

Integrating Livelihoods and Conservation

People Partner with Nature for Sustainable Living (PPN)
2018-2021



List of contents

1. Introduction		
1.1.	The Danish organisation's experience and capacity	5
1.2.	Development of Programme concept	5
1.3.	Lessons learned and results from previous interventions	6
2. Regional, National and Sector context		
2.1.	Regional context	7
2.2.	The Programme's geographical focus	8
2.3.	Sector context	8
3. Partners		
3.1.	Partners	15
4. Programme Objectives		
4.1.	Development objective (overall programme objective)	17
4.2.	Immediate objectives and indicators	17
5. Overall Strategy for the Programme		
5.1.	Overall programme approach	18
5.2.	Key programme components	21
5.3.	Synergy effects in the programme	24
5.4.	Advocacy	24
5.5.	Organisational development	25
5.6.	Sustainability aspects of the programme	25
5.7.	Monitoring and evaluation	26
5.8.	Other key approaches	27
6. Target Group		
6.1.	Target group	27
7. Outputs and Output Indicators		
7.1	Outputs and indicators	30
8. Assumptions and Risks		
8.1.	Assumptions	32
8.2.	Risks and risk management	32
9. Cross-cutting concerns		
9.1	Gender and equity	32
9.2	Indigenous Peoples	33
9.3	Biodiversity, environment, climate and resilience	33
10. Management and organisational set-up		
11.1.	Organisational structure and division of responsibilities	35
11.2.	Organisation and division of responsibilities	35
11.3.	Administrative procedures and financial administration	36
11. Information work in Denmark		37
12. Budget		38

ANNEXES:

- A. Relevant programme framework in terms of an LFA matrix, outcome mapping, or similar.
- B. Budget
- C. Follow-up on Capacity Assessment and assessment of Management Response
- D. Description of strategic focus and core organisational procedures
- E. Relevant sub-strategies
- F. Overview of programme partners, using the Civil Society Fund's ordinary Annex B: Organisational Fact Sheet
- G. Organisational chart for the programme
- H. Job descriptions for expatriate staff
- I. The organisation's popular foundation, i.e. roots in the population
- J. Overview of monitoring set-up
- K. Updated "Calculating existing project portfolio" (to be found on www.cisu.dk/program).
- L. The organisation's statutes
- M. The organisation's procedures and administrative guidelines
- N. Annual report and auditing report
- O. Context related background information

Abbreviations

BCN	Bird Conservation Nepal
CAMB	Strengthening Civil Society Capacity to Advocate for Mainstreaming Biodiversity
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCI	Cambridge Conservation Initiative
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
CFA	Community Forest Associations (Kenya)
CFM	Collaborative Forest Management (Uganda)
CFUG	Community Forestry User Groups
CSG/CSO	Civil Society Groups/Organisations
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFO	District Forest Office (Nepal)
DOF	Danish Ornithological Society/ BirdLife Denmark
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FECOFUN	Federation of Community Forestry Users (Nepal)
GII	Gender Inequality Index
GNI	Gross National Income
GNP	Gross National Product
HDI	Human Development Index
IBA	Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas
IGA	Income Generating Activities
INTUD	International Task Force (Internationalt Udvalg, DOF)
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
KBA	Key Biodiversity Areas
LBM	Locally Based Monitoring
LEEP	Local Engagement and Empowerment Programme (BirdLife)
LCG	Local Conservation Group
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NFP	National Forest Programme (Kenya)
NOF	Norwegian Ornithological Society/ BirdLife Norway
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NTFP	Non Timber Forest Products
PAG	Program Advisory Group
PFM	Participatory Forest Management
PIP	Programme Implementation Plan
PMC	Programme Management Committee
PPN	People Partner with Nature Programme
PRISM	Participatory
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation
Rev/App	Review/Appraisal (CISU)
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SSG	Site Support Group
SWC	Social Welfare Council (Nepal)
TA	Technical Assistance
TOC	Theory of Change
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
UNETCOFA	Uganda Network of Collaborative Forest Associations
UOBDU	United Organization for Batwa Development in Uganda
VDC	Village Development Committee
QAS	Quality Assurance System (BirdLife)

1. Introduction

1.1. The Danish organisation's experience and capacity

Dansk Ornitologisk Forening (DOF)¹ was established in 1906 with the goal to collect data on and protect Danish birds. Today DOF has 16.420² members distributed on 13 local sections all over Denmark. It is an independent Danish organisation with strong traditions for citizen science and the members' active participation in its work. It has recently adopted its new framework strategy (2017-2020). DOF is known for its reliability based on science and data and has had agreements on delivering data to the Ministry of Environment since 2004. It is represented in several Danish networks, including Det Grønne Kontaktudvalg, IUCN and the 92-group for Sustainable Development. DOF is the Danish Partner in BirdLife International, a Partnership of 122 civil society organisations from around the world.

DOF has for the past 30 years worked in and around Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) in Africa and Asia with focus on the involvement of local communities in the sustainable management of natural resources, mainly forests. Most of the projects were funded by Danida, including the *Sustainable and Integrated Management of Mbeling* (2007-2015) on Flores, Indonesia³. DOF currently manages, coordinates and provides technical assistance to the first phase of the CISU funded *Integrating Livelihoods and Conservation. People Partner with Nature Programme* (PPN 2015-2017) and the *Strengthening Civil Society Capacity to Advocate for Mainstreaming Biodiversity Project* (CAMB 2017-2018) funded through the Climate and Environment Fund. DOF's international development and nature protection interventions are managed by an anthropologist and a biologist in DOF's Nature Department, both of whom have long experience in development cooperation.

The CISU Capacity Assessment of May-June 2014 concluded that 'DOF is considered to have professional and administrative capacity to carry out its Danida/CISU supported development activities within the proposed approach considering the full existing and planned portfolio of the organisation. The relevance and strategy of the proposed Program including considerations of activities by other stakeholders and best practices in the main focal areas and internationally are considered to be in top'. This conclusion was based on the external consultant's assessment that DOF and partners had sufficient experience and capacity, a long-term strategy, an International Strategy and guidelines and policy papers. These have since been adapted to the Programme and will be reviewed for the next phase⁴. The external CISU Review/Appraisal of the PPN Programme in 2017 confirmed in its final report that DOF is 'well placed as an organisation to implement the programme'. DOF is a 'strong civil society actor in Denmark...and has strong capacity in running a member organisation'. DOF also has 'relatively strong capacity ... when it comes to ...the integration of nature conservation with development' and qualified staff to run the programme. DOF's social anthropologist has worked part time for the BirdLife Global Secretariat in Cambridge since December 2016 with the main responsibility to develop and ensure implementation of social safeguards, gender and rights across the Partnership. Together with the close cooperation in the CAMB Project, this has considerably strengthened the relationship between DOF and BirdLife and contributed to the integration of DOF's and BirdLife's approaches to e.g. local engagement and empowerment.

1.2. Development of the Programme Document

The original Programme concept and the final Programme Document was developed in close cooperation between DOF and the three Programme partners - Bird Conservation Nepal (BCN), Nature Kenya and *NatureUganda*. It was based on BirdLife's approach to conservation that links

¹ Internationally also known as BirdLife Denmark

² April 2017

³ Mbeliling Landscape is now part of an EC funded project on stakeholder engagement in forest management in South Asia managed by BirdLife. Mbeliling was also used as a pilot for evaluation in the BirdLife/CCI PRISM Project

⁴ They are attached in Annex E

people and nature and on DOF's experience with previous projects on engaging local communities in forest management. The CISU Rev/App concluded that it is a 'sound strategy to understand the next phase as a continuation of the first'. This was also the conclusion of the PPN Partners during the 2016 PMC meeting in March. The recommendations of the Rev/App have been addressed where relevant in the proposal text. DOF has been in charge of formulating this proposal and has had frequent communication with the other partners who have delivered inputs to proposal, budget, Results Framework and Annexes. They have agreed to the final draft of this document, which was also shared with DOF's international task force (INTUD), and approved by the Head of DOF's Nature Department and the Head of DOF's Finances.

Because the concept and the approach remain very much the same the second phase of the PPN Programme does not propose many new initiatives. The main innovative activities are the upscaling and wider outreach of partners to new sites and stakeholders, the wider sharing in the BirdLife Partnership with concrete results (including a manual/guidelines on forest management), in depth social and biological studies to better understand impacts and opportunities of the Programme, building regional BirdLife relationships for sustainable forest management and using Programme strategic approaches coherently.

When the second phase is approved the PMC will begin more detailed planning of Phase II. This will include the formulation of the first detailed annual Programme Work Plan with milestones, revision of sub-strategies and follow up on lessons learned. Some activities will continue into Phase II without break. Partners are expected to have formulated their activity and work plans for the first year of Phase II at the latest one month after starting Phase II.

1.3. Lessons learned and results from previous interventions

The first phase of the Programme has brought a number of lessons and experiences, some of them individually by the partners, others shared across the Programme. Overall the Programme approach is much appreciated by all partners, though it took longer for them than anticipated to start full implementation and some of the hoped for achievements have not yet been fully reached. The Rev/App consultant found that progress has been 'satisfactory with milestones in the respective countries largely being met'. The strategic approach was assessed to be 'relevant and implementation ...largely in accordance with the... strategic approach'. He notes that 'results appear to be underreported' and that there has been little strategic reporting and learning has not been sufficiently documented and shared. He therefore recommends that the PMC find ways to strengthen these in the next phase. The first phase was in itself a learning process especially at Programme level during which partners have had to adapt to coordination with several other partners, joint approaches and sharing of part of the budget. The CAMB project is one tangible result of this cooperation, which has consolidated the partnership between DOF and the BirdLife Secretariat through close cooperation on a joint project. This will also benefit the future PPN Programme, which is now better able to exploit the opportunities of the BirdLife Partnership, including access to resources such as the BirdLife extranet and Partnership meetings. The aim of the CAMB project on strengthening capacity for strategic approaches to advocacy is also expected to benefit PPN.

It has been a challenge to systematically document and share learning not only nationally but between partners and across the BirdLife Partnership. The latter was mainly done during BirdLife events and for Asia at a workshop on local engagement in forest management held in connection with the CAMB training workshop for Asian Partners. Another similar workshop will be held in Copenhagen in January 2018 with PPN partners and Danish NGOs. Partners have continuously shared experiences and learning mainly through meetings, and sharing of reports and publications. In order to have a better overview and the possibility of sharing outside of the PPN Programme a small budget has been set aside to pay for the services of a BirdLife communication officer to set

up and help maintain a PPN page on the BirdLife extranet to which all BirdLife Partners have access.

The PMC set up with annual meetings in alternate countries and quarterly Skype meetings works well, both for ensuring full engagement of partners and for building relationships and understanding. It will as recommended by the Rev/App be continued in the next phase starting with an 'end of Phase I cum beginning of Phase II' PMC meeting in Copenhagen in the beginning of 2018. The Rev/App recommended that the division of roles facilitates more 'stream-lined decision-making within the Programme set up'. This is one of the issues that the PMC will address during the next meeting. There are still some barriers among the South partners to take lead within global aspects of the PPN, partly because the PMC members who are the Chief Executive Officers and the overall Programme Managers (except in DOF) are also very busy outside of the PPN Programme. There have been some changes to the PMC due to change of Programme Officers (Nature Kenya and Nature Uganda) and, very recently, the Chief Executive Officer of BCN. These are not expected to have serious impacts on the next phase. Changes in important staff always causes some delays and loss of knowledge but the new Programme staff have been able to catch up quickly.

The Rev/App noted that overall and especially at site levels implementation was delayed by a long preparation/inception phase during which more activities could have been done simultaneously with baseline studies and other preparatory activities. The observation is correct but the preparation also laid the ground for a more thorough understanding of the sites (social and biodiversity) and together with the formulation of Programme specific strategies and guidelines contributed to a more strategic and joint approach to implementation that may otherwise not have been achieved. Rather than following up on the baseline surveys with similar studies in the second phase the plan is to carry out several in depth studies on thematic issues that appear to be of specific importance. This will include a study on how women experience the benefits of the Programme and potential gender related changes in access to and management of resources.

An important overall lesson at national and site levels is that reducing negative impacts to forested IBAs is best achieved by involving all concerned stakeholders. The Programme has brought more collaboration with Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) working in development and nature conservation and has supported synergies between District line agencies and key stakeholders that are essential in sustaining livelihood and conservation activities in the long term. At community level good governance training has helped develop awareness of equity issues. Overall there has been good participation of women but there is a need for additional empowerment of women to fully participate in management and community decisions. The Programme has also brought lessons on how addressing household needs plays an important role in forest conservation, that without the goodwill of Government stakeholders, achieving best participatory forest management is not possible and that putting in place relevant District/County policy frameworks to ensure continued support to forest conservation is critical. The Partners' most important individual lessons learned are presented in Annex O.1.

2. Regional, national and sector context

2.1. Regional context

The Programme does not have one regional focus. It is implemented in Kenya and Uganda in East Africa and in Nepal in South Asia. DOF would have liked to expand the work in South Asia to include another country in the region (possibly Myanmar) but decided that due to the limited funding it is not feasible at the moment. However, the Programme plans to bring together BirdLife Partners from across the Himalayas and in East Africa, respectively for shared learning on forest management. Programme partners regularly utilise regional and global forums, for example the BirdLife World Congress that is now planned to take place in 2018, and the bi-annual meetings of the Africa and the Asia Partnership. The Programme will also benefit from the outcomes of the

regional seminars of the CAMB Project held in the autumn of 2017 in Singapore and Nairobi and the regional cooperation which is expected to continue after the workshops. These workshops bring together around 13 Asian partners and 12 African partners, the Cambridge, Asia and Africa Secretariats and DOF. The CAMB project will end June 2018 but its focus on the CBD and mainstreaming biodiversity will be continued through the advocacy efforts of the Programme.

2.2. The Programme's geographical focus

The Programme is currently being implemented nationally and at three sites in Kenya, two in Uganda and one in Nepal. This will continue into the second phase with the addition of one more site in Nepal, Madane Forest. Like Reshunga the new site is located in Gulmi District and shares the same District Forest Office. The partners will as part of the preparation for the next phase develop exit strategies for each of the sites and plan for upscaling of Programme approaches. They may decide to phase out some sites in the second half of the next phase and instead include new sites as pilots for future operations. The sites, though geographically distinct, are all rather remote rural forested IBAs with high biodiversity values. IBAs are identified by using internationally agreed, standardized and objective scientific criteria applied by local and international experts. It is a recognized practical tool and site-based integrated approach for conservation and sustainable use of the natural environment by the local people living in and around the IBAs. Kenya, Uganda and Nepal have all been through vigorous IBA-identification processes for a number of years, and new IBAs are still being identified. Last year IUCN adapted the KBA (Key Biodiversity Areas) system. Almost all existing IBAs are also KBAs but to which extent the KBA terminology will replace IBAs is still undecided. It is not expected to affect the Programme. The BirdLife IBA Programme continues to be relevant, both for the selection of sites, IBA monitoring and local engagement through Local Conservation Groups (LCGs)⁵.

Brief introduction to the partner countries⁶:

Kenya covers an area of 581,309 km² and has a population of 48.5 million and a population growth rate of 2.6%^[4]. It is an ethnically diverse country with estimated 42 different ethnic groups. Its GNI^[5] is 1.455 USD, its HDI^[6] ranks as 146 and its GII^[7] as 135. The unsustainable use of natural resources threatens the livelihoods of local communities. Land degradation, land use conflicts, depletion of water catchment areas and loss of biodiversity are some of the consequences. Kenya currently has 67 IBAs covering 10% of the land area, including 22 forests. Only 58% are protected while the rest are severely threatened. The Programme is currently being implemented in Arabuko-Sokoke Forest, Dakatcha Woodland, and Taita Hills. At all three sites, over 60% of local people are poor and the sites continue to be threatened by poverty linked unsustainable harvesting of forest products exacerbated by policy failures and relatively low institutional capacity of both government and civil society⁷. The reason to continue work at the three sites is that there are challenges which could not be fully addressed in Phase I. Poverty and forest loss continue and local duty bearers are not yet fully engaged in joint forest management; IGAs exist but the scale of benefits and scope is limited; the LCGs have little advocacy capacity and policies and strategic frameworks still need to be implemented. Phase II will focus on up scaling, gap filling and consolidation of the IGAs, target group forest management and business development capacities towards sustainability.

⁵ <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/programmes/sites-habitats-ibas-and-kbas> and <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/programmes/local-engagement-and-empowerment>

⁶ See Annex O.4 for more details on sites

^[4] UNDP Human Development Report 2016

^[5] GNI: Gross National Income per capita

^[6] HDI: Human Development Index measuring average achievement in a long and healthy life, knowledge and a decent standard of living

^[7] GII: Gender Inequality Index reflecting inequality in reproductive health, empowerment and the labour market

Kenya has thousands of NGOs involved in all sectors of national development, notably in education, health, the environment and women empowerment. Civil society plays a key role in Kenya's poverty alleviation and climate change part of the Vision 2030 strategy. The broadened definition of civil societies in Kenya are organizations registered under Part III of the Non-Governmental Organizations Coordination Act, 1990, Trusts under the Ministry of Lands, and Community Based Organizations under the Ministry of Social Services. Companies Act, Cooperatives Act, Market Associations, and Faith Based Organizations are registered under the Societies Act. This sector is diverse and cannot be lumped into one form of structure. With this background, there is observed overlap on activity implementation by institutions. To avoid conflict and overlaps, nature conservation CSOs/NGOs recently joined efforts under the Conservation Alliance of Kenya to be able to unify advocacy and lobbying efforts in conservation to the Government though faced with challenges mainly from competing Government interests, infrastructure development, and lack of adequate resource allocation from the exchequer. See Annex O.3 for a list of some national and local LCGs that may be instrumental in the Phase II implementation during which Nature Kenya will work to involve them in advocacy.

Uganda covers an area of 236,040 km² and has a population of 41.5 million and a population growth rate of 3.1%. It has more than 40 ethnic groups. Uganda's GNI is 615 USD, its HDI ranks as 163 and its GII as 121. Uganda has 34 IBAs, 22 within the national protected areas system. Although the general population living below the poverty line has decreased country-wide, little change has occurred among remote communities. They have developed an intricate dependence on forest resources, managing forest-related costs against the benefits such as wood energy, construction material, medicine, farming, livestock grazing, fisheries and hunting. Deterioration of natural resources has been found to have a net negative effect on their well-being as it tends to exacerbate the costs while reducing the benefit. Conversely, increased poverty also tends to lead to increased natural resource degradation. Implementation will continue in Echuya Central Forest Reserve. This site will probably be phased out during Phase II. The focus is on consolidating partnerships, strengthening exit strategies and testing self-reliance of the CFM associations, financing mechanisms and advocacy nodes initiated in the first phase. This would allow more funds to be used to double the number of CFM associations at the second site Kasyoha-Kitomi to four and thereby increasing coverage geographically. There are many lessons from Echuya CFR that will be beneficial to Kasyoha-Kitomi. In conservation terms, the two CFRs remain relevant to the Programme focus and they have similar community interests.

Uganda's legal framework generally provides sufficient space for the formation and free operation of CSOs, although, the practicality of this is in some cases limited. CSOs in Uganda are a group of registered NGOs that come together for a common cause, which is usually linked to human rights, social justice or policy advocacy. The National Civil Societies in Uganda relevant to this Programme include the United Organization for Batwa Development in Uganda, Collaborative Forest Management Associations, the International Gorilla Conservation Programme, the Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation, the Albertine Rift Conservation Society, the Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation Trust and Uplift the Rural Poor, the Wetlands Advisory Group, Uganda Poverty and Conservation Learning Group, the Civil Society Coalition on Oil and Gas, the Environment and Natural Resources Civil Society Organisation Network, the Uganda Forest Governance Learning Group, the Technical Committee on Biodiversity Management, the Uganda Policy Committee on Climate Change, and the Technical Committee on REDD+. CSOs in Uganda generally operate under the 1995 Constitution of Uganda, which provides guarantees to the right of association and recognizes the existence and role of civil society organizations under Article 29(1) (provides that "the freedom of association which shall include the freedom to form and join associations or unions, including trade unions and political and other civic organizations") and Article 38(2) (that provides that "every Ugandan has a right to participate in peaceful activities to influence the policies of Government through civic organizations"). However, all CSO members must be registered under the NGO registration (Amendment) Bill 2000 (Now the NGO Act 2016; Article 29 (i)). The constricted

political environment in Uganda means that CSO activities and potency are necessarily limited to matters outside the explicit political arena and the arena of formal democracy. The majority of CSOs in the country are dependent on external donor funding and the interests of donors often determine their objectives and causes. See Annex O.3 for list of CSOs with relevance for PPN.

Nepal covers an area of 147,181 km² and has a population of 29 million and a population growth rate of 1.7%. It has 102 enumerated castes and ethnic groups. Its GNI is 729 USD in, its HDI ranks as 144 and its GII as 115. The forested areas in Nepal covers nearly 40% but many of them are depleted and biodiversity severely threatened, primarily due to population pressure, overuse, firewood collection, development interventions, illegal activities, and climate change. Especially in the hilly and mountainous areas a healthy forest cover is of vital importance for preventing erosion. Community forestry has had positive impacts on the forests but still needs to be further evolved and to increase equity of benefits⁸. Nepal now has 36 IBAs covering about 28% of the land area and 6 potential IBAs. The Programme will be implemented at two sites, Reshunga Forest and Madane Forest⁹. Madane has status of Protected Forest and can serve as inspiration to Reshunga which is in the process of receiving the same status.

Civil society is regulated by the Association Registration Act 1977. Many civil society organisations, including BCN, are required to register with the Social Welfare Council. There are 46,235 NGOs affiliated with the SWC according to its latest record. All the national level NGOs have to be registered with SWC and the District Office and annually renew the registration. All the new funding sources for projects need to be approved by the SWC after signing of the contract with the donor. Organisations like WWF Nepal, IUCN Nepal, ICIMOD, and the National Trust for Nature Conservation are key players in biodiversity conservation whereas organizations like Forest Action, Rural Reconstruction Nepal, Care Nepal, and FECOFUN are more concerned with social and development issues. BCN has been working with local civil society groups in many of Nepal's IBAs. In some places, these are CFUGs actively joining hand with BCN. CFUGs are bound by forest laws. Though other local CSOs can have diverse objectives BCN has brought them together with forest user groups as local conservation groups (LCGs). As the attached table in Annex O.3 shows the majority of the LCGs at the PPN sites have medium capacity meaning that they are well established democratic groups who are still in need of organizational support but likely to become strong independent groups in the next phase.

2.3. Sector context

Through its focus on the Forest Sector the PPN Programme directly contributes to the SDG target 15.2 *'By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally'* and its indicator 15.2.1 *'Progress towards sustainable forest management'*.

According to FAO's *Global Forest Resources Assessment (2015)* forest management have changed substantially over the past 25 years and there have been positive developments. Globally, though the extent of the world's forests continues to decline from 31.6 percent of global land area in 1990 to 30.6 percent in 2015 as human populations continue to grow and demand for food and land increases, the rate of net forest loss has been cut by over 50 percent. At the same time, the attention paid to sustainable forest management has never been higher. Apart from the Forest Sector and as part of its approach to sustainable forest management PPN engages with other sectors, especially those concerned with social issues, agriculture, water, climate, and the

⁸ The CARE report *Forests for all. A Question of Rights and Equity* concludes that gender and social status play an important role in forest management. A field study from Nepal shows that especially low caste and Dalit people have a tendency to be absent from the executive committees in the CFUGs, when equitable sharing of decisions and benefits is not part of the structure. The same is often the case with women.

⁹ See Annex O.4 for a brief description

wider environment. Engaging multiple stakeholders in forest management is a means to integrating forest management, environmental, social, economic, governance and democratic concerns. The Programme has from the outset worked within national forest laws and regulations and fully use these to guide the application of forest management at IBAs with key stakeholders, mainly the District/County forest offices and LCGs. During the next phase partners will follow up on the Rev/App's recommendation to offer more opportunities for capacity building of forest officers, locally, nationally and possibly regionally. The Forest Sector in the partner countries is described in some detail because it is important for the context in which PPN operates.

Kenya's Forest Sector

Key government institutions with direct mandate in forest management with which Nature Kenya will continue to collaborate include the County Governments in Kilifi and Taita Taveta, Kenya Forest Service, Kenya Wildlife Service, the Forest Research Institute, National Museums of Kenya sparring on biodiversity research and monitoring, the National Environment Management (authority for environmental coordination and safeguards) and the Department for Resource Surveys and Remote Sensing for natural resource monitoring and mapping. While significant progress was made in the first phase to catalyze counties to engage in participatory forest management working closely with responsible agencies and local communities, significant ground remains uncovered to mainstream local communities and forest goods and services into all sectors of the county economies (including agriculture, energy and water) and decision making. In Phase II, Nature Kenya will work for more inclusion of other sectors including agriculture, energy, water and various private sector actors. Sustainable finance for the initiatives has not been a focus in Phase I. Efforts will be made to build the capacity of local civil society groups to enhance their resource mobilization from Government, private sector and institutional donors.

About 7% of Kenya's land area is forested and only 2.6% is closed forest cover. Around 1.6 million ha of land are gazetted as forest reserves, 1.06 million ha of these are indigenous closed canopy forests and 0.16 million ha exotic plantations. Another 0.18 million ha of indigenous forest cover is found outside gazetted areas. The Kenya Forest Master Plan of 1995 lists some 255 separate forest reserves, 52 of which are not yet gazetted. These forests provide goods and services such as wildlife habitats, biological diversity, water catchments, employment opportunities and livelihood resources. Forests and trees play multiple functions in contributing to the livelihoods of communities, especially women and marginal groups, in supplying food and rural energy. However, the forests are threatened with agricultural expansion, over-exploitation and unsustainable use of forest resources. Population increase and widespread youth unemployment have led to increased pressure on forest resources. The average annual depletion of forest cover appears to be about 1%, with the highest rates occurring in forests near or in high potential agricultural lands. The conservation and management of forests is viewed in the context of social and economic development, whose targets are embedded in Kenya's economic blueprint, the Vision 2030 as well as in the Constitution. To guide the Forest Sector's coordination and spur sustainable forest management, Kenya has developed the National Forest Programme (NFP) for 2016-2030. The NFP is a strategic framework for forest policy, planning and implementation to coordinate the Sector's development. The NFP is designed to sustain and restore the resilience of forests in the country by ensuring that forests are able to withstand and recover from climate-related stresses and disturbances such as droughts, wildfires, and epidemics of insects and diseases while adhering to the principles of sustainable forest management. Sustainable forest management will ensure that benefits derived from forests meet current needs and still contribute to the requirements for long-term development. In view of this, investing in forestry research is critical in the development of appropriate technologies and in supporting innovations. Although the Forest Sector contributes only a small amount to the formal economy its unrecorded value in the informal and subsistence sector is great. Over 80% of the national energy supply is met from fuel wood. Forests contribute 3.6% to the GDP excluding environmental services and contributions to other sectors. Current wood deficit is projected to increase from 10 million m³ to at least 15 million m³ per year by 2030. The private sector including tree farmers, communities and

medium- and large-scale investors provide 90% of the wood supply. Forest-related enterprises and industries provide employment to over 60,000 people. The total commercial role of forests in the economy is far larger than this, taking into account value-added, unrecorded and informal sector activity. The principle that all people have the right to benefit equally from the use of natural resources and equal entitlement to a clean and healthy environment is enshrined in the Kenya Constitution of 2010. The enabling policies and legislative, institutional framework for participatory natural resources management include the Kenya Constitution, the Forest Act 2016, the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act 2013, the Environmental Management and Coordination Act 2012, the Energy Act 2006, the Water Act 2016 and the Land Policy 2009. The Environmental Management and Coordination Act protects traditional interests. The Forest Act and the Wildlife Act objectives include sustainable natural resources management for socio-economic development, poverty reduction, employment creation and improvement of livelihoods within a framework where all stakeholders ensure the sustainability of wildlife and the Forest Sector. The Forest Act allows members of a community resident around a forest area to register a Community Forest Association (CFAs) that can protect, conserve, and manage forests and formulate and implement forest programmes consistent with traditional user rights. The latter is the incentive around which the participatory forest management centers seen from the perspective of the forest adjacent communities reliant on forest resources.

Over half a million households, or about 10% of the population, living within 5 km of indigenous forests, depend on the direct use of forest resources, including timber and Non Timber Forest Products (NTFP). Both official regulations and illegal encroachment into forests for agriculture and settlement constitute a major and perhaps the most severe threat to indigenous forest status and integrity. Participatory forest management in Kenya predates the enactment of the Forest Act. In 1993, Nature Kenya piloted community engagement in Arabuko-Sokoke Forest through butterfly farming. This received written government consent to pilot participatory forest management in the forest in 2000 backed by a management plan in consultation with CSGs. Nature Kenya together with Kenya Forest Research Institute helped the Kenya Forest Service in the development of guidelines on participatory forest management. After the enactment of the Forest Act 2005 (revised 2016), Nature Kenya and the Forest Research Institute together with Kenya Forest Services have used the legal frameworks to extend participatory management to other forests. However, success requires devolution of forest management powers, capacity building of community forestry associations and other stakeholders. The challenge is to push for County policies to enable counties to implement their mandate on sustainable forest management including allowing civil society participation in decision-making.

Uganda's Forest Sector

In Phase I *NatureUganda* concentrated on setting up structures, namely organising and building capacity of six CFM associations in two sites, supporting prioritised income generating activities including those targeting only women, setting up forest health monitoring systems and building capacity of communities to apply them. Additionally, the Programme initiated advocacy activities through the CFM associations that targeted to influence both the district local government and the central government's actions and decisions, a role which has seen the CFM groups linked to the Uganda Network of Collaborative Forest Associations (UNETCOFA), an umbrella network for Collaborative Forest Management for individual and sub-regional networks of CFM Associations that are constituted of local level CFM groups. All these are good building blocks for Phase II during which these focal areas will be consolidated.

In Uganda forests cover 3,604,176 ha, of which 17% consists of Central Forest Reserves managed by the National Forestry Authority, 18% of National Parks and Wildlife Reserves managed by Uganda Wildlife Authority, 0.85% jointly managed by the two together, and 0.03% local forest reserves managed by local governments. The rest of the forests (64%) are on private and communal lands, and managed by private and local community forest owners. The Uganda Forestry Policy

2001 provides direction to the Forest Sector developments through specific forestry policy statements. It recognises the importance of the sustainable management of forests on private land, in gazetted areas, and within urban areas for the provision of goods and services. However, the forest cover has continued to deteriorate. Within a period of 15 years from 1990, the forest cover reduced by approximately 1.3 million ha, representing an average annual deforestation rate of 1.8%. The rate of deforestation in Central Forest Reserves was 1.1%. Unsatisfactory forest law enforcement and governance, and institutional failures have been the major causes for the poor performance of the Sector. Forests and trees contribute to the national economy in various ways. The Forestry Policy 2001 estimated the contribution of forests to the GDP to be 6%. In 2004, the annual contribution of forests to household cash income was estimated at 11-27%, and the contribution to ecosystem services at USD 110 million. According to the Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 92% of Uganda's energy needs are met from woody biomass, with rural households consuming about 97% of the household energy requirements. 34.4 million tons of round wood worth USD 130 million were used in construction work in 2007.

Inadequate policies to integrate rural populations in forest management and benefit sharing were found to be a major driver for natural resource degradation and the ensuing poverty. The by-product of this cycle is that basic livelihood strategies of local communities have evolved with heavy reliance on natural resources mainly forests. In order to address poverty especially among the rural populations who often live adjacent to forests, the Forest Sector in the Ministry of Water and Environment reviewed its policies and developed a National Forest Policy in 2001. The Policy proposed reform in the central and local governments' roles with a view that more forest resources should be managed through devolving responsibility to District Local Governments, the private sector and local communities. This was followed by the National Forest and Tree Planting Act 2003, which provides for the conservation, sustainable management and development of forests for the benefit of the people. The law provides for the declaration of forest reserves for purposes of protection and production of forests and forest produce, for the sustainable use of forests resources and the enhancement of the productive capacity of forests. The same year, the Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) Guidelines were approved. These stipulate the manner in which to engage in collaborative forest management between the National Forest Authority (NFA), the responsible government agency, and local communities through CFM groups. The most recent legislation of relevance is the National Forestry Plan 2012, which is a sector-wide national instrument for managing and utilising the forestry resources in Uganda. Since the first plan was developed in 2002, there have only been a few attempts across the country to implement policy approaches to integrate rural populations in forest management, including Echuya and Kasyoha-Kitomi.

Currently, Uganda is developing a Forest Investment Plan, which is part of the overall REDD+ process. The proposed activities will contribute to the overall policy goal of the National Forest Policy, i.e. an integrated forest sector that achieves sustainable increases in the economic, social and environmental benefits from forests and trees by all the people of Uganda. Forests in Uganda are divided broadly into Central and Local Forest Reserves. All Central Forest Reserve are managed centrally by the NFA whereas Local Forest Reserves are managed by District Local Governments under District Forest Services. Echuya and Kasyoha-Kitomi are thus under the jurisdiction of the NFA. Both levels will be main collaborators in the Programme, i.e. centrally through the lead agency, the NFA as well as District Local Governments. The Forest Sector Support Department whose role is to oversee Forest Sector development and the National Forest Resources Research Institute play a part at the national level, while Uganda Wildlife Authority is a major partner at both sites as the national lead agency responsible for wildlife management. The National Environment Management Authority provides necessary oversight and input into income generating activities at community level as well as restoration of degraded landscapes. At District level, the Community Development Offices, the District Agricultural Office and District Natural Resources office are also key collaborators. Lastly, District NGO fora bring together all NGOs in the District for knowledge and information exchange.

Nepal's Forest Sector

In Phase I BCN has worked with CFUGs in revising the operational plans of community forest user groups to intervene on making the biodiversity conservation and participatory forest management component stronger. In addition to this piloting is also ongoing on mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services in community forestry. Also small scale forest based enterprise have been started for the communities and good relations built with the local District Forest Office (DFO) in Gulmi District in Western Nepal.

There is a close relationship between agriculture and the Forestry Sector that contributes hugely to Nepal's principal economic activities, employing about 80% of the population and contributing 33.1% to the total GDP¹⁰. At the national level, 28% of all household income comes from these Sectors. It is estimated that the Forestry Sector alone contributes 15% to the GDP of the country (MoFSC 2009). Similarly, NTFPs contribute about 5% of GDP. Tourism, much of which is nature-based provides about 2% of the total GDP and about 25% of the total foreign exchange earnings (MoFSC 2010). The Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation (MoFSC) is the main governing body for the Forestry Sector. Under this Ministry there are two main departments directly related with forest management, the Department of National Parks & Wildlife Conservation and the Department of Forests. Forests inside the protected areas are under the jurisdiction of the first; forests outside under the latter. Nepal has a well-defined policy and legal framework for the Forestry Sector guided by the Master Plan for the Forestry Sector 1989 and periodic national plans. The Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation is responsible for a number of relevant policies including the revised Forest Policy 2014, the revised Community Forestry Development Programme Guideline from 2014, the Leasehold Forestry Policy Guidelines 2003, the Herbs and NTFP Development Policy 2004, and the Gender and Social Inclusion Strategy in the Forestry Sector 2004–2019.

The Forest Act 1993 supports the handover of national forest to adjoining Forest User Groups (FUGs) which are empowered to manage parts of the forest estate. More than 18,000 FUGs have been established to date, the majority belonging to the Federation of Community Forestry Users (FECOFUN), which acts as a conduit for local communities to input into policy processes. Since its inception in July 1995 FECOFUN has grown into a social movement organization with about 8.5 million people represented, all of whom are forest users. The membership is categorized into two types according to user group involvement in natural resource management and user rights. FUGs organized under the Forest Act 1993 are eligible to become general members of this federation and any other user group based on forest resources at grassroots level are qualified to become elementary member. Of more than 18,000 Community Forestry Users Groups and other Community Based Forest Management Groups (such as leasehold forestry groups, religious forestry groups, buffer zone and traditional forest management groups) approximately 13,000 are affiliated with FECOFUN. FECOFUN is supported by thousands of volunteers and community forestry facilitators as well as by several national and international organisations. Community forestry has been successful in restoring degraded land and greenery, increasing and conserving biodiversity and the supply of forest products, empowering rural women, poor and disadvantaged groups, promoting income generation and community development activities; and in improving livelihoods of people in rural areas.

Nepal is also engaged in REDD+ activities which will enhance its efforts to reduce deforestation and degradation, and encourage forest restoration. Protected Areas have remained the dominant approach to biodiversity conservation. Currently, they cover 23.23% of Nepal's total area. The National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 1973 and the Buffer Zone Management Regulation 1996 are the legal tools for Protected Area declaration and management. For Protected Areas with buffer zones, 30–50% of the total income is shared with local communities to implement community development activities. Altogether, 13 buffer zones have been declared so far, embracing over 80

Village Development Committees (VDC) in 30 districts with over 700,000 people. Communities adjacent to protected areas benefit directly from the services flowing from the habitats. However, they often also bear the costs of restricted access to forest resources. A challenge for protected areas managers is therefore to balance requirements to conserve biodiversity, with the wider benefits of the site and the immediate needs of the local community. Forests outside protected areas fall under six main types of management arrangements: community, collaborative, leasehold, religious, protection, and Government. Except for Government-managed forests, there are different levels of community involvement. Since 2002, the Government has taken the initiative to manage natural forests with high biodiversity value as protection forests. Private forests and trees grown in farmland are contributing to the conservation of biodiversity by minimizing pressures on national forests. The Director General of the Department of Forestry is responsible for the overall forest administration of both national and private forests. The Department extends its services through four administrative levels. At its Headquarters it has functional divisions for planning and monitoring Community Forests and National Forests. There are 74 District Forest Offices responsible for field level implementation of forest programmes. Nepal's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) includes the objective: 'By 2020, all community managed forests to include a biodiversity chapter in their management or Operational Plan and respective user groups to effectively implement those plans'. The NBSAP also recognises that civil society can make a significant contribution to biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation, whilst contributing to health, livelihoods and wellbeing.

3. Partners

3.1. Core Partners

DOF implements the PPN Programme with three national BirdLife Partners: BCN, Nature Kenya and Nature Uganda, all of them with a long association with BirdLife. The CISU Rev/App concluded after the consultant's meeting with Nature Kenya and *Nature Uganda* that they are 'relatively strong organisations with a long history of working with conservation and people' and 'a commitment to support local communities in sustainable livelihoods'. They are 'well respected and have a central position in their respective countries when it comes to conservation and its integration with poverty reduction, rights of people and sustainable development'. The consultant did not meet BCN but had a skype meeting with its CEO and the Head of Programmes. He assessed BCN's capacity to be 'relatively strong' and the organisation as being 'recognised as an organisation that works with the integration of conservation and sustainable development and is relatively well positioned in the national processes related to participatory forest management'. BCN became a full Partner of BirdLife in 2017.

Nature Kenya¹¹ is Africa's oldest science and conservation society founded in 1909 and based in Nairobi. It is a legally constituted membership-based NGO with a membership of over 1000. It has 43 employees, comprised of 22 full-time and 21 project contract employees. The mission of Nature Kenya is connecting nature and people for a sustainable future. The organisation is actively supporting and encouraging community participation in conservation through promotion of sustainable benefits, building a strong constituency for conservation across the country, enhancing knowledge of Kenya's biodiversity sites, advocating policies favourable to biodiversity conservation, and promoting conservation of key species, sites, and habitats. Main activities are capacity building of grass root organizations and local communities to take charge of conservation activities at 67 IBAs of global conservation importance. The Site Support Groups (SSGs) are site based civil society groups with whom Nature Kenya work collaboratively with a wide array of Government agencies and conservation and development organisations. Nature Kenya connects SSGs with Government and other site actors including Community Forest Associations and Water Resource Users Associations to enhance their effectiveness in conservation and development. Nature Kenya has developed resource centres that deliver environmental education to youth taking advantage of SSGs' presence at focus sites and has implemented more than 35 projects in the past 5 years. These have focused

¹¹ www.naturekenya.org

on nature conservation through participatory and sustainable management of resources, thereby integrating development and environmental concerns. DOF has worked with Nature Kenya since 2003.

NatureUganda¹² is the East Africa Natural History Society in Uganda. It primarily works in priority biodiversity areas such as IBAs with different stakeholders ranging from local people to local governments and central government. The activities of the organisation have diversified over the years to include sustainable community based natural resource management, management of species, sites and habitats, identification of areas important for conservation, biodiversity monitoring and development of site or species specific action plans to focused conservation work. It is a membership organisation with over 3000 registered members, the biggest membership organization in Uganda. The organisation operates four branches across Uganda in order to better service its members. Members are engaged in various activities including public awareness through nature-walks and public-talks depending on their interests and expertise and participate in research and conservation through established specialised Working Groups focusing on various taxonomic groups, and a children's education programme called Young Explorers Club. The main goal of NU is to support biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management while contributing to improvement of livelihoods in communities in and around IBAs. The mission is to promote the understanding, appreciation and conservation of nature. It is a registered NGO with 30 employees, based at the Secretariat in Kampala and in the field offices. The engagement in projects and programmes together with DOF has helped NU work closely with District Local Governments, the National Forest Authority and Collaborative Forest Management Associations. This has resulted in improved working relationship leading to improved adherence to the rules and regulations of CFM plans and agreements. DOF has worked with NU since 2010.

Bird Conservation Nepal (BCN)¹³ was established in 1982. It is the leading organisation in Nepal, focusing on the conservation of birds, their habitats and sites, while benefitting people. BCN started its programme implementation fully in 1996 and is legally registered with the Social Welfare Council and District Civil Administration. BCN being a membership based organisation currently has around 1000 plus members and employs around 25 staff. There are around 60 Local Conservation Groups supporting the organisation's various activities around IBAs. It has as its guiding principles conservation of birds, their habitats and biodiversity, people's participation in conservation and benefitting the people themselves, institutional learning and building national and international networks to increase effectiveness in bird and biodiversity conservation. BCN implements several projects with a number of donors, for example in cooperation with BirdLife Norway and funded by the Norwegian development agency NORAD a project at three IBA sites with focus on sustainable management of natural resources and a Darwin Initiative, UK funded project on Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in Community Forestry. BCN became a full partner of BirdLife in 2017. DOF has worked with BCN since 2014.

3.2 BirdLife International

BirdLife¹⁴ is a large international Partnership of now 122 nature conservation organisations. Bhutan's Royal Society for the Protection of Nature (RSPBN) has just become a new Partner. According to BirdLife rules supporting Partners (such as DOF) must work together for implementation of interventions with a national BirdLife Partner. Partnership is obtained based on a number of criteria and Partners are subject to a regular quality assurance process (QAS). The BirdLife Global Secretariat is based in Cambridge in England and has 6 regional offices around the world, including in Singapore and Nairobi. BirdLife's has a Board, a Global Council with elected representations from

¹² www.natureuganda.org

¹³ www.birdlifenepal.org

¹⁴ www.birdlife.org

all the six regions¹⁵, an Executive Team and Regional Directors in addition to qualified staff. It has nine Programmes, including the IBA, Climate, Local Engagement and Empowerment and Forests of Hope Programmes which are implemented with Partners around the world. On its webpage BirdLife has country profiles, data zones for IBAs and other thematic areas, case studies and other resources.

DOF strives to ensure that the Programme's and BirdLife's overall strategic approaches and policies are complementary and to build on the capacity and resources within BirdLife, e.g. through partners' participation in regional BirdLife partnerships meetings, Supporting Partners meetings, the World Congress, trainings and other events¹⁶. DOF's engagement with the BirdLife Secretariat has been considerably strengthened during Phase I. Through the CAMB Project DOF has built close relations with especially the Policy Team on developing training materials and preparing training workshops and there have been several mutual visits. Since December 2016 the DOF anthropologist has contributed part time to the Local Engagement and Empowerment Programme (LEEP) and the capacity building team (PCCD). DOF also cooperates with BirdLife on campaigns and project ideas through its Fundraising Team. In Nepal DOF has cooperated with the Darwin funded project managed by BLI which has as its main objective to mainstream biodiversity within the Forest Sector. The Project is being piloted at several sites in Nepal, including in Reshunga. In Nepal DOF, BirdLife and the UK based Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)¹⁷ and to some extent the Norwegian Partner NOF have regular meetings and try to coordinate activities and inputs where feasible. This cooperation will continue into the next phase, provided the other partners continue to have funding. It was originally planned that the Programme have some cooperation with RSPB. This has not happened, except in Nepal due to staff changes and new priorities in RSPB.

4. Programme objectives

4.1 Development Objective

The overall Development Objective of the Programme is to '*Reduce the destruction of forested IBAs and contribute to the realisation of best participatory forest management practices for the benefit of all*'. Reaching this goal is a long term process that will continue to guide the PPN Programme as recommended by the Rev/App. The long-term objective refers to a process to improve and qualify the management of natural resources, especially forested IBAs, on which local livelihoods depend for food, fuel, etc. and for critical ecosystem services, such as water, soil conservation and reduced vulnerability to natural disasters such as landslides, and climate changes. It builds on the assumption that best practices within participatory forest management based on the genuine involvement of local women and men, government, civil society and other key stakeholders will contribute to improved livelihoods of local communities by securing access to natural resources and ecosystem services. The focus is on equitably shared benefits from participatory management practices addressing the needs of poor and marginalised people, strengthening of civil society and mainstreaming biodiversity concerns into forest management practices.

4.2. Immediate Objectives and Indicators

The Rev/App confirmed the opinion of the PMC that the three Immediate Programme Objectives continue to be valid and relevant in the second phase. The wording of Objective I and III have only been slightly changed in order to better capture the Programme focus in Phase II.

The Immediate Objectives are:

1. *Programme partners have capacity to work strategically with sustainable forest management and upscale learning*

¹⁵ Achilles Byahunga, CEO of Nature Uganda, is currently a Council member

¹⁶ The World Congress was originally planned to take place in Singapore in October 2017 but was postponed till 2018. Date and venue are not yet made public. PPN Programme partners will if feasible participate in the congress.

¹⁷ RSPB was founded in 1889 and has more than a million members. It is based in Bedfordshire in England.

2. *Participatory forest management contributes to improved livelihoods of poor communities, and reduce pressure on ecosystems and biodiversity*
3. *LCGs have capacity and popular mandate to act as independent democratic organisations for the benefit of their communities and biodiversity*

Outcomes and indicators

Outcomes	Indicators
<i>For Objective 1</i>	
Partner cooperation and lessons sharing of PFM strengthened within BirdLife	Through concrete activities partners share experiences and challenges and coordinate with similar programmes
Partners develop and upscale model for PFM	Guidelines produced based on shared experiences and studies of PFM within the Programme
Partners strongly engaged in advocacy for the integration of human well-being and biodiversity conservation	Partners participate in important national fora for mainstreaming biodiversity and CBD processes
<i>For Objective 2</i>	
Government stakeholders take responsibility for improved forest management	Revised forest management plans agreed, adhered to and implemented
Local beneficiaries experience better livelihoods as a result of improved forest management practices	Studies and participatory monitoring show that beneficiaries experience livelihood improvements and increased well-being
Biodiversity values in selected IBAs maintained and ideally improved	Regular IBA monitoring reports and studies
<i>For Objective 3</i>	
LCGs able to influence governmental decision making processes and the implementation of participatory forest management plans	Local and national Government stakeholders engage actively with LCGs, e.g. by inviting them to meetings
LCGs act as voices for sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation in their community and at District/County and national level networks	LCGs widely recognized in communities and by other stakeholders as main local actors in sustainable forest management
LCGs show capacity to advocate for community engagement in sustainable forest management	LCGs influence local Government policies on forest management

5. Overall Strategy of the Programme

5.1 Overall Programme approach

The Rev/App found that the Programme's strategic approach continues to be valid and recommends to 'build on the same strategic approach and continue with the current objectives...while ensuring added focus on replication, national scale-up and advocacy'. The approach is based on the concept of sustainable development integrating environmental, social and economic factors. It addresses many of the SDGs (signed by all partner countries), directly or indirectly especially those related to

natural resources (Life on Land), poverty, equity, and gender equality but also several others including climate change, and sustainable communities¹⁸. Its main concern is to develop a model for forest management that is successful in integrating these, thus contributing to sustainability¹⁹.

The Programme's strategic approach is centered around sustainable and participatory forest management. The term 'participatory forest management' (PFM) covers various approaches around the world that have proven to be successful in involving local people in managing and thus reducing pressure on forests by allowing them to participate in decisions that influence their well-being and livelihoods and benefit them economically. Advocacy is closely linked to the Programme's forest management goals, while the strengthening of local civil society groups (LCGs) is both, a goal in its own right and a means to improve local livelihoods for the needy, better manage ecosystems, and carry out advocacy, especially at local and decentralised levels. The Programme has in its first phase supported LCGs in having a stronger voice in forest management and conservation, forest management plans have been revised and good relations established between partners and the Forest Sector in all three countries.

The Programme is feeding into at least two of BirdLife's strategic pillars of the 2013-2020 BirdLife Strategy, namely local empowerment and capacity development. It is informed by BirdLife's strategic priorities (e.g. working in and outside IBAs), host country development plans, National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans²⁰, and the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society (2014). It is further guided by the Rio+20 agreements on the SDGs and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its 2020 goals. It supports the ambitious goal 4 of the New York Declaration on Forests (2014) to support 'alternatives to deforestation driven by basic needs in ways that alleviate poverty and promote sustainable and equitable development' and goal 10 'Strengthen forest governance, transparency, and the rule of law, while also empowering communities and recognizing the rights of indigenous peoples'. During the first phase site based support focused on improving the livelihoods of local people through support to income generation and skills training. Poverty reduction is one of the Sustainable Development Goals and one of the main concerns of Danish development cooperation. The Programme will continue to strengthen partners' capacity to work with livelihoods, social safeguards, gender, engagement of women, and the rights of indigenous peoples. It will also continue to support local people's genuine and equal participation, mainly through support to civil society. The Programme approach is in line with national policies and laws that have provisions for institutional arrangements with clear guiding principles of participatory forest management. It will enable national stakeholders, both civil society and collaborating Government agencies to support participatory natural resources management by and for local natural resources rights holders recognising their rights to sustainable living through freedom of participation in decision making. It will target national partners who will be the conduits of change at national and regional Government levels to create the enabling environment for local civil society. It builds capacity of LCGs so that they can act as agents of change to promote site based participatory forest management and collaborations among local civil society actors including forest associations, women groups, forest user groups and local Government authorities. It will enhance the ability of the national BirdLife partners to catalyse national policy making and implementation of participatory forest management objectives beyond just the target sites.

As confirmed by the Rev/App PPN contributes to the change triangle by combining capacity, strategic services and advocacy as mandatory for achieving its goals. It has provided an excellent opportunity to further integrate these based on shared lessons and with a long-term focus on

¹⁸ PPN mainly contributes to Goal 15 but also to the Goals 1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 13 and 16

¹⁹ An in-depth analysis has not been carried out on the PPN contribution to the SDGs but will be done in the next phase. It will refer to the approach that is being developed by BirdLife and other partners in the Cambridge Conservation Initiative (CCI) specifically on conservation and the SDGs.

²⁰ BirdLife Strategy 2013-2020; *Listening to Local Voices. Livelihoods and the Environment at IBAs, Building Partnerships for Conservation and Development; Good for Nature, Good for People, Key lessons learned from BI's Improving Livelihoods Projects in Africa, Empowering the Grassroots, BirdLife, Participation and Local Communities*, and other Birdlife publications

enhancing civil society's capacity to facilitate and advocate for social accountability in delivery of Government services and local initiatives.

Though no full Theory of Change (TOC) process was carried out with partners²¹ – this will be done during a planned monitoring and evaluation workshop in January for the national planning processes – the thinking of the Programme is change oriented. This is exemplified by the Results Framework and the TOC Diagram in Annex A. In simple terms the PMC assumes that the three Programme objectives are preconditions for achieving the Development Goal. For capacity of partners to translate into forest protection it is assumed that partners must significantly scale up in order to show the effectiveness of the PPN model, for forest management planning to become influential it must translate into implementation and for this to be successful it is necessary to engage all important stakeholders, including the LCGs. Similarly the outcomes, outputs and activities are assumed to be important steps for reaching the objectives, each of which demands a certain level of inputs and methodological steps.

Overall the Development Objective of the Programme is to ensure the long-term protection of biodiversity based on the participatory management of forested IBAs. Mutual knowledge sharing about the value of ecosystems and the laws governing community participation in forest management is a precondition for true involvement. One of the main activities of the Programme will therefore continue to be to strengthen and support local capacity for advocacy, environmental education, public awareness, use of local knowledge and other approaches to inform and involve the people. The aim is both, to strengthen local capacity and local people's knowledge and ownership and to involve a substantial part of the local people, including youths and children, as well as authorities and other stakeholders. Moving a step up from community level the District or County levels will be another important area of engagement, especially for support to civil society to engage with Government and other stakeholders, including civil society networks (e.g. in Nepal FECOFUN at District level). Programme partners strive to encourage equal opportunity for meaningful participation by strengthening a bottom up approach to decision making, influencing the top down delivery of services, and building consensus for priority areas in sustainable livelihood improvement and conservation.

The second phase of the Programme will have a duration of 4 years but with a lower annual budget than in Phase I. This requires that some activities are phased out or change character to be less resource demanding. It is thus not foreseen to extend the number of IGAs. At the same time partners want to scale up and extend the chosen participatory forest management model to more sites and stakeholders. The Programme will slightly shift its focus after the first two years. The first two years will mainly be used to consolidate, further build capacity of LCGs, communities etc. while the last two will focus on phasing out, building exit strategies and upscaling to include other sites, LCGs and local Government offices.

The implementation at District/Country and site level will be guided by the common approach. The partners will develop activities and a work plan that shall be ready as drafts in the beginning of the next phase. All activities shall contribute to the overall goal and objectives of the Programme and deliver to the outcomes and outputs but will depend on the context, including the local partner's experiences, national regulations, etc. identified during the first phase. It is important to note that though the Programme is informed by a strategic approach it does not build on a set of fixed methods tailored to its many facets. The Programme shall continue to provide space for innovative approaches, and refinement but also for errors. This is essential for a learning process as is the increased capacity for and application of critical analysis of both approaches and achievements.

²¹ There was no opportunity for partners to meet during the formulation of the Programme Document for Phase II

5.2 Key Programme Components

The three Components are closely linked to the three Immediate Objectives, meaning that the Programme shall aim to build BirdLife capacity, promote sustainable forest management, human well-being and biodiversity conservation and work together with Local Conservation Groups in order to reach the long term objective.

Component 1: BirdLife partner capacity

Component 1 focuses on Programme management, sharing of knowledge, and partner capacity to work strategically with the integration of conservation, livelihoods and human well-being, measure impacts and share experiences of chosen approaches. The aim in the second phase is to develop a joint model and guidelines for participatory forest management, and to contribute with lessons and other knowledge sharing within the BirdLife Partnership. Another key concern is the partners' capacity to work strategically with advocacy and public awareness at all levels, e.g. with Government stakeholders to mainstream biodiversity across sectors and secure better engagement of civil society especially at District/County levels but also to build public awareness of how improved forest management and conservation of biodiversity serves the benefit of all. The component is expected to produce three outcomes: 1. Partner cooperation and lessons sharing of PFM strengthened within BirdLife, 2. Partners develop and upscale model for PFM and 3. Partners strongly engaged in advocacy for the integration of human well-being and biodiversity values. Activities, though not exclusive or fully planned, include annual PMC meetings, presentation of PPN at BirdLife meetings, formulation of PFM guidelines, partner advocacy plans and stakeholder analysis for Phase II.

The PMC has proven to be effective and important for having a shared PPN Programme identity. The annual meetings and the quarterly skype meetings have served to bind partners together. In the next phase there will be more emphasis on the sharing of lessons and responsibilities, which will also enable the PMC to document and produce shared results (tools, reports, presentations). One of the outputs will be a model/guidelines for BirdLife engagement in participatory forest management. Apart from Programme experiences it will also seek to learn from experiences from across the Partnership, including the EC funded BLI Project *Strengthening Non State Actor Involvement in Forest Governance* and the Darwin Project in Nepal on mainstreaming biodiversity in the Forestry Sector.

The Programme has drafted a Programme Advocacy and Communication Strategy²² and some partners have developed advocacy plans for the Programme. All partners participated²³ in a communication skills training workshop in Copenhagen in August 2017. The expected outcome is that communication, advocacy, Programme and field staff will be better able to plan, implement, monitor and measure impacts of various advocacy and communication activities. Communication plans will be a topic at the next PMC meeting. The CAMB Project will finish end of June 2018. The Programme will follow up on its achievements on advocacy skills and seek to strengthen partner and LCG engagement in mainstreaming and in other CBD processes. The second phase will also focus on partners' ability to monitor the Programme and assess results and impacts so as to better inform their own and shared learning and to be better able to duplicate and upscale the achievements.

Component 2: Forest management, livelihoods and biodiversity

Until now the main part of staff resources and the budget was spent on this component. The emphasis will in the second phase increasingly be on consolidating, and follow up on Income Generating Activities (IGAs) with skills training and exchange visits rather than on beginning new activities. Focused studies on the equitable sharing of benefits will supplement existing knowledge gained through the original baseline surveys and serve to monitor improvements for all three

²² Annex E

²³ NK and NU with four staff; BCN with three staff

objectives of the component - participatory forest management, human well-being and biodiversity conservation, each with one expected outcome: 1. Government stakeholders take responsibility for improved forest management, 2. Local beneficiaries experience improved livelihoods as a result of improved forest management practices and 3. Biodiversity values in selected IBAs maintained and ideally improved. Context specific activities will be planned by the three partners. They will include support to the implementation of forest management plans, facilitation of or other support to meetings between Government and civil society stakeholders, training of forest officers at District/Country levels, skills training for IGAs, including support to marketing of products and cooperation, follow up training on LBM, and analysis of monitoring data and studies related to social and biodiversity issues.

Participatory forestry refers to processes and mechanisms, which enable people with a direct stake in forest resources to be part of decision-making in all aspects of forest management, including policy formulation processes²⁴. Programme partners have supported and facilitated processes of involving local stakeholders, mainly the Forest District/County Offices and LCGs in reviewing and revising existing forest management plans. The aim has been and will continue to be to explore the opportunities of national regulation to enhance real participation of main stakeholders for the benefit of both forests and communities. The partners strive to enhance equity (of gender, socio-economic background etc.) in the process and to integrate and mainstream biodiversity in the efforts to manage forests sustainably. All partners have established good relationships with Government stakeholders but also encounter challenges, mainly because of the frequent change of officers meaning that good relationships and training efforts can easily be lost. In the ideal situation all stakeholders would work cooperatively to secure the forest eco-system for the benefit of all and all would recognize that they have both duties and rights in that process. In the real world Government stakeholders and local communities are faced with forest fires, illegal logging, unsustainable management practices, outside pressures etc. and have scant resources to deal with such challenges. The Programme has allowed partners to address these and other challenges but also to support alternative and sustainable uses of forest resources, locally based monitoring of biodiversity etc. At some sites the next step could be to explore the potentials of how local benefits can be better thought into the management of eco-system services, water for example.

The main aim of the support to increase human well-being in selected communities is to make local people better able to build and improve livelihoods based on available natural resources without jeopardizing sustainability. These can be forest based or related to the agricultural land surrounding the forests, for example bee keeping which is quite popular and can bring considerable income when processed and marketed well, introduction of new vegetables that make them easily accessible for the local population or enhancing existing practices of extracting forest resources like churi in Reshunga or bamboo in Echuya, to make them more sustainable. The support has mostly been technical skills training, distribution of seeds/technology and for some participation in exchange visits. It was relatively successful in enhancing equality with high participation of women in IGAs and saving groups.

Human well-being can be loosely defined as encompassing personal and environmental security, access to materials for a good life, good health and good social relations, all of which are closely related to each other, and underlie the freedom to make choices and take action. The Programme will in the second phase pursue the concept of human well-being rather than poverty reduction as the overall social development goal. It can be extremely difficult to measure poverty reduction in subsistence communities and the term is easily limited to economic factors. Access to vegetables may for example contribute to improved well-being in the form of more secure or better nutrition even when the vegetables do not generate extra incomes. Easy access to clean water can improve women's well-being and may be a compelling argument for getting involved in forest management activities despite lack of economic benefits, participation in clean up campaigns or LBM may not

²⁴ www.fao.org/forestry/participatory

increase incomes but it may help build a sense of community and the value of taking care of the environment for those who participate. The concept of well-being also allows for a broader appeal to all community members, for example in the LCGs where some members may not be poor or marginalized but are important for building ownership and community engagement.

The third outcome is related to the importance of biodiversity for sustainable forest management and general recognition of the value of biodiversity for human well-being. BirdLife has through its IBA monitoring, TESSA²⁵ monitoring tools etc. set up systems for regular monitoring of biodiversity in IBAs. It is closely linked to forest management and mainstreaming of biodiversity and to local engagement including making target groups aware of biodiversity and building their interest and capacity to work for its protection, e.g. through environmental education of children, bird guide training, and education of tourists. DOF has long and also in previous projects provided training on and supported a citizen science approach to monitoring. Locally Based Monitoring (LBM)²⁶ engages local stakeholders in looking after the forest and its resources and is thus an important tool for stakeholder engagement, awareness of biodiversity and ecosystem values and building knowledge of the forest through regular monitoring. It also provides data that can be used to assess the health of the forest and for more scientific studies.

Component 3: Local Conservation Groups

For the partners – and for BirdLife - civil society engagement through LCGs is instrumental for conservation. They are also the main venue to the communities and the target of considerable Programme support. Partners support LCGs to build their sustainability, recognition in local communities and by other stakeholders, their organisational structures, equity and transparency, networking and advocacy skills. Despite positive developments this goal has not been fully reached and there continues to be variation in the ability of the LCGs. The Programme will continue to have emphasis on building capacity, independency, networking skills and engagement through training, facilitation and exposure to other civil society groups and LCGs. It will also support the LCGs to be better able to assert their roles as main agents for advocacy and change. The outcomes are: 1. LCGs involved in governmental decision making processes and the implementation of forest management and CFM, 2. LCGs act as voices for sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation in their community and in District/County and national level networks and 3. LCGs show capacity to advocate for community engagement in sustainable forest management. Activities include organisational support to make the LCGs better able to act independently, facilitation of network meetings, support to LCG skills for advocacy and for LCGs to participate in meetings and trainings with Government and other stakeholders.

The component feeds directly into the second objective of the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society, namely to ensure that 'civil society...has the space and capacity to gain influence to combat poverty and inequality, promote human rights as well as sustainable development in an accountable, inclusive and transparent manner'. It also contributes to BirdLife's Local Engagement and Empowerment Programme and its goal to help local civil society groups to build 'confidence, skills, knowledge, resources and rights'²⁷. One of the challenges is to ensure access for civil society to political fora and platforms and to ensure that the openings in national political regulations, especially for forest management, are fully recognised and utilised. Another challenge is to make them better able to engage all – members and other women and men in the communities - regardless of their social status, gender and education, and not the least to make them independent of Programme or partner support. In Reshunga for example most households are members of CFUGs but relatively few people participate in decision making and women are underrepresented.

²⁵ Toolkit for Ecosystem Service Site Based Assessment

²⁶ See Annex E

²⁷ BirdLife International *Empowering the Grassroots. BirdLife, Participation, and Local Communities*, 2011. The aim is to increase the number of IBA LCGs, grow their capacity to monitor and manage natural resources sustainably, link local groups, empower them through rights (for example tenure, policy and legal processes) and provide sustainable resource for local group development, networking and action

5.3 Synergy Effects in the Programme

The Rev/App confirms that 'synergy is promoted and there is good reinforcement between components and countries'. PPN also builds on and contributes to the synergy between BirdLife partners, for example as described above in Nepal. For the INTRINSIC²⁸ training in 2015 staff from most of BCN's projects participated and the BLI Darwin Project on mainstreaming biodiversity was piloted in Reshunga. Together with this project DOF plans to have a joint workshop on community forestry and mainstreaming biodiversity in the Forestry Sector in connection with the CAMB training in Singapore in October. In the next phase the aim is to build more synergy also between BirdLife Partners in Kenya and Uganda and likewise in the regions targeted at both LCGs and Government. Though PPN primarily engages with the Forest Sector, its regulations, policies, departments and staff, it will continue to seek cooperation with other sectors such as the Social Sector, Agriculture and Environment. The country poverty reduction and gender strategies are an important reference frame for the Programme's take on the implementation of participatory forest management. It also aims to create synergy among organisations, and others, who work within similar thematic areas, at least in the sense that partners participate and/or help establish networks and other formal and informal channels for coordination and sharing of best practices. Finally, the Programme continues to build synergy between the PPN partners' approach to forest management which will result in a joint model/ guidelines that can be shared across the BirdLife Partnership. The planned extranet page will also contribute to synergy as it will provide a forum for BirdLife Partners working with community engagement in forest management as well as resources such as reports, scientific articles and tools.

5.4 Advocacy

The Rev/App concludes that 'advocacy is working well and is linked to collaboration with Government at various levels'. Advocacy understood as 'a process by an individual or group, which aims to influence public policy and resource allocation decisions within political, economic, and social systems and institutions' (Danish Civil Society Policy) continues to be a main goal and cross cutting aspect of the Programme. It permeates the cooperation with Government stakeholders, and the communication efforts of partners. In order to strengthen the strategic approach to communication DOF facilitated training of partners with the expressed goal to enhance their skills to develop a realistic communication plan and to monitor advocacy activities. The CCI PRISM²⁹ project, which is briefly described in Chapter 5.7 provides tools for monitoring and measuring impacts of advocacy which will be useful for partners. The tools will be tested with African partners at the CAMB workshop in Nairobi in November.

The Programme aims to spread knowledge and build awareness of the value of biodiversity for the survival of ecosystems and to engage Government, the public, and civil society in conservation, mainly through the tool of sustainable forest management. It also addresses people's rights to access and participatory management of natural resources, gender and other equity issues. It is built on the realisation that it is vital to reach out to decision makers, the media, civil society and the general public to remind all that sustainable economic growth is best built on and intricately linked to the sustainable use of natural resources. The Programme will strategically use the partner countries' commitment to the UN Biodiversity Plan 2011-2020 and those Aichi targets which are especially relevant to PPN advocacy, mainly the mainstreaming of biodiversity across sectors and the necessity to engage and benefit local communities in conservation. In addition to political advocacy, partners will also increase communication on biodiversity to the general public and at site levels. The Programme Advocacy and Communication Strategy will be revised based on Partner experiences and recommendations from CAMB and the training workshop in Copenhagen. As for partner capacity the focus in the next phase will be results and product oriented meaning

²⁸ *Integrating Rights and Social Issues in Conservation*, a manual developed by BirdLife International

²⁹ *Practical Impact Assessment Methods for Small and Medium Sized Conservation Projects*

that partners will develop Programme advocacy goals and activities with clearly defined indicators of success including products that may serve as examples and be used for sharing within the Partnership. Impact assessment of advocacy will be part of the external Mid-Term Review. If then needed a more detailed study will be carried out to further guide partners in their advocacy. The CAMB Project funds workhours for advocacy, which has enabled BCN to employ an advocacy officer on a limited contract. Hopefully this position can be kept after the Project finishes. The other partners have also been able to pay for staff time for advocacy. It is always a challenge to find sufficient resources for advocacy which is a long term and time consuming activity.

5.5. Organisational development

The Programme partners are as described by the Rev/App 'relatively strong' when it comes to integrating livelihoods and conservation and strong conservation organisations. As mentioned earlier the first phase of PPN has in itself been a learning process that has helped develop skills among partners and has thus contributed to the strength of the partners. In addition PPN has provided support to several capacity building activities, including support to the financial departments/staff of all three partners that made them (more) familiar with e.g. MANGO and the CISU Accountability Check; PPN supported BCN and Nature Kenya staff to participate in the INTRINSIC training offered that built capacity to work with social and rights issues and the recent communication training built capacity of field and communication staff. The partners have themselves also organised training of their staff. PPN will continue to provide support to capacity, to the partners' participation in and facilitation of international collaboration and for sharing and learning by integrating site specific experiences and achievements into a greater perspective, thus contributing to a wider understanding of the thematic areas within which the Programme operates. We trust that this is both mutually beneficiary for the partners involved and for BirdLife. The BirdLife Extranet accessible to all BirdLife employees offers a good opportunity for sharing with other Partners. This opportunity was not sufficiently explored in the first phase, mainly due to time constraints and the late realisation that Secretariat assistance would be needed to set it up. The regional and other international BirdLife meetings are important venues for meeting and sharing with other partners. DOF will explore ways to continue to build its ability to facilitate, in a target oriented manner, the capture, documentation and analysis of lessons learned and to guide partners in the implementation, especially through guidance at strategic and methodological levels. With limited funding it is a challenge for all partners, including DOF to add resources (new staff) though additional competencies could be important for reaching certain goals. All partners have received some support from RSPB and/or BirdLife to for example revise their strategies. The BLI QAS process helps ensure that partners are on track including in areas such as transparency, financial management and governance.

5.6 Sustainability aspects

The Rev/App found that the sustainability of Programme activities in the first phase was 'relatively good' and believes that scale up and model building will further enhance sustainability. The Programme approach is built on the assumption that working with multiple stakeholders and building good relationships with Government stakeholders will contribute to ownership and to long-term dedication to improved forest management practices. Training, capacity building, exposure visits, networking and multi stakeholder events, support to strengthening civil society groups, and advocacy are all thought to contribute to sustainability not only at District/County and site levels but also nationally. Partners are already engaged with Government stakeholders in CBD/NBSAP processes. It is expected that their role will be strengthened especially within the Forest Sector through the contacts and processes established through the CAMB Project and the PPN Programme. As described in Chapter 5.1 the Programme's main concern is to achieve sustainability by creating a balance between biodiversity concerns, social and livelihood issues.

The advantage of being Partners in the large international BirdLife Partnership is obvious. Programme partners have access to capacity and resources (training, methodologies, extranet

etc.), including core support to organisational strengthening and building strategies. Through BirdLife's efforts to influence international processes through position papers, cooperation with other actors, and presence at important international events (e.g. Climate and Biodiversity COPs), Programme partners have access to these processes and can use them for advocacy in their own countries. BirdLife also offers opportunities for meeting and cooperating with other BirdLife Partners at international, and regional levels and to enhance national engagement by cooperating and coordinating with other BirdLife projects in the country as it has been the case with BCN in Nepal. PPN partners, including DOF, also guarantee continuity by having been active conservation organisations for many years with a good reputation and a stable membership. All partners have been working with conservation, livelihoods and local engagement before PPN, work with similar issues and approaches in other projects and programmes and can be expected to continue to be engaged in these after the Programme's second phase has ended. The partners will continue to seek other funding opportunities for other but related initiatives. Upscaling of Programme lessons and model building will enable partners to share with other conservation and forest management actors, and in the BirdLife Partnership where it may lead to similar efforts in other countries around the world.

5.7 Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

The intention of an intervention is of course hugely important but it is the results and impacts that show to which extent the intention has led to success measured on the processes that the intervention has helped initiate and the changes it has produced. The challenge is to not only measure how intentions and processes are leading to outcomes and impacts but also to decide who is measuring and interpreting evidence of impacts and for whom. It is not enough to measure how many, how often and who but also to ask why, meaning that monitoring and assessing successes can and should be based both on quantitative facts (such as how many women participated in the LCG training) and an analytic qualitative process that involves listening to the opinions of stakeholders (such as women explaining what would make them participate in LCG trainings).

Following this approach the PMC formulated guidelines for monitoring, evaluation and reporting at the outset of the Programme³⁰. A system and formats for internal quarterly and annual reports was developed and several times revised to better reflect emerging needs and to simplify the system which was quite time demanding, especially for DOF who has the task to synthesize the individual partner reports into a joint Programme Report that is shared and agreed by the PMC. The guidelines were not fully implemented and the reporting system still needs to be revised to better show what the Programme has actually achieved, some of which seem to be 'underreported' in the words of the Rev/App. The prior training of field staff in Programme specific monitoring methods and increased support from the partner secretariats are expected to contribute to more results oriented reporting. The suggested Most Significant Change approach was not used. This will be addressed in the second phase as part of the monitoring training and the development of more participatory approaches to measuring impacts. As part of supervision at least one person from DOF's Programme Team visits each partner at least once annually, depending on whether there are other opportunities for meeting partners in that year (PMC and other meetings and trainings) and the amount of work hours that can be spent on travelling³¹.

The PRISM toolkit mentioned above will be finalised in the next couple of months. It will contain a manual and online resources. It is quite comprehensive and addresses a large number of thematic areas, for example livelihoods, and governance and policy and provides tools to for example TOC, participatory impact assessment and capacity for conservation assessment tools. DOF will explore

³⁰ Annex E

³¹ Travels and supervision visits are time consuming. In the first phase more DOF work hours were spent on home office support (planning of meetings, trainings, development of methodologies, Programme products etc.) than anticipated meaning that not all of the planned visits could be carried out. See Annex J for brief overview of monitoring set up

whether someone from the PRISM Team should provide the planned training of partners in January and will review the tool for its usefulness as soon as it is officially launched. The planned monitoring training of the PMC will provide partners with tools and methodologies that can contribute to better monitoring, impact assessment and reporting practices which they shall share with site staff in order to make them better able to involve local stakeholders in monitoring. The monitoring training will be linked to practical training for partners on how to employ a TOC approach to planning of national implementation.

5.8 Other key approaches

DOF will continue to engage students and volunteers in Denmark. In the first phase two students prepared for their master theses at two sites in Kenya and thus contributed to the overall knowledge of the Programme and DOF's communication to members through articles in *Fugle & Natur*. A volunteer and member of DOF's International Task Force carried out an assessment of the partners' communication resources and skills and helped inform the communication training workshop. In the second phase DOF will seek to engage students, especially with social science background to carry out specific studies at PPN sites and also to encourage volunteers to contribute with their knowledge by visiting the sites. The partners are encouraged to do the same. It remains a challenge that there is only a small budget for this. DOF also considers seeking additional funding for biological and other studies that would be important for gaining more knowledge and learning. As the Programme aims to address issues related to climate and benefits from ecosystem services it will be necessary to find external support as none of the partners, including DOF have sufficient experience within these areas. It may be that cooperation with BirdLife's Climate Programme could be an opportunity. It could also be that climate adaptation could be the topic of a proposal for a smaller project in support of PPN.

6. Target groups

6.1 Target groups and primary stakeholders

The Programme continues to work with three main target groups and primary stakeholders:

- a. Local communities in and around seven forest IBAs
- b. Local Conservation Groups (LCGs) or similar;
- c. Government stakeholders and decentralised/local authorities, especially from the Forest Sector

The wider target group includes other civil society organisations/NGOs and the public, including private businesses with whom partners will cooperate for advocacy, in networks and at local levels or who are invited to participate in trainings and other events. The BirdLife Partnership will benefit from shared lessons learned and support to its strategic priorities and at the regional levels from activities to bring Partners and target groups together. The Programme partners will benefit from increasing capacity to support and monitor impacts of conservation and livelihoods and to share experiences and approaches within their organisation, including with members. DOF will reach out to its members and to the Danish public in its daily communication and through specific activities planned for the next phase (details in Chapter 12).

List of main target groups (see Annex O.2 for details)

Site	Size	Population	Main LCG/target group	Gov stakeholders
<i>Nepal</i>				
Reshunga Forest	3.400 ha	33.365	8 CFUGs (one new) + 2 women groups (one new)/ 1442 HH	District Forest Office (DFO) and FECOFUN, Gulmi chapter. Both based in Thamgas

Madane Forest (new site)	13.761 ha	32.278	4 CFUGs/ 655 HHs	District Forest Office (DFO) and FECOFUN, Gulmi chapter. Both based in Thamgas
<i>Kenya</i>				
Arabuko-Sokokoke	40.000 ha	130.000	3000 HH	County Government of Kilifi and its associated sector ministries
Dakatcha Woodland	82.000 ha	50.000	Dakatcha Woodland Conservation Group (local official partner)/ 2800 HH	County Government of Kilifi and its associated sector ministries
Taita Hills	450 ha	300.000	Dawida Joint Management Committee	Taita-Taveta County Government and sector departments
<i>Uganda</i>				
Echuya Forest Reserve	3400 ha	123.345	4 CFMs/ 6000 people	Local Governments of Rubanda and Kisoro districts
Kasyoha-Kitomi Forest Reserve	39.200	414.454	9 CFMS/	Forest sector range office in Bushenyi

a. Local communities

The partners have selected a number of local communities in and around the Programme IBAs. The main beneficiaries are women, men and children who are directly dependent on the forest and local ecosystem services. The communities are typically remote and geographically scattered. Livelihoods are primarily based on agriculture and forest resources. Most of the households can be classified as poor though poverty is not evenly distributed. The Programme has from the beginning tried to reach out and include indigenous groups and other poor and marginalised groups and households and to ensure that no one is left out of benefits or negatively affected by forest management practices. The Rev/App found that though it does not not 'feature strongly in the reports...the Programme is making important contributions to poverty reduction'. Managing the resources sustainably 'has a positive impact on the poorest for whom a sustained natural resource base is of...higher importance than for those with wider income generating opportunities'.

Marginalisation and vulnerability are often related to other factors than economic poverty. Access and rights to vital natural resources (such as wood, water and land) and to decision making are crucial for inclusion and livelihoods and will therefore continue to be an important concern. In the first phase members of the target communities benefited from support to IGAs. In order to extend and consolidate benefits the Programme will explore opportunities and build skills for more cooperation in producing, processing and marketing of products as well as in seeking ways to build resilience and food security. The goal of the next phase is not to introduce new IGAs but to build independence of farmers/producers from Programme support and upscaling. The ideal situation is that farmers work together to seek and use opportunities, ask for support from Government and other duty bearers (e.g. agricultural extension support) and seek funds where available. The socio-economic baseline studies contributed with some basic information on key issues such as the use of forest resources by women and men and local livelihoods. In order to better understand how access to and use of natural resources and how it is organised influence livelihoods, the environment/forests and power structures and also how the Programme influences gender balance and women's participation, the Programme plans to carry out one or more case studies.

b. Local Conservation Groups

The BirdLife Partnership has established more than 2000 LCGs at IBAs worldwide. The ultimate aim is for all 12,000 IBAs to be looked after by community based organisations with the commitment and expertise to conserve their sites and wildlife, and to use them sustainably for their own benefit and for generations to come. There are LCGs in all three partner countries but not necessarily at all sites. The main civil society groups in the PPN Programme are Community Forestry User Groups (CFUGs) in Nepal, Site Support Groups (SSGs) and Community Forestry Associations (CFAs) in Kenya and Collaborative Forest Management Groups (CFMs) in Uganda. The SSGs and CFMs are LCGs while CFUGs and CFAs are a Government requirement for participation in community/collaborative forestry. Despite not being LCGs in name all of the groups are engaged in the Programme in similar ways.

In the second phase partners will further strengthen the support to local civil society following the BirdLife principles for local empowerment, which also include building networks. The experience of BirdLife shows the value of linking people and institutions across scales and geography, to share resources and experience, and bring local voices to national, regional and international decision-makers. LCGs can form part of this networking approach, connecting local people nationally, as well as to institutions at national, and international level. LCG networks are in principle in place in all three countries but they need strengthening and support to meet more regularly among themselves and with Government stakeholders. The PMC discussed during the meeting in March in Uganda whether it would be feasible to have a joint workshop between LCG representatives from all three countries during the next phase as part of the empowerment and sharing lessons within the Partnership process or whether it would produce more benefits to concentrate on the national and regional levels. Due to costs and logistics the focus will be on strengthening national LCG networks but also to strive to bring them together at regional levels (East Africa/ Himalayan region).

Most of the LCGs have received support during the first phase in organisational capacity, technical skills training, democratic structures, and improved gender balancing. Many of them are still relatively weak and it is important that the Programme continues to support them with the overall goal to build their capacity to exist and act independently of partner support, and to support their coming together in networks with a vision of influencing political processes. It is important that they are better able to represent their communities and that there is more equal participation in the decisions and management of the groups, including of women. The Programme recognises that the most vulnerable may not have the resources or may not want to be leading agents of change in the LCGs with whom the partners work but the Programme will continue to actively support their inclusion. The ideal outcome would be that LCGs speak for all members of their community, that membership extends to all households within the community regardless of gender, status or ethnic background and that the communities support and use the LCGs as their voice in consultations with e.g. Government stakeholders and as guardians of biodiversity and agents of change towards sustainable forest management and livelihoods. There is still some way to reach this goal for most LCGs in the Programme. Exchange visits to strong civil society actors and facilitation of participation in civil society networks are important activities.

c. Government stakeholders

The Programme aligns its activities, especially for forest management with Government regulations and strive to use the opportunities for community participation given in these. It was a main achievement of Phase I that partners managed to build good relations with Government stakeholders, especially at the District/County level offices of the Forest Sector (view Chapter 2.3 for details), to initiate and support multi stakeholder processes and to bringing the LCGs together with Government. This work shall continue in the second phase. The character and activities of the cooperation differ between the countries and sites. The most desirable outcome would be if

Government stakeholders would take the lead in establishing and maintaining multi-stakeholder fora (with LCGs and other stakeholders), in mainstreaming biodiversity in forest management in policies and implementation and in implementing sustainable and participatory forest management plans and community agreements with long term benefits for forest and people. As described earlier building capacity of and relationships with Government officers is hampered by the lack of resources of many Government offices and the frequent change of staff. By upscaling of training and reaching out to several levels the partners hope to be able to create a momentum that will continue also in the future to build knowledge and engagement. If this would also lead to increased Government or other funding to support the DFOs to become fully engaged in the implementation of the participatory forest management plans it would be an added benefit and a huge success.

7. Outputs and Output Indicators

7.1 Outputs and indicators

The Programme has three components that reflect the immediate objectives and their expected outcomes and outputs. Each outcome has 2-3 expected main outputs that all Partners shall contribute to in their national work plans and LFAs. Based on this and the overall approach of the detailed activities will be developed before or right at the beginning of Phase II along with work plans with milestones. In order to have some flexibility and to reflect different contexts the activities are not required to be identical across countries and sites.

Output	Indicator
1.1.1 PMC better able to capture lessons learned and share responsibilities	PMC members take lead on aspects of Programme management, coordination and technical guidance according to competencies
1.2.1 Upscaling of PFM approach nationally and shared across BirdLife Partnership	PFM model/ guidelines
1.2.2 Partners have increased volume of knowledge based products and documented sharing of lessons	Number of publications and presentations of Programme achievements in national and international fora and in BirdLife
1.3.1 Partners engage in advocacy for local and civil society participation in biodiversity conservation	Partners facilitate multi-stakeholder cooperation and learning
1.3.2 Public knowledge of biodiversity values for human well-being strengthened	Partner action plans based on communication and advocacy strategy with activities and indicators for expected results
2.1.1 Local level forest offices engage actively with LCGs	LCGs invited to participate in District/County level fora for forests and environment
2.1.2 Improved forest management plans are being implemented	Forest management plans widely shared, and plans for implementation developed, agreed and implemented
2.1.3 National level offices, agencies and ministries engaged with national partners	Partners invited to national technical committees and networks in forest management

2.2.1 Beneficiaries have enhanced skills for sustainable livelihood practices, access to markets and are better able to demand for public services	Beneficiaries take initiative to seek funds, expertise, new markets and cooperation for marketing
2.2.2 High level of equity in sharing of Programme benefits	Plans with indicators for involving and benefiting women, indigenous and poor households developed, implemented and shared with beneficiaries
2.2.3 Local beneficiaries have diversified their income options and have sustainability plans	Local beneficiaries have concrete plans for managing and sustaining income sources
2.3.1 Monitoring results indicate maintained or improved biodiversity and ecosystem services	Regular IBA monitoring and reports
2.3.2 LCGs actively engaged in monitoring and safeguarding biodiversity and ecosystem services	LCGs supervise and report irregular/illegal actions and challenges (e.g. cases of fire, water shortages etc.)
3.1.1 LCGs are invited to District/County level processes related to forest management and livelihoods improvement	Number of invitations and attendances to meetings, trainings etc. and importance of these
3.1.2 LCGs take responsibility together with government stakeholders for the local implementation of sustainable forest practices and livelihood improvement	LCGs supervise forest management practices and livelihood improvement, and engage with their communities to promote best practices
3.2.1 LCGs have and implement sustainable CFM plans based on a joint vision	Forest sustainability plans with indicators of success produced and implemented
3.2.2 LCGs build equity, transparency and democratic structures within their organisation	Training, financial management, adherence to clear governance structures, and AGMs show growing strength and active participation of members
3.2.3 LCGs participate actively in relevant networks	Participation in network activities at District/County level and possibly beyond and actively networking with other LCGs in the Programme area
3.3.1 LCGs influence local governments to formulate Bye-Laws or pass resolutions on forest management	Bye-laws or resolutions in place for better forest management
3.3.2 LCGs take lead or participate in advocacy activities aimed at improved forest management	Advocacy activities by LCGs improve the perceptions of District/County leaders and the communities

8. Assumptions and Risks

8.1 Assumptions

It is assumed that the four Partners will continue to be BirdLife Partners and will dedicate the necessary and agreed resources to reach the objectives of the Programme, including active participation and sharing in the PMC and the BirdLife Partnership. It is also assumed that national Governments and local authorities will continue to cooperate with partners and that there will be no major changes in national forest or other laws that will affect the opportunities for participatory forest management negatively. Finally, it is assumed that the freedom of civil society to act on behalf of biodiversity and people will not be jeopardized through new regulations, conflicts or other external influences.

8.2 Risks and risks management

The major risks are political instability in all of the three countries, which may affect Programme sites and/or partners, natural disasters and changes in forest policies and regulations that may affect Programme approaches negatively. These risks are considered to be relatively small for the duration of the Programme though natural disasters and changing weather patterns are difficult to predict and may affect all of the sites at any time. This is why building resilience and ability to adapt to climatic changes are built into the Programme's approaches to economic activities and natural resource management. A more immediate risk are that potential changes in staff engaged in the Programme will affect the timely implementation of the Programme and cause delays and loss of capacity. During the timeframe of 4 years it is likely that some staff and even Directors will be replaced. In order to minimize negative impacts the PMC and individual partners will ensure that knowledge and capacity are shared within the organisation and that leaving staff ensure a proper transfer of knowledge.

9. Cross-cutting concerns

The Programme has a number of cross-cutting concerns which are particularly important for reaching its expected result. These include gender, equity, indigenous peoples, and biodiversity/environment. In the second phase there will be an added focus on climate and resilience. The PMC has developed strategies for several of these concerns, and DOF has assisted BirdLife in formulating a BirdLife Position on Indigenous Peoples, and guidelines for implementing this and the BirdLife Position on Gender and Conservation and has led a process of strengthening social safeguards and rights across BirdLife Programmes and the Partnership. To build capacity and awareness BirdLife has set up a page on its extranet with BirdLife's and other resources, including training materials, conventions etc. and will in the future offer webinars on social and rights issues³².

9.1 Gender and equity

Gender equality is one of the Sustainable Development Goals and almost all UN member states, including the countries in which DOF works, have committed themselves to promoting gender equality and women's rights. In its new development strategy *The World 2030* Danida continues to focus on the rights of women and girls and to work towards societies in which 'people are not discriminated against because of their gender'. According to the UNDP *Human Development Report 2016* and its Gender Inequality Index (GII) that reflects women's disadvantages in reproductive health, political participation, education and the labour market the Partner countries fare rather poorly.

Despite some differences in ranking and content of gender inequality in the three countries the challenges for women and gender equality are similar. According to a 2017 USAID report on gender in Kenya traditional ideas hold women back from contributing to important development goals especially in the areas of economic growth, nutrition and food security. UN Women reports that Kenya brought in a progressive, rights-based constitution in 2010, which provides the legal

framework for the Government to fulfil basic rights, and for marginalized and vulnerable groups, especially women and children, to claim their rights. However, women still face challenges including the ability to participate effectively in decision making and leadership and the majority of the female members of the national parliament and the County assemblies are new to the legislature. The situation is compounded by the absence of a credible and vibrant women's movement to advocate for the constitutional gender equality gains. The Kenyan economy remains vulnerable to external shocks and unemployment continues to be a challenge and there are additional challenges for women. For instance, while over 80% of Kenyan women are engaged in small holder farming, only 1% own land in their own right, access less than 10% of available credit, and less than 1% of agriculture credit. Female poverty is exacerbated by gender based violence. Women's empowerment is hindered by polygamy, early marriage and harmful cultural and traditional practices such as female genital cutting. Traditional practices governing inheritance, acquisition of land and benefits accruing to land produce continue to favour men. Women's ability to access the justice system is limited by legal costs, traditional justice systems, illiteracy and ignorance of rights. Women are also disproportionately affected by HIV/Aids with 6.9% of women aged 15 to 64 affected, compared to 4.4% for men of the same age group.

According to the same report in Uganda though poverty has reduced significantly over the last twenty years, this growth has not been inclusive. The Government of Uganda has made significant progress in developing legal frameworks, policies and programmes to protect women's human rights and advance gender equality. Despite these commendable efforts, women in Uganda still face discrimination and marginalization due to slow change and the culture and practices of public institutions. There are deep-rooted cultural and traditional practices that discriminate against women and girls and customary practices in many parts of Uganda that discriminate in cases of succession and inheritance that limit women's access to land, finances and property. Limited freedom to public expression of opinion and violence against women remains a major obstacle to the empowerment of women.

In Nepal as more men leave their homeland in search of employment, the women—especially in rural areas—have begun to take a larger role in society. Nevertheless the majority of women remain trapped in the cycle of poverty and gender based inequality. Women can for example run a farm yet have no access to the profits the land yields. Although the Constitution provides protections for women, including equal pay for equal work, the Government has not taken significant action to implement its provisions. The status of women in Nepal remains very poor in terms of health, education, income, decision-making, and access to policymaking. Women face systematic discrimination, particularly in rural areas. Literacy rates are substantially lower than men's, and women work longer hours. Violence against women is still common, and there are not enough women in professions. Women's representation has been ensured in constituent assembly, but women's equal participation in all state mechanisms is far from ideal.

The Programme has from the outset had a strong focus on promoting gender equality and supporting women empowerment both as a target in itself and as a cross cutting issue. The Rev/App found that 'issues of inclusiveness and equity are addressed directly and at a satisfactorily level'. The PMC has a Programme Gender Strategy and each partner has formulated gender action plans, carried out gender specific surveys, participated in gender training and implemented gender sensitive and inclusive activities. In line with the strategy, the Programme will continue to concentrate on those aspects of gender equality where the Programme can have an impact and can contribute to change among beneficiaries such as knowledge, capacity, empowerment, and involvement of women. In addition to the knowledge gained from the surveys conducted during the Inception Phase, monitoring results and other lessons, the Programme will carry out a more in depth gender sensitive study on how beneficiaries have experienced Programme benefits and perceive most significant changes in order to revise the existing strategy and adapt concrete activities to this knowledge. Women have generally had high participation in

income generating activities, less in LCGs, trainings, advocacy and exchange visits. Despite efforts from the partners it continues to be difficult to persuade women to take on new roles.

It was emphasised in the original Programme Document that equality as a cross cutting issue not only refers to gender but also to households and individuals at Programme sites who are especially in need of support and consideration because of poverty, family situation (e.g. widows), age or other forms of marginalisation. The socio-economic profiling of the sites provided data and knowledge which helped partners develop activities and strategies for their involvement and benefits. As with gender activities were planned in such a way that they best address inclusion.

9.2 Indigenous peoples

Because there are indigenous peoples in some of the Programme localities, e.g. the Batwa in Echuya in Uganda, the PMC has formulated a strategy that addresses their rights and special relationship with the forest. The strategy envisages that indigenous groups at Programme sites are supported to build their capacity to realise their specific rights within the framework of the Programme and to participate fully in its benefits. Other important goals are that they are recognized by other stakeholders as having specific customary rights and identity and are respected on an equal footing, that they are adequately represented in stakeholder consultations, trainings etc., that they have access to capacity building for advocacy, networking, organisational and technical skills and are able to contribute with their traditional natural resource management practices and knowledge including having resources and capacity to advocate for their role and rights in natural resource management. The next phase will have more focus on understanding the role and situation of indigenous groups and how they have actually benefited from and contributed to the Programme, including at the sites where they have received little specific attention.

The PMC will review its strategy and align it with the BirdLife Position, which is in the process of being adopted by the BirdLife Council. DOF will realign the two documents and build capacity of partners, e.g. by using some of the BLI options for capacity building. As with gender, DOF supports the efforts of BirdLife to provide resources and training to partners. Many BirdLife Partners have experience of working with indigenous peoples as reflected in the 2016 *Contribution from BirdLife International to the Thematic Report of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. However, not all Partners have knowledge and understanding of the specific rights of indigenous peoples as laid down in the ILO treaty no. 169, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), and other legal instruments.

9.3 Biodiversity, environment, climate and resilience

The main aim of all of BirdLife's work is to protect birds while acknowledging the mutual dependency of birds with the ecosystem in which they live. For the Programme conserving biodiversity and making people aware of its value is an important goal in itself. Biodiversity is also a cross cutting issue in political processes of mainstreaming biodiversity in forestry and other sectors, and in the implementation of economic activities which shall as minimum not affect biodiversity and ecosystems negatively and preferably make a positive contribution. Because biodiversity conservation and local livelihoods are closely linked to ecosystem services and climate changes these are thought into PPN. Biodiversity is not limited to the forests but is also part of the surrounding landscapes, which are home to, for example, common birds which must continue to be common as a result of sustainable land use patterns catalysed by sound policies which also benefit intact forest ecosystems. Specific indicators will help monitor biodiversity, ecosystem services and livelihood activities screened against impacts on the ecosystem, climate change adaptation and resilience measures in order to mitigate conflicts between biodiversity conservation and the economic interests of local stakeholders. The second phase will strive to work for mainstreaming climate adaptation measures across the Programme and to build capacity related to climate issues in partner organisations. Mainstreaming climate change may well be the topic of a training course in the PMC or in the partner organisations. Economic and capacity building activities at site levels

will have an increased focus on resilience understood as the 'ability to cope with change'. Kenya experienced serious drought in the last years and the Programme recognises the need to build farmers' skills to adapt to shifting weather conditions or other changes that severely affects productivity and livelihoods. Finally, environment issues, such as pollution of water, are a natural cross cutting concern as they affects livelihoods and biodiversity. Advocacy for conservation and support to IGAs will also look at potential negative environmental side effects and build awareness on how to deal with these.

10.1 Organisational Structure and Division of Responsibilities in the Danish Organisation

The DOF Board of Representatives consists of 60 member delegates from 13 local branches across Denmark that meets twice annually to agree on the overall direction within the current 4-year DOF strategy. Of the 60 delegates, an Executive Committee with a Chairman and 12 members is constituted meeting 6 times annually to follow-up and take decisions about the work done by all members/volunteers as well as the DOF Secretariat. The role of the Bureau of the Executive Committee consisting of the Chairman and four members is to mainly oversee the financial status of DOF and take decisions on any minor miscellaneous issues popping-up in between the scheduled Executive Committee meetings. The DOF Secretariat, currently consisting of 34 staff, carries out the day-to-day work. Below the DOF CEO, the Secretariat has two departments, each led by a Department Head. One department covers finance and administration, membership service and the DOF shop, while the Nature Department is responsible for national and international projects and programmes, software development, communication, policy and advocacy and fundraising. The DOF PPN Programme Team is part of the Nature Department and consists of a biologist and a social anthropologist (see Annex H for job descriptions, and section 10.2 below). This Team is responsible for the day-to-day management, coordination and oversight of the Programme on all aspects, mainly progress on implementation, status on expenditure/financial management and all contact to CISU, but also TA and development of guidelines, policies and methodologies. The PPN Team involves other DOF technical staff and hires external consultants for short-term technical assistance when needs arise. As during Phase I, the Finance and Administration Department will be responsible for accounting, bank transfers to partners etc., while the Communication Team will be the main responsible for information work in Denmark covered by the 2% budget for this activity (see Chapter 11).

10.2 Organisation and division of responsibilities in the actual Programme

The coordination and steering of the Programme and between partners was discussed during the 2017 PMC meeting as well as during and after the Rev/App process and report, the Management Response to the Rev/App recommendations and the assessment of the Assessment Committee relating to Recommendation 2 (Review section). The PMC has agreed on the management response, and on dealing with it in more detail at the next PMC meeting, including on how to introduce a more dynamic and pro-active approach with each Programme partner taking lead on specific Programme level tasks as and when necessary. These could be spearheading the mutual process of collective learning, cross country and Programme lesson sharing and identification of joint capacity building areas of all partners. The intention of such a step is to introduce more dynamism and team spirit among Programme partners to increase professionalism and Programme coherence, and hence also an add-on to the more formal and contractual responsibilities of each partner.

DOF is as per contract formally responsible for the entire Programme to CISU and will take lead in providing general oversight and coordination of Programme activities with partners and carry out supervision and monitoring at Programme and country levels, including submitting Back to Office reports by all DOF employees after each Programme travel. DOF is also responsible for Programme related information, communication and knowledge sharing in Denmark as well as spearheading and back stopping recruitment and sub-contracting of external consultants that may be required at Programme level, and will be responsible for arranging and facilitating the final external audit at the end of Phase II. The DOF PPN Team will be responsible for being updated on new policies,

guidelines etc. from CISU and Danida relevant for guiding the Programme work, and on new methodological approaches as well as 'best practices' within the broad context of development cooperation and conservation. The three partners in the South are responsible for implementation in their respective countries and sites, cooperation with stakeholders, achievement of results, hiring and line management of adequate staff, quality assurance of deliveries, monitoring, financial and narrative reporting internally and to DOF as well as sharing of lessons between partners and in BirdLife. Additionally, they are responsible for hiring local short-term consultants in collaboration with DOF as and when needs arise. They shall also share information on relevant political and other developments in their countries, changes in their own organisations, and knowledge and data, which can be useful for other partners and the Programme. DOF and the other partners will be involved at the national levels of partners when it is considered an added value.

For the coordination and joint steering of the Programme, the PMC will continue to meet annually with an alternating partner having hosting responsibilities, and on Skype quarterly. In order to contribute to wider ownership instead of the two members from each partner (CEO and Head of Programmes from BCN, NK and NU and the Programme Team from DOF), the PMC has budgeted for the participation of an additional person from each partner at each meeting. This would allow primarily site staff or in some cases board members or other staff to gain knowledge and contribute with own experiences. The PMC will be overall responsible for planning, ensuring alignment between national activities and objectives and strategies, following-up on and sharing of lessons learned, assessment of training needs and the refinement of the joint monitoring system and any other Programme level documents. The annual PMC meetings will also include training of participants and, if relevant and feasible, field visits. The existing Programme Advisory Group (PAG) – one in each of the four Partner countries - will continue sparring with the partners in the planning, reviewing and quality checking of the interventions and the overall Programme level work. For implementation of the Programme, the three South partners will create new or use existing field offices. In Kenya, the offices will be located in Marafa (Dakatcha), Gede Ruins (Arabuko-Sokoke) and Wundanyi (Taita); in Uganda in Kabale (Echuya) and Rubirizi (Kasyoha-Kitomi); and in Nepal in Tamghas (Reshunga) and in Arkhabang (Madane). The field offices will have at least one permanent field officer. The Programme Manager will be based at the Head Office and will be assisted by a Finance Manager, Communication/Advocacy Officer and other support staff. The Programme Manager of each of the three Head Offices will be the main responsible for the national implementation of the PPN Programme and will report directly to the CEO, the DOF Programme Team and the other two Programme partners, as well as to the national PAG. At the global level, the PMC is responsible to agree on best ways to feedback into and interact with the BirdLife Global Secretariat and the Regional Secretariats in Singapore and Nairobi.

10.3 Administrative procedures and financial administration

Prior to the Inception period, DOF is obliged to enter into a formal contract with CISU, and during the Inception period, to enter into a formal contract with each of the three South partners. Part of the latter are all the formal CISU guidelines relevant for the Programme, including audit instructions that partners must sign up to follow. This also includes the CISU approved DOF Anti-Corruption Policy, which stipulates the roles and responsibilities on this subject. It has been translated into English to allow it to be attached as a formal document to each of the three South partner contracts, on top of the formal inclusion of the Danida anti-corruption clause in all three South partner contracts.

All four partners are obliged to ensure that accounting and auditing is in full compliance with the current version of the CISU guidelines, 'Financial Standard for grants of and above 1 Million, including Programs', at any point in time, pertaining to budgets, accounting, financial reporting and internal controls. This entails having a professional and sufficiently equipped financial administration system in place from the onset of Programme implementation; including financial management procedures, internal control measures, top-end electronic accounts system, up-to-date bookkeeping documented by vouchers, and segregated accounts duties between minimum two employees.

Finally, all four partners shall maintain up-to-date records of expenditures that are sufficient to be audited annually by a registered and reputable audit company.

DOF is responsible for the overall financial administration, for the management of the Danish funds as well as for ensuring that the use of the Danish grant is appropriately accounted for. The budget line 'Not planned activities' will be the responsibility of DOF including at final external audit level. The budget line 'Not planned activities' is primarily to be spent on joint activities for all four partners. Alternatively, subsequent to PMC decisions on expenditure, funds might be selected, approved and documented in minutes of meetings by the PMC for activities in one or two of the partner countries. Such a decision has to be followed by an addendum to any existing contract(s) and feature in the revised partner's budget (and external annual audits) only if it involves transfers of the agreed funds to partner(s). The 'Budget margin' will initially be held by DOF until spending of it has been approved by CISU and/or the PMC.

DOF will be responsible for submitting payment requests to CISU based on records of expenditure and resulting cash requirement budgets at the Programme level. Grant disbursements to partners, for which DOF is responsible, shall be processed following payment requests based on quarterly financial reports and cash budgets prepared and submitted by partners to DOF. Each partner will have a fixed budget for the entire Programme period, which has to feature in both quarterly financial reports and payment requests. As per the CISU guidelines, the grant disbursements have to be deposited in a special bank account that is separated from the partners' own cash holdings. Additionally, accrued bank interests and net exchange rate gains have to feature clearly for audit purposes, and be credited and reimbursed to CISU upon Programme finalisation. Each South partner is obliged to allocate the CISU funds to the Programme activities according to the Programme Document, Budget, Results Framework and the Annual Work Plans.

The annual audits of the Programme accounts will be conducted following the fiscal year January-December. Each of the South partners is obliged, in agreement with DOF, to contract a registered external audit company to carry out both the formal annual financial audit of their Programme accounts and the performance audit to international accounting standards (IFAC/INTOSAI), CISU guidelines/audit instructions and the audit instructions given by DOF's external audit company. When the draft annual audit report is approved by the DOF Head of Finance, each South partner shall provide one signed soft and two signed hard copies of the annual external audits for every year by end of March the subsequent year.

By the end of the PPN Programme Phase II, DOF's external audit company will conduct a full final audit of Programme accounts. It will be based on the annual audit reports, supplied by the local external audit companies through the South partners, their final accounts, including accrued bank interests and net exchange rate gains, lists of fixed assets etc. as well as DOF's bank transfers to South partners' bank accounts and DOF's own spending, time sheets etc. for the entire Phase II.

11. Information work in Denmark

There will be two main activities for information work in Denmark, both of which will be implemented by members of DOF's Communication Team under the guidance of the PPN Programme Team to ensure compliance with the PPN approach. Both activities are based on visuals as the means to attract public interest and attention and thus supplement the more factual communication of the Programme Team.

The main and most resource demanding activity will be a public exhibition with high quality photos of the interaction between people and forests, most of them taken at Programme sites. The activity is planned to take place at the latest in the beginning of the third year of implementing the second phase. It will be held at a popular venue that is likely to attract a wider public and will be used as an occasion to also present the Programme, possibly at a workshop that is thematically focusing on aspects of the complex relationship between people, forests and biodiversity. The pictures will also

be used to produce a calendar, which can be shared by all partners, and used for promoting and creating interest in the Programme.

For the production of the Programme video in the first phase a lot of footage from several sites was produced that did not go into the video. The intention is to use and reuse some of the materials in short spots on specific issues on DOF's social media. This activity will be ongoing and has been budgeted for with work hours.

The DOF PPN Team will continue and increase its efforts to share knowledge of and increase interest among members for DOF's international local engagement and nature protection work and the PPN Programme using the existing channels for this. These include the member magazine *Fugle og Natur*, the web page www.dof.dk, board meetings, staff meetings, and thematic public and membership meetings. These activities are budgeted for in work hours for the PPN Team.

12. Budget

The total budget for the Phase II of the Program adds up to DKK 15 million distributed over 45 months, i.e. April 2018 – December 2021, as agreed with CISU. This is the result of first two drastic funding reductions from Danida, MoFA, followed by a recent increase/back-flow of some of the reduced funding. The first threshold as per the recent hearing process on the suggested guidelines for Programme applications from CISU was set at DKK 4.5 Million per year, but to be on the safe side for this Phase II Program application, CISU advised DOF to stay within DKK 4 Million per year. Hence the current total budget figure of DKK 15 Million. This is equivalent to a reduction of 24 % of the annual overall budget compared to Phase I. As is evident from the attached Annex B Program budget, the template is identical to the one used for Phase I, but following the recommendations of the Rev/App consultant (Review cum Pre-appraisal report p.15), the component budgets are now Output-based to be backed by detailed national budgets and work plans during the inception of Phase II. It is also evident that compared to the Phase I Program budget, the annual budgets had to be reduced as a direct result of the aforementioned circumstantial funding reductions. This means that the site specific activities in particular under Component 2 have had to be reduced considerably to give room for one more site added in Nepal and to keep the 2 and 3 sites in Uganda and Kenya respectively. Based on the implementation of Phase I and the findings and recommendation of the RevApp consultant (Review cum Pre-appraisal report p.21), the salary parts of the budget have had to be increased for all four partners to create the necessary outputs dictating very labour/manpower intensive face-to-face implementation work by the involved staff. The DOF work hours have remained the same, despite the increased Programme period, and could prove to be too optimistic. To translate the sum of recommendations of the RevApp consultant in combination with the lessons learned through Phase I, the Component 1 and 3 budgets have been comparatively boosted for Phase II to cater for a higher level of implementation activity, while the budget for Component 2 has been comparatively reduced. So a combination of a stronger emphasis on more and wider sharing/involvement, model formulation/scaling-up, focus on fewer and more lucrative IGAs and a more intensive strengthening of LCGs.

Concerning the mandatory co-financing/matching funding, it has been agreed with CISU, also based on the RevApp consultant's recommendations (Review cum Pre-appraisal report p.21), that DOF and Programme partners will seek to phase-in co-financing/matching funding to the magnitude of minimum DKK 200.000 during Phase II. This co-financing/matching funding is to come in the form of additional Project/Programme funding obtained by the 3 South partners that is ear-marked to the same 7 Programme sites targeting similar and/or mutually supportive activities; as well as or alternatively Project/Programme funding targeting the Phase II thematic working areas at the national level for all 4 Program partners. This co-financing/matching funding, of minimum DKK 200.000, can be secured at any stage during the Phase II, but has to be actively pursued in year 3 (if not successful prior to that), and obtained at the latest during the first half of year 4.



This Programme Proposal was developed and agreed by DOF, Nature Kenya, Nature Uganda and Bird Conservation Nepal and submitted to CISU on 5th October 2017