool users at the site level will have improved their understanding of applying human rights-based approaches to conflicts over wildlife.

Post-project, we will seek funding to scale up testing of the tool and to update the user manual into a publicly available user-friendly version. A much larger, long-term impact of this project – though less certain – will be if the guidance and tool inform implementation of the GBF, with the tool being added to the monitoring framework for Target 4. During the lifetime of the project, we will engage with relevant Working Groups to encourage this, highlighting the potential to scale up the guidance through its integration into international safeguarding standards and the tool through its adaptable approach.

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.

Our theory of change suggests that the international conservation community recognises the value of a rights-based approach to conservation policy and action. This is evidenced in the GBF and in statements made by conservation organisations, donors and representatives of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. However, what it means to apply such an approach to human-wildlife conflict, a significant negative social impact of conservation, remains unclear.

The outputs of this project – development of international guidance, and development and testing of a site-level

tool – will provide proof of concept for applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict.

Post-project, scaling this work will include further testing the tool, and advocating for integration of the guidance into international safeguarding standards and the tool into the monitoring of the GBF. If successful, we expect improvements in the capacities of policymakers and practitioners to engage with a rights-based approach while also improving their conservation practices through use of the guidance and tool.

Ultimately, we see this project as being a small but crucial step towards improving the management of conflicts over wildlife by respecting the rights and obligations of different stakeholders, thereby reducing conflicts and benefiting Indigenous Peoples and local communities and conservation action.

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?

The key benefit of this project will be providing the global conservation community with a novel approach to addressing human-wildlife conflict.

The project will involve strategic communications to encourage key conservation donors and organisations to integrate our guidance into existing standards. This is to ensure the knowledge generated by the project continues to influence existing and new conservation initiatives to better safeguard against potential rights violations.

We will develop and test the tool in contexts with varying levels of conflict, producing an easy-to-adapt process for understanding conflicts, initiating multi-stakeholder dialogue and producing effective management plans. The tool will focus on long-term conflict management and accountability for planned actions. While the tool will not be made public immediately after the project, we will continue learning from the four testing sites – which will remain key sites for partners post-funding – in order to then develop a user-friendly manual, enabling its scaling.

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?

If proven, there is significant potential for scaling the application of a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict using the international guidance and site-level tool this project will produce.

If integrated into safeguarding standards of major conservation organisations and donors, the guidance has the potential to enable systems change scaling. This would especially be the case if current and future conservation projects are required to demonstrate how their projects respect human rights and uphold obligations to rightsholders throughout the project cycle.

We will test the site-level tool in different contexts with varying levels of conflict and diverse potential duty-bearers in order to produce an adaptable tool and maximise its capacity for replication at other sites. The project will also improve the capacity of project partners to apply rights-based approaches to conflicts as well as providing a mechanism for further self-capacity development for other organisations that use the guidance and tool.

Section 7 - 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
<p>Fiduciary (financial)</p> <p>Funds granted to IIED or subgranted by IIED may be used for purposes that do not comply with the Darwin Initiative financial guidance</p>	Major	Unlikely	Major	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 contracted in accordance with our financial policy. There will be close financial and activity monitoring throughout the project.	Moderate
<p>Safeguarding</p> <p>IIED staff or partners may knowingly or unknowingly behave in a way that causes harm to others or damages the reputation of their organisation.</p>	Major	Unlikely	Major	IIED has a strict safeguarding policy and all staff are required to sign a code of conduct. IIED requires partners to have a similar code that adequately addresses personal conduct and safeguarding issues. If they do not they are expected to adopt the IIED code of conduct.	Moderate
<p>Delivery Chain</p> <p>The theme of this project has so far been unexplored, thus it is unclear if applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict would be useful for managing such conflicts, or addressing biodiversity loss and multi-dimensional poverty. We may find that after development and testing, the approach is unsuitable.</p>	Severe	Possible	Major	The project team includes experts on rights-based approaches and human-wildlife conflict. We will conduct literature reviews and expert consultations to ensure we sufficiently explore this theme and produce practical outputs, including sharing of lessons learned. The tool will draw on existing approaches, some of which have been successfully field tested.	Major

Risk 4	Depending on the existing type or level of human-wildlife conflict, field testing of the tool could bring to the fore underlying conflict between stakeholders (eg communities vs government bodies), which could lead to escalation of conflict.	Moderate	Possible	Major	Project partners have extensive experience at the field testing sites, making them familiar with the levels of conflicts and stakeholders involved. However, before field testing, we will conduct feasibility assessments to ascertain whether it is appropriate to test the tool. If not, we will consider other potential sites.	Moderate
Risk 5	Data Protection legislation contravened either by data breach, loss, or misuse of personal data by IIED staff or contracted partners.	Moderate	Possible	Major	IIED is compliant with GDPR and has a data protection risk assessment process built into wider project management processes	Moderate
Risk 6	Inability to secure funds for a follow-on project to scale up the guidance and tool, including the production of a user-friendly manual for the tool	Moderate	Possible	Minor	This is always a risk with a short project focused on developing an innovative approach that has major scaling-up potential and will need additional resources to realise this potential. From the start of Year 2, the project team will proactively engage with donors to build interest in a follow-on project.	Minor

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.). Please note your response to this question won't influence the outcome of your application.

No

Section 8 - Workplan

Q24. Workplan

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

📎 [HR+HWC BCF Workplan](#)

📅 23/10/2023

🕒 22:13:19

📄 pdf 138.5 KB

Section 9 - 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).

Overall project progress will be measured by regular review of progress against the project logical framework indicators. A more detailed M&E plan will be developed during the in-person workshop in Q1 of the project. At this workshop, 2 staff from each of the partners will meet to further elaborate on the project activities and the communications strategy. This will be followed by a review of the indicators and assigning of responsibility amongst the project team for progress against each. In particular, a more detailed M&E plan for all outcome-level indicators and output-level indicators 1.2-1.3 and 3.3-3.4 will be developed (eg, the audience mapping exercises might influence where we publish the guidance or how we seek endorsement of it from key stakeholders). In particular, we will draw on all partners' experiences using different impact evaluation methods – such as outcome harvesting and most significant change – to review the means of verification for all indicators that involve primary data collection at the national-level or at tool-testing sites (ie, 0.2-0.4 and 3.3-3.4). All data collected at the national and site levels will be segregated by age, gender, wealth and other social characteristics as appropriate (eg caste at the sites in India and ethnic groups at the sites in Indonesia). If needed, IIED will provide training and guidance to project partners on the research method selected for monitoring and evaluation of the project's impact at the tool-testing sites.

The project M&E system will be managed by the Researcher at IIED, in collaboration with all project partners. IIED will hire a researcher with the knowledge and skills to lead on the project M&E. We will have virtual project team meetings every month to review progress against the activities and indicators, as well as against the workplan.

Total project budget for M&E (£)

£ [REDACTED]

(this may include Staff and Travel and Subsistence Costs)

Total project budget for M&E (%)

[REDACTED]

(this may include Staff and Travel and Subsistence Costs)


Number of days planned for M&E


[REDACTED]


Section 10 - 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 expect to measure progress against these and how we can verify this.

 [HR+HWC BCF Logical Framework](#)

 23/10/2023

 20:21:30

 pdf 162.89 KB

Impact:

Conflicts over wildlife are managed with respect for the rights and duties of different stakeholders resulting in reduced conflict and corresponding benefits for people and nature

Outcome:

Proof of concept for applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict through the development of international guidance and a site-level adaptable tool

Project Outputs

Output 1:

Guidance on applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict developed and shared with key stakeholders

Output 2:

A novel and adaptable tool to assess human-wildlife conflict from a rights perspective developed

Output 3:

No Response

Output 4:

New tool is tested and a beta-version user manual produced

Output 5:

No Response

Do you require more Output fields?

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

No

Activities


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


- 1.1 Review case studies of human-wildlife conflict alongside literature review and expert consultation on rights approaches in conservation to identify relevant human rights laws and conventions
- 1.2 Consult experts and review literature in conservation and other sectors on how to identify rightsholders, duty-bearers and their responsibilities
- 1.3 Hold an in-person workshop for the project team to produce draft guidance, develop a communications strategy, and refine the project monitoring, evaluation and learning system
- 1.4 Hold two virtual workshops with the project team to review and revise draft guidance
- 1.5 Share final guidance with rightsholders, duty bearers and other relevant stakeholders at the national and global level
- 2.1 Review multi-stakeholder tools in conservation that involve diagnostic, dialogue, action planning and progress monitoring elements (eg social impact assessments, safeguards and conflict resolution)
- 2.2 Build on identified multi-stakeholder tools and Output 1 to develop a novel and adaptable tool
- 2.3 Hold monthly meetings with the project team to develop, review and revise a user manual for the new tool
- 3.1 Test the diagnostic, dialogue and action planning elements of the tool in two sites per country where there are a diversity of duty-bearers and levels of conflict
- 3.2 Hold a virtual workshop with the project team to share learnings from testing the first three elements of the tool
- 3.3 Hold site-level progress monitoring meetings six months after the action planning element of the tool is tested
- 3.4 Hold a second virtual workshop with the project team to share learnings from testing the progress monitoring element of the tool
- 3.5 Integrate learnings from the testing of the tool into the user manual


Section 11 - Budget and Funding

Q27. Budget

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

 [11521 Darwin Innovation Budget_Final](#)

 23/10/2023

 19:45:36

 xlsx 94.34 KB

Q28. Alignment with other funding and activities

This question aims to help us understand how familiar you are with other work in the geographic/thematic area, and how this proposed project will build on or align with this to avoid any risks of duplicating or conflicting activities.

Q28a. Is this new work or does it build on existing/past activities (delivered by anyone and funded through any source)?

New Initiative

Please give details.

The development of international guidance on a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict and the creation and testing of an accompanying adaptable site-level tool is new work, which will begin at the start of this project. However, the guidance and tool will draw on past activities led by project partners. This includes IIED

and ZSL's work on rights-based approaches in conservation, social safeguards, and development of solutions to managing human-wildlife conflict; IIED's work on developing multi-stakeholder approaches and tools; NCF's work on human-centric approaches to human-wildlife conflict; WALHI North Sumatra's work on conflict resolution processes and human rights in conservation. Project staff have also been involved in developing the guidelines produced by the IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict and Coexistence Specialist Group, which the project will draw on to develop both the guidance and tool. Project staff are also aware of and have actively engaged in broader work on social safeguards and rights-based approaches in conservation led by other NGOs, donors, and researchers.

Q28b. Are you aware of any current or future plans for work in the geographic/thematic area to the proposed project?

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.

We are aware of multiple projects exploring rights-based approaches in conservation, however, these focus on rights to land, territories and resources, procedural rights, and free prior informed consent. Similarly, there are projects that recognise the importance of applying multidisciplinary approaches to human-wildlife conflict. However, the novelty of this project is the exploration and field-testing of what it means to apply a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict. The project team have discussed this proposal with human rights and human-wildlife conflict experts and will continue to actively engage with relevant experts and processes (such as the development of the Target 4 indicator related to human-wildlife conflict in the GBF monitoring framework) throughout the lifetime of the project. The purpose of such engagement is twofold: to better inform project activities and outputs and share learnings, and to ensure the outputs do not duplicate but rather complement other activities in the broader fields of both rights in conservation and human-wildlife conflict.

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? Please make sure you read the guidance documents, before answering this question.

IIED strives to ensure project activities and outputs offer high quality and impact at the best possible cost. As an organisation we use a '4E' framework – Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Equity – to achieve Value for Money.

The key cost driver of this project is salaries. This reflects the personnel-intensive nature of a project based on desk review, primary research, guidance and tool development and testing. To ensure we achieve high-quality outputs and impact, we have partnered with organisations that each bring different needed expertise to all activities. This includes experts on human-wildlife conflict, rights-based approaches to conservation, policy advocacy, and the development of multi-stakeholder approaches and tools. IIED, ZSL and NCF are all contributing towards these salary costs. Salaries have been costed using actual salary day rates and careful estimates of the amount of time needed to complete each activity. Each of the partners has measures to ensure its staff rates are fair and benchmarked against similar organisations.

To further strengthen the project, we included consultants who can provide legal expertise; guidance on developing social safeguards and mainstreaming human rights throughout project cycles; and communications assistance to ensure our outputs are audience-appropriate and accessible. We have discussed the project with

these consultants and costed for based on their actual day rates.

Field-testing of the tool will take place in at least four sites. NCF has contributed matched funding for fieldwork travel and subsistence costs at two sites. ZSL has committed to funding field testing at two additional sites.

Q30. Capital items

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

The project will not involve the purchase of any capital items.

Section 12 - Outputs, Open Access, Ethics & Safeguarding

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.

IIED has safeguarding processes in place to ensure that all partners apply the same rigorous standards. This process will involve a session devoted to the concept of safeguards and specifically the safeguard policies that apply to this project. This session will form part of the in-person workshop organised by the project in Q1, which at least two key project staff from each partner will attend. Thereafter, at all monthly meetings with partners, there will be a regular agenda item to check in on any safeguarding issues.

Q32. Ethics

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

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' in order to ensure that appropriate and high ethical standards are upheld throughout its duration and that all Darwin Initiative key principles of good ethical practice are met. IIED's ethics policy provides a rigorous framework to ensure that ethical considerations inform the design and conduct of all research, partnerships, and policy engagement activities undertaken by IIED staff and partners. IIED's review process 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. Consent will be obtained from all participants involved in key informant interviews, focus groups, and other participatory research methods adopted by the project to produce the guidance and test the tool. To comply with data protection legislation, data collected by these means will be anonymised unless explicitly agreed otherwise. Prior to testing the tool, risk assessments will be conducted, ensuring activities do not pose unacceptable or unnecessary risks to project staff or participants.

Section 13 - 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 14 - 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?
Dilys Roe	Project Leader	10	Checked
TBC	Researcher, IIED	20	Checked
Anita Sohal	Project Manager, IIED	6	Checked
Clair Grant-Salmon	Communications and Marketing, IIED	1	Checked


Do you require more fields?


Yes


Name (First name, surname)	Role	% time on project	1 Page CV or job description attached?
Jodie Frosdick	Communications and Editorial, IIED	1	Checked
TBC	Researcher, Nature Conservation Foundation	100	Checked
Munib Khanyari	Senior Researcher, Nature Conservation Foundation	30	Checked
Rigzen Dorjay	Field Researcher, Nature Conservation Foundation	100	Checked
Kulbushansingh Suryawanshi	Senior Researcher, Nature Conservation Foundation	10	Checked
Simon Hedges	HWC expert, Zoological Society of London	5	Checked
Surshti Patel	Rights and equity expert, Zoological Society of London	5	Checked
Fhiliya Himasari	Program Manager, WALHI North Sumatra	30	Checked

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

 [All Partner CVs](#)

 23/10/2023

 19:40:15

 pdf 1.33 MB

Have you attached all project staff CVs?

Yes

Section 15 - 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 (IIED)

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

IIED is an independent policy research institute working for a more sustainable and equitable global environment. IIED staff are prominent members of the Human Rights and Biodiversity Working Group which aims to advance a human rights-based approach in implementation of the Global Biodiversity Framework.

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

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

Dilys Roe leads IIED's Biodiversity Team and has been the project leader on a number of previous Darwin Initiative and IWT-CF projects. As Project Leader for this project, Dilys will oversee the delivery of the project outputs to time and budget as well as provide technical support. Dilys is a member of the IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict and Coexistence Specialist Group, which will be a key source of technical advice and peer review. The Researcher who will be hired on the project will lead the coordination of activities with project partners, provide technical research support, and contribute to monitoring and evaluation. IIED's communications team will support the project by providing dedicated editorial and marketing advice ensuring the outputs are effectively disseminated.

International/In-country Partner International

Allocated budget (proportion or value): 

Representation 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: Nature Conservation Foundation

Website address: <https://www.ncf-india.org/>

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

The Nature Conservation Foundation (NCF) has over 25 years of experience conducting research and implementing projects to conserve biodiversity in collaboration with local communities and governments in India. Their work on human-wildlife conflict management has received global recognition.

NCF will contribute intellectually as well as practically to this project. Four of their staff from their High-Altitude Program will be involved in developing the guidance and tool as well as testing the tool at two sites where they have other long-term projects. NCF will also be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of project activities.

International/In-country Partner In-country

Allocated budget: ██████████

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

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

2. Partner Name: WALHI North Sumatra

Website address: <https://www.walhi.or.id/>

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

The Indonesian Forum for the Environment or WALHI Indonesia has over 40 years of experience conducting research, advocating for policy changes and implementing projects on environmental protection and social justice. This includes their work in North Sumatra which uses human rights-based approaches in key conservation areas such as the Batang Toru ecosystem.

WALHI North Sumatra will contribute intellectually as well as practically to this project. Four of their staff (and one finance manager) will be involved in developing the guidance and tool as well as testing the tool at two sites where they have other long-term projects. WALHI North Sumatra will also be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of project activities.

International/In-country Partner In-country

Allocated budget: ██████████

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

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

3. Partner Name: Zoological Society of London

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

What value does this Partner bring to the project?

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

Zoological Society of London (ZSL) is a science-driven conservation society with extensive experience designing and implementing human-wildlife conflict mitigation projects across their international field programmes. They have also developed the FAIRER framework which focuses on putting human rights at the heart of our conservation practice.

ZSL will contribute intellectually as well as practically to this project. Two of their staff will be involved in developing the guidance and tool. One of these staff members (Simon Hedges) is a member of IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict and Coexistence Specialist Group. In Q2 of the project, ZSL is committed to identifying two additional sites to test the tool based on testing needs. ZSL will cover all field costs involved with testing the tool at these additional sites. These sites will be in eligible countries where ZSL has other long-term projects. ZSL will also be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of project activities.

International/In-country Partner International

Allocated budget: █

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

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

4. Partner Name: *No Response*

Website address: *No Response*

What value does this Partner bring to the project?

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

No Response

International/In-country Partner International
 In-country

Allocated budget: 0

Representation on the Project Board (or other management structure) Yes
 No

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

5. Partner Name: *No Response*

Website address: *No Response*

What value does this Partner bring to the project?
No Response

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

International/In-country Partner International
 In-country

Allocated budget: 0

Representation on the Project Board (or other management structure) Yes
 No

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

6. Partner Name: *No Response*

Website address: *No Response*

What value does this Partner bring to the project?
No Response

(including roles, responsibilities and capabilities and capacity):

International/In-country Partner International
 In-country

Allocated budget: 0

Representation on the Project Board (or other management structure) Yes
 No


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


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


No Response

Please provide a combined PDF of all Letters of Support for all project partners or explain why this has not been included.

 [All-partner-LoS](#)

 23/10/2023

 21:59:13

 pdf 684.35 KB

Section 16 - Lead Partner Track Record

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

Please provide details of the most recent awards (up to 6 examples).

Reference No	Project Leader	Title
DARCC022	Dilys Roe	South-south capacity building for human-elephant conflict management
DARNV011	Phil Franks	A new tool for advancing locally led conservation
DARNV009	Dilys Roe	Developing and testing a sustainability assessment framework for wildlife use
IWT 060	Dilys Roe	Learning and Action Platform for communities and IWT (LEAP)
IWT 036	Dilys Roe	Implementing Park Action Plans
25-006	Phil Franks	Enhancing equity and effectiveness of protected areas conservation

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

Yes

Section 17 - Certification

Q36. 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 ineligible.

On behalf of the

Company

of

I apply for a grant of





£199,240.00

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, a cover letter, letters of support, a budget, logframe, theory of change, Safeguarding and associated policies, and project workplan.
- Our last two sets of signed audited/independently verified accounts and annual report (or other financial evidence – see Finance Guidance) are also enclosed.


Checked

Name	Phil Franks
Position in the organisation	Principal Researcher
Signature (please upload e-signature)	 PFS2  23/10/2023  14:26:15  jpg 32.61 KB
Date	23 October 2023

Please attach the requested signed audited/independently examined accounts.

 Trustees' Report & Accounts 22-23  20/10/2023  12:27:17  pdf 1.35 MB	 Trustees Report & Accounts 20-21  20/10/2023  12:27:17  pdf 324.61 KB
--	---

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

 IIED Safeguarding-Whistleblowing-Conduct  20/10/2023  12:26:36  pdf 565.38 KB

Section 18 - Submission Checklist

Checklist for submission

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 my 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 the budget is complete, correctly adds up and I have included the correct final total at the start of the application.	Checked
The application has been signed by a suitably authorised individual (clear electronic or scanned signatures are acceptable).	Checked
I have attached the below documents to my application:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a cover letter from the Lead Partner, outlining how any feedback received at has been addressed where relevant, as a single PDF. 	Checked
my completed logframe as a PDF using the template provided	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 for the Lead Partner (or other financial evidence – see Finance Guidance, 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 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: Applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict

	Activity	No. of months	Year 1 (24/25)				Year 2 (25/26)			
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Output 1	Guidance on applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict developed and shared with key stakeholders									
1.1	Review case studies of human-wildlife conflict alongside literature review and expert consultation on rights approaches in conservation to identify relevant human rights laws and conventions	6								
1.2	Consult experts and review literature in conservation and other sectors on how to identify rightsholders, duty-bearers and their responsibilities	6								
1.3	Hold an in-person workshop for the project team to produce draft guidance, develop a communications strategy, and refine the project monitoring, evaluation and learning system	1								
1.4	Hold two virtual workshops with the project team to review and revise draft guidance	2								
1.5	Share final guidance with rightsholders, duty bearers and other relevant stakeholders at the national and global level	12								

Project Title: Applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict

	Activity	No. of months	Year 1 (24/25)				Year 2 (25/26)			
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Output 2	A novel and adaptable tool to assess human-wildlife conflict from a rights perspective developed									
2.1	Review multi-stakeholder tools in conservation that involve diagnostic, dialogue, action planning and progress monitoring elements (eg social impact assessments, safeguards and conflict resolution)	6								
2.2	Build on identified multi-stakeholder tools and Output 1 to develop a novel and adaptable tool	6								
2.3	Hold monthly meetings with the project team to develop, review and revise a user manual for the new tool	9								
Output 3	New tool is tested and a beta-version user manual produced									
3.1	Test the diagnostic, dialogue and action planning elements of the tool in two sites per country where there are a diversity of duty-bearers and levels of conflict	6								
3.2	Hold a virtual workshop with the project team to share learnings from testing the first three elements of the tool	1								

Project Title: Applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict

	Activity	No. of months	Year 1 (24/25)				Year 2 (25/26)			
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
3.3	Hold site-level progress monitoring meetings six months after the action planning element of the tool is tested	3								
3.4	Hold a second virtual workshop with the project team to share learnings from testing the progress monitoring element of the tool	1								
3.5	Integrate learnings from the testing of the tool into the user manual	12								

Project Title: Applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict

Project Summary	SMART Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Impact: (Max 30 words) Conflicts over wildlife are managed with respect for the rights and duties of different stakeholders resulting in reduced conflict and corresponding benefits for people and nature</p>			
<p>Outcome: (Max 30 words) Proof of concept for applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict through the development of international guidance and a site-level adaptable tool</p>	<p>0.1 By the end of the project, guidance on applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict is endorsed by at least two conservation donors or organisations [DI-C01]</p> <p>0.2 By the end of the project, at least 2 local or national environmental organisations with improved capability and capacity as a result of project [DI-A03]</p> <p>0.3 By the end of the project, at least 200 local community men and women from across 4 testing sites with increased participation in local decision-making related to human-wildlife conflict [DI-B05]</p>	<p>0.1 Written endorsement from key stakeholders</p> <p>0.2 Interviews with local or national organisations that participate in project activities</p> <p>0.3-0.4 Interviews and focus group discussions (using outcome harvesting or most significant change) at each testing site, with data segregated by age and gender</p>	<p>0.1 Relevant key stakeholders see value in the guidance and are willing to endorse it. We think this is a reasonable assumption based on informal discussions with IUCN SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict and Coexistence Specialist Group members and international donors.</p> <p>0.2 Given there is no existing guidance or tools for applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict, the capabilities associated with it will be new to most organisations.</p> <p>0.3-0.4 Willingness from all key stakeholders to participate in testing the tool. We will be testing the tool at sites where partners</p>

Project Title: Applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict

	<p>0.4 By the end of the project, at least 200 local community men and women from across 4 testing sites with strengthened (recognised/clarified) rights [DI-B06]</p>		<p>have been working long-term. Based on discussions with project partners, it is reasonable to assume willingness from local communities and all key stakeholders to participate in the tool testing process</p> <p>0.4 We assume that 'strengthened rights' include clarification about a right. We also assume this includes human rights, procedural rights and rights to resources, lands and territories, among others.</p>
<p>Outputs: 1. Guidance on applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict developed and shared with key stakeholders</p>	<p>1.1 Draft guidance produced and shared with at least 10 experts for feedback by the end of Quarter 3, Year 1</p> <p>1.2 Guidance on applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict is published by the end of Year 1 [DI-C01]</p> <p>1.3 Guidance on applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict is shared with at least 10 conservation organisations and decisionmakers (policymakers and donors) by the end of Year 2</p>	<p>1.1 Dissemination records and written feedback from experts</p> <p>1.2 Guidance available online</p> <p>1.3 Audience mapping documents and dissemination records</p>	<p>1.1 Suitable experts are willing to receive draft guidance and provide feedback. We do not anticipate a problem with recruiting experts based on informal discussions had with experts in human-wildlife conflict and rights-based approaches within our networks.</p>

Project Title: Applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict

<p>2. A novel and adaptable tool to assess human-wildlife conflict from a rights perspective developed</p>	<p>2.1 List of relevant tools and approaches developed and reviewed by the end of Quarter 2, Year 1</p> <p>2.2 Prototype of the tool developed and ready for testing by the end of Quarter 3, Year 1</p>	<p>2.1 Review report with comments from all partners and project meeting minutes</p> <p>2.2 Basic manual for testing the tool</p>	<p>2.2 It is possible to produce a integrate learnings from relevant tools and approaches and apply a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict. Based on informal discussions with experts in human-wildlife conflict and rights-based approaches within our networks, we do not anticipate a problem with the development of such a tool.</p>
<p>3. New tool is tested and a beta-version user manual produced</p>	<p>3.1 Testing of the tool is completed at at least 4 sites by the end of Quarter 3, Year 2</p> <p>3.2 At least 4 new/improved [habitat management] action plans addressing human-wildlife conflict produced and endorsed by key site-level stakeholders by the end of Quarter 1, Year 2 [DI-B01]</p> <p>3.3 At least 8 individual tool users reporting that they are applying new capabilities 6 months after action planning is completed [DI-A04]</p> <p>3.4 At least 20 individual tool users reporting that the action plans are effective 6 months after action planning is completed</p>	<p>3.1 Site reports and action plans</p> <p>3.2 Site-level action plans developed during tool testing</p> <p>3.3-3.4 Feedback gathered (site-level workshop and individual interviews) when testing progress monitoring element of the tool, with data segregated by age and gender</p> <p>3.5 Final beta-version of the user manual with all testing learnings integrated</p>	<p>3.1-3.4 Willingness from all site-level key stakeholders to participate in the progress monitoring element of the tool. We will be testing the tool at sites where partners have been working long-term. Based on discussions with project partners, it is reasonable to assume willingness from local communities and all key stakeholders to participate in all elements of the tool testing process</p> <p>3.2 The actions in management plans will be developed by key site-level stakeholders using the tool. We assume these will be added to new or improved habitat management plans, however some sites might prefer to include them in species management plans or as</p>

Project Title: Applying a rights-based approach to human-wildlife conflict

	<p>3.5 Beta-version of the user manual developed by the end of Year 2</p>		<p>standalone action plans instead. Developing a separate action plan might be preferred by stakeholders to encourage more immediate action implementation.</p> <p>3.4 At least 1-3 people or organisations per site are motivated by their use of the tool to take some actions towards managing or resolving human-wildlife conflict. This assumption is based on IIED's experience with other multi-stakeholder tools that involve action planning.</p>
<p>Activities</p> <p>1.1 Review case studies of human-wildlife conflict alongside literature review and expert consultation on rights approaches in conservation to identify relevant human rights laws and conventions</p> <p>1.2 Consult experts and review literature in conservation and other sectors on how to identify rightsholders, duty-bearers and their responsibilities</p> <p>1.3 Hold an in-person workshop for the project team to produce draft guidance, develop a communications strategy, and refine the project monitoring, evaluation and learning system</p> <p>1.4 Hold two virtual workshops with the project team to review and revise draft guidance</p> <p>1.5 Share final guidance with rightsholders, duty bearers and other relevant stakeholders at the national and global level</p> <p>2.1 Review multi-stakeholder tools in conservation that involve diagnostic, dialogue, action planning and progress monitoring elements (eg social impact assessments, safeguards and conflict resolution)</p> <p>2.2 Build on identified multi-stakeholder tools and Output 1 to develop a novel and adaptable tool</p> <p>2.3 Hold monthly meetings with the project team to develop, review and revise a user manual for the new tool</p> <p>3.1 Test the diagnostic, dialogue and action planning elements of the tool in two sites per country where there are a diversity of duty-bearers and levels of conflict</p> <p>3.2 Hold a virtual workshop with the project team to share learnings from testing the first three elements of the tool</p> <p>3.3 Hold site-level progress monitoring meetings six months after the action planning element of the tool is tested</p> <p>3.4 Hold a second virtual workshop with the project team to share learnings from testing the progress monitoring element of the tool</p> <p>3.5 Integrate learnings from the testing of the tool into the user manual</p>			