




















































## People Partner with Nature for Sustainable Living (PPN) – *Integrating Livelihoods and Conservation Phase III (2022-2025)*

<p><b>Key results/outcomes:</b>            1: Enhanced sustainability and climate change resilience of local community land-use and livelihoods            2: PPN (People Partner with Nature) forests' conservation status maintained or improved            3: The basis for sustainability and upscaling of Participatory Forest Management (PFM) improved</p> <p><b>Justification for support:</b>            The programme objective of PPN is 'Forest sites conserved creating sustainable benefits for biodiversity, people and climate'. The Participatory Forest Management (PFM) methodology continues to be the overall approach of the PPN Program and is based on the recognition that forest resources are still important for the livelihoods of the forest adjacent communities, and that previous century strict 'policing' of forest reserves didn't lead to sustainable forest conservation and resource use. A new component (piloted in phase II) on climate adaptation and mitigation has been mainstreamed into the new program strategy. The objective of the program is aligned with the principles for civil society support outlined in "The World We Share" and in the "Policy for Danish Support to civil society". The program has a relevant civil society approach, combining strategic services, capacity building and advocacy.</p> <p><b>Major risks and challenges:</b>            Nature destruction: National (and local) development programs based on unsustainable natural resource extraction (like oil and gas) and large-scale infrastructure developments like construction of roads, dams, powerlines etc., sometimes driven by corruption and short-term gains, has the potential to and could in the worst-case scenario end up damaging the Program forest sites. To mitigate the consequences of nature-damaging development programs, the PPN Partnership deliberately works to build/strengthen locally based organisations that can respond, in a timely manner, to planned and factual unsustainable/illegal natural resource extraction in any type of conservation area and beyond.</p>	<b>File No.</b>	2019-1911																						
	<b>Country</b>	Kenya, Uganda & Nepal																						
	<b>Responsible Unit</b>	HCE																						
	<b>Sector</b>	15150																						
		<i>DKK mill.</i>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>Tot.</b>																	
	<b>Commitment</b>	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	18.4																		
	<b>Projected Disb.</b>	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	18.4																		
	<b>Duration</b>	Jan. 2022 - Dec. 2025 (48 months)																						
	<b>Finance Act code.</b>	06.33.01.12																						
	<b>Head of unit</b>	Mette Thygesen																						
	<b>Desk officer</b>	Marie Theil Kjær																						
	<b>Financial officer</b>	CISU's controller																						
	<b>Relevant SDGs</b> [ <i>Maximum 5 – highlight with grey</i> ]																							
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td style="width: 16.6%;"> No Poverty</td> <td style="width: 16.6%;"> No Hunger</td> <td style="width: 16.6%;"> Good Health, Wellbeing</td> <td style="width: 16.6%;"> Quality Education</td> <td style="width: 16.6%;"> Gender Equality</td> <td style="width: 16.6%;"> Clean Water, Sanitation</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Affordable Clean Energy</td> <td> Decent Jobs, Econ. Growth</td> <td> Industry, Innovation, Infrastructure</td> <td> Reduced Inequalities</td> <td> Sustainable Cities, Communities</td> <td> Responsible Consumption &amp; Production</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Climate Action</td> <td> Life below Water</td> <td> Life on Land</td> <td> Peace &amp; Justice, strong Inst.</td> <td> Partnerships for Goals</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>							 No Poverty	 No Hunger	 Good Health, Wellbeing	 Quality Education	 Gender Equality	 Clean Water, Sanitation	 Affordable Clean Energy	 Decent Jobs, Econ. Growth	 Industry, Innovation, Infrastructure	 Reduced Inequalities	 Sustainable Cities, Communities	 Responsible Consumption & Production	 Climate Action	 Life below Water	 Life on Land	 Peace & Justice, strong Inst.	 Partnerships for Goals	
 No Poverty	 No Hunger	 Good Health, Wellbeing	 Quality Education	 Gender Equality	 Clean Water, Sanitation																			
 Affordable Clean Energy	 Decent Jobs, Econ. Growth	 Industry, Innovation, Infrastructure	 Reduced Inequalities	 Sustainable Cities, Communities	 Responsible Consumption & Production																			
 Climate Action	 Life below Water	 Life on Land	 Peace & Justice, strong Inst.	 Partnerships for Goals																				

### CSF Budget: Summary table of Cost Categories

		Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of Total
Cost category							
A1	Direct activity cost	1.753.476	438.369	438.369	438.369	438.369	11%
A2	Implementation through local independent partner	10.700.000	2.675.000	2.675.000	2.675.000	2.675.000	64%
A3	Allocated programme support cost	1.184.928	296.232	296.232	296.232	296.232	7%
A5	Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA)	272.768	68.192	68.192	68.192	68.192	2%
A6	Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15% of PPA)	1.486.586	371.647	371.647	371.647	371.647	9%
A7	Auditing in Denmark	153.644	38.411	38.411	38.411	38.411	1%
B1	Administration in Demark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget)	1.088.598	272.150	272.150	272.150	272.150	7%
	Total applied amount <b>before</b> scoring	<b>16.640.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>100%</b>
	Total granted amount <b>after</b> scoring	<b>18.360.000</b>	<b>4.590.000</b>	<b>4.590.000</b>	<b>4.590.000</b>	<b>4.590.000</b>	

After scoring a total of **DKK 18,4 mill** is approved (against applied DKK 16,6 mill.). The budget will be adjusted proportionally before signing final agreement with CISU.

## 1. Introduction

- **Parties:**

CISU and Dansk Ornitologisk Forening (DOF) – Birdlife Danmark

The present development engagement document details the objectives and management arrangements for the development cooperation concerning People Partner with Nature for Sustainable Living – Integrating Livelihoods and Conservation Phase III 2022-2025 as agreed between the parties specified below. The development engagement document together with the documentation specified below constitutes the agreement between the parties. Dansk Ornitologisk Forening-programme will be financed within the current Civil Society Fund (CSF) administered by CISU.

The objective of the programme is aligned with the principles for civil society support outlined in "The World 2030" and in the "Policy for Danish Support to civil society".

The programme has a relevant civil society approach, combining strategic service, capacity building and advocacy. There is a focus on SDG 1, 13, 15, 16 and 17.

Assessment process: The programme has been through a comprehensive process according to the agreed CISU procedures for programme organisations. An external consultant has made a Review/Appraisal as a basis for the assessment conducted by the CSF Assessment Committee. The final programme document has been desk appraised by two internal CISU Assessment Consultants, followed by an overall assessment by the CSP granting committee, in which the programme has been in competition, according to merits, with five other programme applicants. The assessment was based on 12 criteria. No embassy comments have been received.

Quality control: Monitoring of result framework and learning on overall Theory of Change will be done as part of CISU-led yearly consultations. An external review will be conducted in last year of the programme phase.

The CSF Assessment Committee recommends the programme for final approval by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

### Key documentation:

- Programme document with annexes, including an overall result framework.
- Review/appraisal report by external consultant.

## 2. Background

- **National, thematic, or regional context, key challenges, and opportunities relevant to the proposed programme**

According to the State of World's Forests 2020 by FAO and UNEP (2020) the world's forest continues to decline primarily due to population growth, agriculture, and unsustainable levels of exploitation, much of which is illegal. The situation in Kenya, Uganda and Nepal does not differ much from the global tendencies when it comes to deforestation. In Kenya, only seven percent of the country's natural forest area remains corresponding to approx. 40,000 km<sup>2</sup>. In Uganda, nine percent of the natural forest area remains, covering approx. 11.300 km<sup>2</sup> of the country's total area, while in Nepal 40 percent of the country's forests remains, covering approx. 59,600 km<sup>2</sup> of the country's total area.

### Kenya

In Kenya, deforestation is driven by agricultural expansion, unsustainable use of forest resources and population increase, all three factors often exacerbated by widespread youth unemployment. The average annual depletion of forest cover appears to be about 1%.

Although the forest sector contributes only a small amount to the formal economy, its unrecorded value in the informal and subsistence sector is great. According to FAO's State of the World's Forest (2014), estimates that Kenya's forestry sector contributes USD 365 million to the GDP annually. Over 80% of the national energy supply is met by fuelwood. Forests contribute 3.6% to the GDP excluding vital environmental services and contributions to other sectors. Current wood deficit is projected to increase from 10 to at least 15 million m<sup>3</sup> 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, considering value-added, unrecorded, and informal sector activity. Over half a million households, or about 10% of the population, living within 5 km of indigenous/natural forests, depend on the direct use of forest resources, including timber and Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs). Both official regulations and illegal encroachment into forests for agriculture and settlement constitute a major and perhaps the most severe threat to indigenous/natural forest status and integrity. Dakatcha is threatened by agricultural expansion given that it is not protected. As for Arabuko & Taita Hills forests, pressure here is driven by unsustainable forest resource use.

Just over 9.400 km<sup>2</sup> of the forests are under formal protection corresponding to 255 forest reserves according to the National Forest Program. 32.000 km<sup>2</sup> is gazette under county, community, or private ownership. A large part of the forest areas under protection (just over 12.000 km<sup>2</sup>) are classified as indigenous closed canopy forests providing goods and services such as wildlife habitats, biodiversity, water catchments, employment opportunities and livelihood resources for millions of people.

### Uganda

As in Kenya deforestation in Uganda is driven by agricultural expansion and unsustainable use of forest resources combined with a high population growth, poor forest management and lack of enforcement of forest legislation by authorities. 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. Within a period of 15 years from 1990, Uganda's forestry estate has shrunk from 24% of the total land area to 9% in 2015, representing an average annual deforestation rate of 1.7%. The rate of deforestation in Central Forest Reserves was 1.1%. The Forestry Policy 2001 estimated the contribution of forests to the GDP to be 6% while the annual contribution of forests to household cash income was estimated at 11-27% in 2002. 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.

Just over 36% of the forests are under different categories of formal protection extending from Central Forest Reserves (18,5%) managed by National Forestry Authority (NFA), over National Parks and Wildlife Reserves (17,5%) managed by Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) to local forest reserves (0,03%) managed by local governments (District Local Governments under District Forest Services). The rest of the forests (64%) are on private and communal lands and managed by private and local community forest owners.

### Nepal

The deforestation is driven by Illegal logging, encroachment, road construction and fuelwood consumption. Such activities are mainly due to growing population and ongoing development activities.

The average annual depletion of forest cover appears to be about 1.7%

Within a period of 19 years from 2001, the forest cover was reduced with approximately 464 km<sup>2</sup> representing an average annual deforestation rate of 0.90 percent. The agriculture and the forestry sector contribute with 39% to the total GDP and employ about 80% of the population. At the national level, 28% of all household income comes from these two sectors. It is estimated that the forestry sector alone contributes 15% to the GDP of the country (MoFSC 2009). Similarly, Non-Timber Forest Products (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).

3286.627 km<sup>2</sup> of the forests are under formal protection corresponding to 16 forest reserves. The Ministry of Forests and Environment (MoFE) 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 and Soil Conservation. Forests inside Protected Areas are under the jurisdiction of the first, forests outside under the latter. Currently Protected

Areas cover 23.39% of Nepal's total area and is the dominant approach to biodiversity conservation.

## **3. Presentation of programme**

**Lessons learned and results from previous interventions hereunder follow-up on latest Capacity Assessment/reviews (summary of management response or similar) and other assessments:**

During the current PPN II, good progress has been made on all four components, and good results have been achieved vis-à-vis enhancing the capacities of Bird Conservation Nepal (BCN), Nature Kenya (NK) and Nature Uganda (NU), improving the management of the targeted forests, improving livelihoods, reducing the pressure on forests, and strengthening the capacities and engagement of local civil society in forest management. It is too early to assess climate change results; however, it is evident that the environmental status of the targeted forests has improved. This is supported in the 2021 review where it is emphasized by the consultant that the DOF BirdLife, BCN, NK and NU partnership has proven its capacity to manage and implement PPN II and deliver tangible results. Tangible improvements have also been achieved regarding livelihoods and the conservation of forests and biodiversity, just as the Program has effectively included women and vulnerable groups and enhanced their voice and influence in forest governance.

More specifically, the program has in phase 2 been successful in enhancing equality & equity with high participation of women in e.g., IGAs like beekeeping, which is quite popular and 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 Chiuri or bamboo, that makes these activities more sustainable.

The program partners have in phase 1 and 2 supported and facilitated processes involving local stakeholders in jointly reviewing and revising existing forest management plans with forest authorities. This has enhanced real participation and equity in the process and integrating and mainstreaming biodiversity in the efforts to manage forests sustainably for the benefit of both forests, local communities, and forest authorities, showcasing that the PFM approach is working well. 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 local settings but lasts institutionally at the national level.

These observations are in line with the partnership's own conclusions based on e.g., focus groups interviews with the target groups, progress reports and Locally Based Monitoring (LBM), where conclusions are clear: Despite the national trend of deforestation in Kenya, Uganda, and Nepal, all six program forests have shown signs of recovery in terms of regrowth of indigenous canopy tree species, and the rate at which forest disappears is also slowing down as a result of program efforts. Furthermore, the three local partners have documented maintained or even increasing populations of some endangered and endemic bird and tree species and an increase in canopy cover. The progress on forest conservation can be attributed to the Program's persistent efforts to improve local living conditions and reduce local people's forest dependency, in combination with targeted advocacy and policy work locally and nationally. Additionally, this has contributed to strengthening sustainability in forest management on aspects of over-exploitation, benefit sharing, strengthening of Community Forest Groups (CFGs) organization and influence, forest law enforcement, and the perceived overall value of the forests to all involved stakeholders. In Uganda, these efforts have led to an increased buy-in of local authorities, who are now hoping to upgrade the status of Echuya forest to a National Park.

#### *Review recommendation to the PPN partnership capacities*

The CISU 2021 Review concluded that the three partners have a clear niche and unique in bird and nature conservation and are recognized by national government stakeholders for their contribution to PFM, as evidenced by invitation from the governments to participate in national policy and planning processes. The three partners have for several years been engaged in the promotion of PFM as a mean to conserve the environment and improve livelihoods, which, in combination with a very good track record of retaining staff, has proven very conducive for continuity. The three partners generally have stronger staff capacity for conservation than livelihoods, but considerable experience has been gained over the last two phases of the PPN Program, and useful assistance has been received through collaboration with other NGOs and government technical staff in the implementation of livelihood activities.

The CISU external review consultant could not travel due to the travel restrictions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. Hence, the field visits were carried out by national consultants and interviews with implementing partners and stakeholders in Kathmandu, Nairobi and, to a lesser extent, Kampala were carried out as remote interviews using internet applications (VoIP).

However, the review also came up with two interesting recommendations to improve the partnership and support the Programs long-term sustainability approach, which the Program will work to strengthen in phase three. These are:

**Recommendation 1:** Enhance synergies and skills transfer among the implementing partners, through:

- a) Implementing peer visits where BCN, NK and NU staff work together on replicating approaches, best practices and lessons to address specific issues and opportunities
- b) Linking to other parts of DOF, in particular mobilize the DOF Climate & Biodiversity Fund to engage in protecting existing forests and community involvement for sustainability

**Recommendation 2:** Strengthen institutional capacities of BCN, NK and NU with a focus on addressing specific challenges, through:

- a) Providing capacity development on: i) advocacy, lobbying, creating alliances and influencing policy and planning, ii) in-country fundraising, iii) nature-based climate change adaptation and mitigation solutions, and iv) research with a focus on informing policy
- b) Enhancing the socio-economic engagement capacity through additional staffing or more structured/formalised partnerships with rural development NGOs

The recommendations regarding capacity have been converted to concrete actions in the ToC and the Results Framework, where the Program at the output level prioritizes strengthening of institutional capacity to further support the program's long-term sustainability, including fundraising as the partners to a significant extent depend on funding mobilised by DOF BirdLife and other international partners. This is a potential threat to the long-term organisational and technical capacity of the partners.

In cooperation with the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB, BirdLife in United Kingdom), and as part of RSBP's exit strategy from Nepal, DOF BirdLife has set up a fundraising working group under the auspices of the BirdLife partnership with the participation of the management from BirdLife's regional Asia office, BirdLife International's capacity development program and RSPB.

Recommendations regarding enhancing synergies and skills transfer among the implementing partners will take place on an ongoing basis as a new approach to the work. Linking the Program to other parts of DOF BirdLife, in particular to the work of the DOF BirdLife Climate & Biodiversity Fund, is a political process where the decision-making power lies with DOF BirdLife's political leadership. However, a working group has already been set up to investigate the possibilities of linking the PPN Program with the Climate & Biodiversity Fund. Danish PPN staff are involved in the process.

### **Partners in the Programme including the role and responsibilities of the key drivers of change**

Nature Kenya 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, 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 favorable 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 Local Conservation Groups (LCGs) are site based civil society groups with whom Nature Kenya works collaboratively with a wide array of Government agencies and conservation and development organisations. Nature Kenya connects LCGs 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 centers that deliver environmental education to youth taking advantage of LCGs' presence at focus sites and has implemented more than 35 projects in the past 5 years. NK became a full partner of BirdLife in 1993. DOF BirdLife has worked with Nature Kenya since 2003.

Nature Uganda 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 governments. 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 to better service its members. 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 Programs together with DOF has helped NU work closely with District Local Governments, the National Forest Authority and Collaborative Forest Management Associations. NU became a full partner of BirdLife in 1995. DOF BirdLife has worked with NU since 2010.

Bird Conservation Nepal (BCN) was established in 1982. It is the leading organisation in Nepal, focusing on the conservation of birds, their habitats, and sites, while benefiting people. BCN started its Program 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 organisations' various activities around IBAs. It has as its guiding principles conservation of birds, their habitats and biodiversity, people's participation in conservation and benefiting the people themselves, institutional learning and building national and international networks to increase effectiveness in bird and biodiversity conservation. BCN became a full partner of BirdLife in 2017. DOF BirdLife has worked with BCN since 2014.

#### *BirdLife International*

BirdLife International is a global Partnership of conservation organizations (NGOs) that strives to conserve birds, their habitats and global biodiversity, working with people towards sustainability in the use of natural resources. Together the Partnership is defined by 117 BirdLife Partners worldwide – one per country or territory – and growing. DOF BirdLife is the Danish partner of the global BirdLife Partnership. The BirdLife Global Secretariat is based in Cambridge, UK, and has 6 regional offices around the world, including in Singapore and Nairobi. BirdLife's has a Board, a Global Council with elected representatives from all the six regions, an Executive Team and Regional Directors in addition to qualified technical staff. It has nine Programs, including the IBA, Climate, Local Engagement and Empowerment and Forests of Hope Programs which are implemented with Partners around the World. The BirdLife HQ in Cambridge collects and provides data on bird species, IBAs and other thematic areas, case studies and other resources. BirdLife was reorganized in the 1980s as a response to the need for a more efficient organization for international bird protection. DOF BirdLife was one of the architects behind the modernization of the BirdLife we know today. DOF BirdLife has been a full member of BirdLife International since the 1980s.

**Overall strategy (Intervention logic, Theory of Change or Rationale) and key assumptions related to the programme strategy (how the programme will achieve the outcome level, outcome indicators and targets)**

Program pillar 1

Training in and rolling-out sustainable PFM as well as monitoring and surveillance of the state of the forests and biodiversity is one of three pillars in the program strategy and is aimed at striking a healthy balance between local development on one side and forest and biodiversity conservation on the other. The conservation, management and monitoring are centered around the formal Community Forest Groups (CFGs) in partnership with the forest authorities. Each CFG is responsible for a specific part of the forest in question and holds a signed PFM agreement with the forest authorities about rights and responsibilities in their section of the forest. The PFM work and the biodiversity and forest canopy cover monitoring will take place in the main or all parts of six forest estates, and partly also in Echuya Forest. The total forest area is adding to app. 1,800 km<sup>2</sup>.

In addition, the Program has added (since 2020) a special focus on the high fuelwood consumption which contributes to both forest degradation/removal of nutrients and CO<sup>2</sup> emissions. The fuelwood consumption alone in the seven sites adds up to several thousand tons annually. One of the solutions is establishing Energy Saving Stoves (ESSs) reducing household fuelwood consumption by up to 40-50% (based on preliminary results in 2021). To further reduce the pressure on the forests, the program will over a period of four years from 2022 to 2025 plant 83,000 seedlings (ensuring a min. survival rate of 85%) in the agricultural land outside the forests. Tree planting contributes to increased CO<sup>2</sup> uptake and, together with the ESSs and the program's general ambition to reduce deforestation, is part of the program's climate mitigation strategy. In addition, tree planting has an added value for both biodiversity, agriculture, and the local community livelihoods as the selected species will be nitrogen-fixating and/or fruit trees, which will provide shade, reduce temperatures in their immediate surroundings, retain moisture, provide crops in the form of fruit, and will serve as a habitat for insects, birds, mammals, and other animal groups, just as some of the trees can, with time, be used for building materials and fuelwood.

Program pillar 2

However, pressure on the forest areas and their resources cannot be reduced with just good management practices and joint monitoring/patrolling alone. It also requires that the pressure agricultural and agriculture-related activities put on forests is reduced - a pressure that is likely to increase with the population growth around the program forest sites in all three countries.

Continued support to further development and extending of climate-smart agricultural practices continues to be the core of the second pillar of the program strategy, while the Program in phase 3 moves away from training in IGAs to organizing communities in cooperatives and explore options for private sector engagement in financing and market linkages by carrying out/implement market analysis, value addition/improve product processing, quality improvement and bulking to strengthen market access and increase income aiming at ensuring better profitability and more long-term sustainability.

The development of site-wide, sustainable enterprises is informed by and based on previous IGA experiences and successes and will integrate and make use of existing Saving and Loans Groups established in previous Program phases. The underlying assumption is that increased income from selected IGAs and selected enterprises will sufficiently supplement the income of many households, in combination with climate-smart agriculture, to make it unnecessary for them to encroach on more forest land and other natural areas to obtain better livelihoods. The push for a better utilization of the currently utilized agricultural land around the PPN forests is also becoming a necessity due to shrinking household acreage and increasing land prices.



The Program focus on climate-smart agriculture follows the same logic that by introducing a range of higher-yielding and more climate resilient crop varieties using organic measures and simple irrigation methods, households will experience a higher and more sustainable net yield of more crop varieties, and thereby improving food security, nutritional status, and net income (if some of the produce is sold).

Climate-smart agriculture constitutes most of the program's climate adaptation strategy in combination with the tree planting in and around agriculture areas.

The creation of sustainable enterprises and the building of local capacities in climate-smart agriculture are approaches that complement each other well, as climate-smart agriculture has a broad mainly subsistence and livelihood improving focus, while support for the development of sustainable enterprises has a primarily monetary and market-oriented focus, tailoring the two approaches to the diverse contexts that exist in the forest-adjacent communities and stimulates development at different levels creating local lasting changes in relation to adaptation to climate change, better food security and nutrition as well as a reduction in poverty.

### Program pillar 3

Advocacy and to some extent also lobbying and policy work constitutes the third pillar in the program strategy. At both national and local levels, the work is building on the training and practical experiences gathered during previous program phases as well as through other similar projects and programs. At the national level, the program partners execute their advocacy work on program related topics towards selected target groups, including governments, sometimes alone but often collaboratively through established networks, coalitions, and platforms. The national lobbying and policy work relating to the program is mainly targeted at seeking influence on PFM and other forest/nature/environment legislation as well as international green/environmental conventions. At the local level, the advocacy work is spearheaded by the Local Conservation Groups (LCGs), sometimes assisted by the formal Community Forest Groups (CFGs).

In phase III, the more political and information-oriented efforts take place to develop and test contextually appropriate approaches for sustainability, upscaling, and replication through strategic partnerships by applying a landscape perspective and engage more in local development planning processes through LCGs and in alliances with civil society partners and in collaboration with local governments to ensure they do not lead to encroachment in the forests, as there has generally been limited engagement by the partners in local development planning and local land-use planning, although these can significantly affect forests.

In addition, the partnership will engage in PFM training course development with forestry training/research institutions and offer attachments and PPN site visits for forest practitioners and forestry students, formalize a national partnership between BCN and FECOFUN in Nepal to include biodiversity conservation elements in CFG agreements and by gradually expanding PFM support to into new parts of PPN forests and beyond.

Capacity building of partners and (in-country) fundraising is central to both upscaling of PFM, forest conservations and enhancing sustainability and climate change resilience of local community land-use and livelihoods.

<b>Summary of assumptions:</b>	<b>KEY ASSUMPTION</b>
<b>Programme Outcome 1</b>	1 - Increase in household nutrition, food security and net income will reduce the need for agriculture encroachment and pressure on forest resources and ecosystem services.
<b>Programme Outcome 2</b>	1 - Forest authorities remain willing to share the formal and legal responsibility for PFM with and bestow the rights to benefit from forest resources to forest adjacent communities 2 - Communities will manage forest resources sustainably and in a transparent and inclusive manner and avoid elite capture
<b>Programme Outcome 3</b>	1 - FECOFUN and forestry training/research institutions have the willingness to engage in upscaling of PFM with emphasis on biodiversity through close collaboration with national program partners 2 - Availability of funding options for upscaling in Kenya, Uganda and Nepal.

## Summary of results framework:

<b>Program objective</b>		<b>Forest sites conserved creating sustainable benefits for biodiversity, people, and climate</b>			
<b>Program theme 1</b>		<b>Livelihoods</b>			
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Outcome 1</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Targets (end of program) Kenya</b>	<b>Targets (end of program) Uganda</b>	<b>Targets (end of program) Nepal</b>
<p>1.1 Climate smart agriculture improved</p> <p>1.2. Site-wide, sustainable enterprises promoted</p> <p>1.3. LCGs and partners engaged in local (district/county) and national development planning processes of forest adjacent land</p> <p>1.4. Technical skills of partners in nature-based climate change adaptation and mitigation solutions and socio-economic engagement capacity improved</p>	<b>Enhanced sustainability and climate change resilience of local community land-use and livelihoods</b>	<p>1. Sustainable harvest yield optimization without the inclusion of new agricultural land measured in kg/ha</p> <p>2. Number of site-wide sustainable enterprises established (<i>Production volume/income/HH measured by end of program</i>)</p> <p>3. Number of indigenous nitrogen-fixating, or fruit trees planted and surviving</p>	<p>1. Mean harvest yield of legume crops increased to 156 kg/ha per year (26% increase from baseline of 124 kg/ha per year) for 600 HHs in all 3 sites Improved breed of Goat and chicken rearing increased at household level from baseline of 200 HHs to 500 HHs in Dakatcha Woodland</p> <p>2. Min. two site-wide and sustainable enterprises established (beekeeping + butterfly rearing in Arabuko-Sokoke and Taita Hills, and beekeeping + ecotourism in Dakatcha Woodland</p> <p>3. 18,000 trees planted (Min. 15,300 surviving = 85% survival rate) by 900 HHs in all 3 sites</p>	<p>1. Mean harvest yield of cooking bananas/plantain increased to 75,000 kg/ha/year (25% increase from baseline of 60,000kg/ha/year) for 2,000 HHs in Kasyoha-Kitomi</p> <p>2. Min. two site-wide and sustainable enterprises established (beekeeping and fruit wine production in Kasyoha-Kitomi)</p> <p>3. 40,000 trees planted (Min. 34,000 surviving = 85% survival rate) by 2,000 HHs on 1 site</p>	<p>1. Mean harvest yield of Wheat increased to 3,540 kg/ha per year (20% increase from baseline of 2,950 kg/ha per year) for 2,500 HHs in 2 sites</p> <p>2. Min. two site-wide and sustainable enterprises established (beekeeping + organic vegetable production in both Resunga and Madane)</p> <p>3. 25,000 trees planted (Min. 21,250 surviving = 85% survival rate) by 1,000 HHs in 2 sites</p>
<b>Program theme 2</b>		<b>Conservation</b>			
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Outcome 2</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Targets (end of program) Kenya</b>	<b>Targets (end of program) Uganda</b>	<b>Targets (end of program) Nepal</b>
2.1. Fuelwood consumption reduced in forest		1. Average number of headloads of fuelwood measured	1. Fuelwood consumption reduced to 60	1. Fuelwood consumption reduced to 20	1. Fuelwood consumption reduced to 70

<p>adjacent communities</p> <p>2.2. CFGs' capacity to steward PPN forests in cooperation with forest authorities improved</p> <p>2.3. CFGs and partners engaged in influencing the enforcement of PFM legislation locally and nationally</p> <p>2.4. Partner skills on evidence-based advocacy and influencing policy and planning developed</p>	<p><b>PPN forests' conservation status maintained or improved</b></p>	<p>in kg/HH/week (one headload = 20kg) (<i>Baseline: fuelwood consumption by 10% of HHs to get energy saving stoves (ESS) installed. End of program measure: fuelwood consumption of same 10% of HHs in year 4</i>)</p> <p>2. Population/population density of two forest specialist species per PPN forest site</p> <p>3. Canopy cover in %</p>	<p>kg/HH/week (40% reduction from baseline of 100 kg/HH/week) in 2,000 HHs on all 3 sites</p> <p>2. Population/population density of two forest specialist species <math>\geq</math> baseline (Taita Hills baselines: Taita Apalis 200 individuals and Taita Thrush 1,000 individuals, Arabuko-Sokoke baselines: Sokoke Scops Owl 5/km<sup>2</sup> and East Coast Akalat 6000 pairs in sampling area, Dakatcha Woodland baselines: Fischer's Turaco encounter rate of 3 birds/km and Clarke's Weaver min. 50 active nests)</p> <p>3. Canopy cover in % is <math>\geq</math> baseline (Taita Hills baseline: app. 60%, Arabuko-Sokoke baseline: app. 50%, and Dakatcha Woodland baseline: app. 20%)</p>	<p>kg/HH/week (50% reduction from baseline of 40 kg/HH/week) in 2,000 HHs on 1 site</p> <p>2. Population/population density of two forest specialist species <math>\geq</math> baseline (Kasyoha-Kitomi baselines: Funtumia sp. (forest tree) encounter rate of 105 saplings/km + 322 mature trees/km, and Great Blue Turaco 10 individuals/km<sup>2</sup>; Muchuya Swamp in Echuya Forest baseline: Grauer's Swamp-warbler 40 individuals/km<sup>2</sup>)</p> <p>3. Canopy cover in % is <math>\geq</math> baseline (Kasyoha-Kitomi baseline: app. 85%)</p>	<p>kg/HH/week (50% reduction from baseline of 140 kg/HH/week) in 2,700 HHs on 2 sites</p> <p>2. Population/population density of two forest specialist species <math>\geq</math> baseline (Resunga baselines: Mountain Bulbul 38 individuals/km<sup>2</sup> and Rufous Sibia 48 individuals/km<sup>2</sup>, and Madane baselines: Maroon Oriole 26 individuals/km<sup>2</sup> and Golden-throated Barbet 10 individuals/km<sup>2</sup>)</p> <p>3. Canopy cover in % is <math>\geq</math> baseline (Resunga baseline: app. 66% and Madane baseline: app. 52%)</p>
<p><b>Program theme 3</b></p>		<p><b>Upscaling</b></p>			
<p><b>Outputs</b></p>	<p><b>Outcome</b></p>	<p><b>Indicators</b></p>	<p><b>Targets (end of program) Kenya</b></p>	<p><b>Targets (end of program) Uganda</b></p>	<p><b>Targets (end of program) Nepal</b></p>

<p>3.1. PFM support gradually expanded into new parts of PPN forests and beyond</p> <p>3.2. Partnership with FECOFUN for upscaling formalized in Nepal</p> <p>3.3. PFM training course developed with forestry training/research institutions</p> <p>3.4. Partners' funding mobilization skills for upscaling/replication improved</p>	<p><b>The basis for sustainability and upscaling of PFM improved</b></p>	<p>1. Number of CFGs actively involved in site-wide networks</p> <p>2. Number of CFG agreements with FECOFUN that includes biodiversity conservation elements</p> <p>3. Number of practitioners and students participating in field visits</p>	<p>1. 9 CFGs involved in 3 site-wide networks</p> <p>3. 40 forest practitioners and students participate in field visits to PPN sites</p>	<p>1. 8 CFGs involved in 1 site-wide network</p> <p>3. 100 forest practitioners and students participate in field visits to PPN sites</p>	<p>2. 150 CFG agreements with FECOFUN that includes biodiversity conservation elements, including CFGs in Resunga and Madane</p> <p>3. 125 forest practitioners and students participating in field visits</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

### Target groups and beneficiaries:

By the end of 2025, the Program will have reached c. 7,000 HHs in Nepal, c. 5,300 HHs in Kenya and c. 4,500 HHs in Uganda, corresponding to c. 85,800 individuals. The many individuals are reached in different ways and for different purposes following the activities under the outputs leading up to the expected outcomes.

The focus on strengthening sustainable and participatory management of forests is achieved through organizing and training CFGs in management, monitoring, patrolling and documentation of illegal forest activities and influencing the enforcement of PFM legislation to conserve the ecosystem services and the natural resources that the forests provide, which the forest adjacent communities still depend on.

The focus on reducing encroachment by improving community livelihoods in terms of food security, nutrition, and poverty reduction and by influencing local development planning processes of forest adjacent land is achieved through training of Farmer Groups (FGs) in sustainable and climate-resilient agriculture as well as support to establishing of site-wide, sustainable enterprises.

The influence on local development planning processes is done through partners and Local Conservation Groups (LCGs) acting as local branches of the partner, sometimes in close collaboration with the CFGs in place.

In Kenya, the LCGs also engage in environmental education and awareness raising and monitoring of biodiversity and collect data to support local governments in their biodiversity conservation planning process. In Nepal, the LCGs do not have the status of local branches but play the same role as advocates for sustainable local development and they consist only of young people: "Leaders of the future". In Uganda, the CFGs carry the same mandate and implement the same activities as the LCGs in Kenya and Nepal.

All community members are invited to become members of at least one of the Community Forest Groups (CFGs), Local Conservation Groups (LCGs), Farmer Groups (FGs) or enterprises.

The Program thus works directly with 149 groups (62 groups in Nepal, 57 in Kenya and 30 in Uganda) established by the partnerships benefitting a total of c. 85,000 people indirectly, including c. 16,800 people directly benefiting from training and learning.

The focus on securing a sustainable upscaling of the program's best practices with PFM is achieved by engaging in cooperation with new CFGs and forestry training/research institutions.

### **Monitoring & Evaluation:**

The thinking behind and adaptation of the Programs' new ToC has also given rise to a radical change of the monitoring formats compared to the first two phases. The aim has been to make reporting simpler (for partners to fill out), and much more results oriented by focusing on a few strategic targets as the foundation of monitoring and documenting results but also by creating a monitoring tool that captures results and challenges so that the Program can continuously be adapted to changes in the context e.g., based on the monitoring on assumptions and risks. Quarterly reporting is thus designed to measure progress towards the realization of end-of-Program-targets every quarter. In addition, the monitoring will focus on the realization of main activities and most significant progress observed under outputs during each quarter in addition to risks and assumptions monitoring.

Once a year the Program implementation is being evaluated cf. delivery on targets, to which extent the Program has contributed to the impact and main lessons learned vis-à-vis achieving the outcomes and impact to be communicated to CISU, constituencies and the public. Based on the Annual Country Progress Reports, changes to program strategy can occur prompting adaptation of the program and/or budget where necessary to ensure the Program Partnership works towards the changes agreed on. This will be discussed at the physical PMC meetings held annually in January/February where annual workplans are also being discussed and agreed. Prior to PMC meetings, Program partners develop and share work plans and corresponding detailed budgets.

### **Risk analysis and risk management:**

Three overall risks have emerged from the risk analysis: COVID-19, drought, and unsustainable natural resource extraction/ large-scale infrastructure developments.

#### **COVID-19**

As COVID-19 is considered a non-permanent risk and currently actively dealt with professionally by health care staff and relevant ministries in the three partner countries, it is not included in the above ToC. Besides, despite the global and national COVID-19 situation, NK, NU and BCN remain operational and implement and manage the PPN II and a number of other projects. Field visits are also possible, as long as local requirements for the use of medical face masks and hygiene rules are complied with and restrictions on distance and number of people allowed to gather simultaneously. These requirements and restrictions are complied with by e.g., implementing workshops and meetings in small groups and by making widespread use of online meetings/training etc. nationally as well as having regular program-wide and bilateral meetings online meetings.

#### **Drought**

Furthermore, droughts, especially in coastal lowlands in Kenya, and floods in Nepal can influence the number of households with improved yields but nonetheless makes the program effort more important, especially the program's focus on climate adaptation and especially activities centered around climate change adaptation based on training in climate-smart agriculture practices and use of organic measures and simple irrigation methods and introducing a range of higher-yielding and more climate resilient crop varieties.

#### **Nature destruction**

National (and local) development programs based on unsustainable natural resource extraction (like oil and gas) and large-scale infrastructure developments like construction of roads, dams, powerlines etc., sometimes driven by corruption and short-term gains, has the potential to and could in the worst-case scenario end up damaging the Program forest sites. To mitigate the consequences of nature-damaging development programs, the PPN Partnership deliberately works to build/strengthen locally based organisations that can respond, in a timely manner, to unsustainable/illegal natural resource extraction in any type of conservation area.

Equally important is the great local support from the communities involved in the development of IGAs based on NTFRs, which create local ownership and financial incentives to protect the forest areas as well as other natural areas from destructive activities as the communities have invested time in the IGA development and see a financial return on their efforts. In short, the involvement of communities in community livelihood improvement has created a greater self-awareness and understanding of the link between sustainable development and nature conservation, giving both LCGs and CFGs strong mandates. Together with a strong organization, this is assumed to help mitigate and manage potential risks related to nature-destructive activities both in and around Program forest sites.

In addition, the locally driven advocacy can be supplemented by campaigns which, together with local representatives, can put external, public, and media-borne pressure on political and private actors. Should the need arise, the PPN Partnership has the capacity to support, organize and execute such campaigns. NK proved this back in

2018, when an oil and gas company, with the backing of local and national government, initiated prospecting activities in Arabuko-Sokoke Forest. An effective media-backed counter-campaign was organized by NK with a demand for an immediate halt to the prospecting and explaining the importance of nature protection. This created public pressure on the local government, with back-up from other BirdLife-partners and a range of other national and international NGOs and institutions, which resulted in local government putting an immediate stop for the prospecting activities. In addition, the partners has established good relations with forest authorities, local and national governments through years of fruitful cooperation, which should reduce risks of forest destruction, also taking into consideration that all three partner countries do have sensible and functional environmental laws, just as potentially destructive projects and plans will often be detected at an early stage (this is one of the reasons for training the target group in the use of documentation in the form of regular monitoring as including the use of GPS and cameras, cf. outcome 2) improving the likelihood of counteractions and/or mitigation following due processes.

The design and formulation of a proper risk management system with guidelines and methodologies to keep track of any developments during implementation will be finalized in the beginning of the new phase when the identified risk areas have hopefully been approved.

### **Sustainability and phasing out:**

Sustainability permeates the entire program planning and implementation from; linking DOF BirdLife monitoring trips with PMC meetings and merging monitoring visits and financial audits to save flights, to strategic collaboration with educational institutions and building and strengthening of local and national forest networks to create a sustainable foundation for upscaling forest protection, over capacity building of partners with a special focus on resource mobilization to peer learning where partners across the partnership build capacity for/with each other and exchange experiences and knowledge. The program's upscaling to Tanzania will be south-south-driven primarily implemented by NK and NU, which is another example of the program's peer learning approach.

Close attention to regular monitoring and assessment of risks, assumptions and sustainability is, and will continue to be so during PPN III, part of the quarterly narrative reporting, quarterly online PMC meetings as well as on the annual physical PMC meetings. In addition, and as part of the day-to-day work, DOF BirdLife and especially the partners closely follow the political, legislative, and human rights situation in the partner countries.

## **4. Overview of management set-up at programme level**

### **Overall organization:**

NK, NU and BCN are responsible for implementation in their respective countries and sites, cooperation with all their local and national stakeholders, achievement of results, hiring and line management of adequate staff, quality assurance of deliveries, monitoring, financial and narrative reporting internally and to DOF BirdLife 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 BirdLife as and when needs arise and share information on relevant political and other developments in their countries, changes in their own organizations, and knowledge and data, which can be useful for other partners and the Program. This knowledge and data are also the basis for the annual risk and assumptions analysis, which will be carried out during PPN III.

DOF BirdLife is as per contract formally responsible for the entire Program to CISU and day-to-day management. DOF BirdLife takes lead in providing general oversight of the program on all aspects, mainly regarding progress on implementation, status on expenditure/financial management and all contact to CISU, but also TA and development of guidelines, policies, and methodologies. The DOF international team involves other DOF BirdLife technical staff and hires external consultants for short-term technical assistance when needs arise. In addition, DOF BirdLife takes the lead in coordinating Program activities with partners and carrying out supervision and monitoring at Program and country levels. DOF BirdLife is also responsible for Program 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 Program level and will be responsible for arranging and facilitating the annual external audits after having received annual audit reports from partners.

*Program Management Committee*

To coordinate and jointly steer the Program, the Program Management Committee (PMC) will continue to meet physically at least once per year with each partner having hosting responsibilities on a rotational basis, and online, as a minimum, through quarterly video meetings and bilateral ad hoc dialog with Program managers and TA sessions. The PMC consists of directors and program managers from the three local partner organizations in addition to DOF BirdLife's international staff with responsibility for the PPN Program, and is the 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 Program level documents. The PMC is also responsible for the information on and dissemination of DOF BirdLife's Behavioral and Values Policy and Guidelines (including Code of Conduct Policy, Safeguarding Policy - PSHEA Policy, Complaints Policy & Procedures, and Anti-Corruption Policy).

It will be possible to report unacceptable incidences/circumstances etc. anonymously both internally in DOF BirdLife and externally, through a form on DOF BirdLife's website, which is currently being developed by DOF BirdLife's IT-team. A specific complaints instruction with the required minimum information and a format to support the process will also be made readily accessible on DOF BirdLife's website. This will be in Danish and English.

#### *Administrative procedures and financial administration*

Prior to the Inception period, DOF BirdLife 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 previous partners, as well as with the incumbent partner, Nature Tanzania. Part of the contract, as annexes, are all the formal CISU guidelines relevant for the Program, including audit instructions that partners must sign up to follow. This also includes the CISU approved DOF BirdLife 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 four partner contracts.

#### **Financial Management:**

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 Program implementation; including financial management procedures, internal control measures, top-end electronic accounting 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 BirdLife 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 'Un-allocated funds and budget margin' will be the responsibility of DOF BirdLife.

DOF BirdLife will be responsible for submitting payment requests to CISU based on records of expenditure and resulting cash requirement budgets at the Program level. Grant disbursements to partners, for which DOF BirdLife is responsible, shall be processed following payment requests based on quarterly financial reports and cash budgets prepared and submitted by partners to DOF BirdLife.

Each partner will have fixed annual budgets as well as one for the entire Program period, which must feature in both quarterly financial reports and payment requests. As per the CISU guidelines, the grant disbursements must 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 must feature clearly for audit purposes and be credited and reimbursed to CISU upon Program phase finalization. Each partner is obliged to allocate the CISU funds to the Program activities according to the Program Document, Budget, Results Framework, and the Annual Work Plans.

The annual audits of the Program accounts will be conducted following the fiscal year January-December. Each of the partners are obliged, in agreement with DOF BirdLife, to contract a registered external audit company to carry out both the formal annual financial audit of their Program accounts and the performance audit to international accounting standards (IFAC/INTOSAI), CISU guidelines/audit instructions and the audit instructions given by DOF BirdLife's external audit company.

Annually, including at the end PPN III, DOF BirdLife's external audit company will conduct full audits of Program accounts. It will be based on the annual audit reports, supplied by the local external audit companies through the partners, their annual final accounts, including accrued bank interests and net exchange rate gains, lists of fixed assets

etc. as well as DOF BirdLife's bank transfers to partners' bank accounts and DOF BirdLife's own spending, time sheets etc. for the entire Phase III.

## 5. The programme budget

Turnover Budget - CSF and co-financing		Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of PPA
A. Expected Liquid Funds (funds raised in Denmark)		180.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	45.000	1,3%
B. Programme CSF Funds		16.640.000	4.160.000	4.160.000	4.160.000	4.160.000	n/a
C. Expected Co-financing		540.000	135.000	135.000	135.000	135.000	4,0%
<b>D. TOTAL</b>		<b>17.360.000</b>	<b>4.340.000</b>	<b>4.340.000</b>	<b>4.340.000</b>	<b>4.340.000</b>	
Liquid Funds (funds raised in Denmark) (A) in % of PPA		1,3%	1,3%	1,3%	1,3%	1,3%	
Co-financing (C) in % of PPA		4,0%	4,0%	4,0%	4,0%	4,0%	
<i>Budget in DKK</i>							
CSF Budget - Outcome and Cost Category breakdown							
Main budget lines		Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of Total
<b>I. Programme and Project Activities (PPA) (Details below)</b>		<b>13.638.404</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>82%</b>
Outcome 1		5.255.976	1.313.994	1.313.994	1.313.994	1.313.994	39%
<i>Hereof Cost Category A1</i>		584.492	146.123	146.123	146.123	146.123	11%
<i>Hereof Cost Category A2</i>		4.276.508	1.069.127	1.069.127	1.069.127	1.069.127	81%
<i>Hereof Cost Category A3</i>		394.976	98.744	98.744	98.744	98.744	8%
Outcome 2		4.573.332	1.143.333	1.143.333	1.143.333	1.143.333	34%
<i>Hereof Cost Category A1</i>		584.492	146.123	146.123	146.123	146.123	13%
<i>Hereof Cost Category A2</i>		3.593.864	898.466	898.466	898.466	898.466	79%
<i>Hereof Cost Category A3</i>		394.976	98.744	98.744	98.744	98.744	9%
Outcome 3		3.809.096	952.274	952.274	952.274	952.274	28%
<i>Hereof Cost Category A1</i>		584.492	146.123	146.123	146.123	146.123	15%
<i>Hereof Cost Category A2</i>		2.829.628	707.407	707.407	707.407	707.407	74%
<i>Hereof Cost Category A3</i>		394.976	98.744	98.744	98.744	98.744	10%
<b>I. Total PPA Costs Budget</b>		<b>13.638.404</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>82%</b>
A5. Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA)		272.768	68.192	68.192	68.192	68.192	n/a
A6. Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15% of PPA)		1.486.586	371.647	371.647	371.647	371.647	n/a
A7. Auditing in Denmark		153.644	38.411	38.411	38.411	38.411	1%
<b>II. Total Direct Costs Budget</b>		<b>15.551.402</b>	<b>3.887.851</b>	<b>3.887.851</b>	<b>3.887.851</b>	<b>3.887.851</b>	<b>93%</b>
III. B1. Administration in Denmark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget)		1.088.598	272.150	272.150	272.150	272.150	n/a
<b>IV. Grand Total Costs Budget</b>		<b>16.640.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>100%</b>
CSF Budget: Summary table of Cost Categories (Automatically calculated.)		Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of Total
Cost category							
A1	Direct activity cost	1.753.476	438.369	438.369	438.369	438.369	11%
A2	Implementation through local independent partner	10.700.000	2.675.000	2.675.000	2.675.000	2.675.000	64%
A3	Allocated programme support cost	1.184.928	296.232	296.232	296.232	296.232	7%
A5	Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA)	272.768	68.192	68.192	68.192	68.192	2%
A6	Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15% of PPA)	1.486.586	371.647	371.647	371.647	371.647	9%
A7	Auditing in Denmark	153.644	38.411	38.411	38.411	38.411	1%
B1	Administration in Denmark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget)	1.088.598	272.150	272.150	272.150	272.150	7%
<b>Total / control</b>		<b>16.640.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>100%</b>
CSF Budget - Geographical breakdown							
Main budget lines		Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of Total
<b>I. Programme and Project Activities (PPA) (Details below)</b>		<b>13.638.404</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<i>PPA Geographical breakdown of A1+A2+A3 in intervention countries:</i>							<b>n/a</b>
Kenya		4.614.560	1.153.640	1.153.640	1.153.640	1.153.640	28%
Uganda		3.584.220	896.055	896.055	896.055	896.055	22%
Nepal		2.501.220	625.305	625.305	625.305	625.305	15%
<b>Total PPA in intervention countries</b>		<b>10.700.000</b>	<b>2.675.000</b>	<b>2.675.000</b>	<b>2.675.000</b>	<b>2.675.000</b>	<b>64%</b>
<i>Geographical breakdown of A1+A3 in non-intervention countries:</i>							<b>n/a</b>
Global Cross-Cutting expenses (A3 global costs)		248.368	62.092	62.092	62.092	62.092	1%
Not Denmark nor intervention countries (A1 + A3)		0	0	0	0	0	0%
Country/region 1		0					0%
Country/region 2		0					0%
Denmark (A1 + A3)		2.690.036	672.509	672.509	672.509	672.509	16%
<b>Total PPA in non-intervention countries</b>		<b>2.938.404</b>	<b>734.601</b>	<b>734.601</b>	<b>734.601</b>	<b>734.601</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>I. Total PPA Costs Budget</b>		<b>13.638.404</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>3.409.601</b>	<b>82%</b>
<i>Other costs in Denmark (A5, A7 and B1)</i>		1.515.010	378.753	378.753	378.753	378.753	9%
<i>Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA), A5</i>		272.768	68.192	68.192	68.192	68.192	n/a
<i>Auditing in Denmark, A7</i>		153.644	38.411	38.411	38.411	38.411	1%
<i>Administration in Denmark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget), B1</i>		1.088.598	272.150	272.150	272.150	272.150	7%
<b>Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15% of PPA), A6</b>		<b>1.486.586</b>	<b>371.647</b>	<b>371.647</b>	<b>371.647</b>	<b>371.647</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>IV. Grand Total Costs Budget</b>		<b>16.640.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>4.160.000</b>	<b>100%</b>



Overall assessment according to CISU Programme guidelines

<b>STRATEGIC RELEVANCE</b>		<b>Score 1-5</b>
<b>Criteria 1</b>	<b>Strategic orientation: Strengthening civil society in the global South and relevance to the Sustainable Development Goals</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>The programme <i>People Partner with Nature for Sustainable Living</i> (PPN) is a conservation program now entering into its third phase. The programme objective of PPN is formulated as ‘Forest sites conserved creating sustainable benefits for biodiversity, people and climate’. This objective is to be reached through three expected outcomes: (1) Enhanced sustainability and climate change resilience of local community land-use and livelihoods, (2) PPN forests’ conservation status maintained or improved, and (3) The basis for sustainability and upscaling of PFM improved. The applications strategic orientation is thus assessed to be coherent with the overall mandate, vision and strategy with the objectives of DOF as they are presented in the DOF BirdLife’s international strategy for 2021 to 2024 and positions presented in policy papers like DOF BirdLife’s policy for Indigenous Peoples and policy for Gender.</p> <p>The third phase of program includes an expansion of the outreach with a new partner in Tanzania. This is in line with the thematic review from March 2021 recommending DOF to engage in no more than one new country and in alignment with DOF’s own strategy to focus and build regional clusters of intervention. The cluster concept is assessed to offer a potential synergy between programs. The program development from phase II to phase III includes a acknowledge follow-up on the recommendations from the thematic review. This encompasses particularly a more focused program with three expected outcomes, where the relatively new focus on climate adaptation and mitigation is integrated in the three components. The program is thus assessed to have developed a more focused strategic approach.</p> <p>The program document describes comprehensively the alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). For SDG 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 13, 15, and 17 the program specifies targets and qualify how the program contributes to civil society engagement in the delivery. As it is a requirement in particular to apply the crosscutting priorities of SDG 16 and 17, it is noted that regarding SDG 17, the program contributes to <i>“strengthening of global, public, private and civil society partnerships as well as the strengthening of international cooperation around, and access to, science, technology and innovation”</i>. Regarding SDG 16 about governance, the application has no reference.</p> <p>In DOF BirdLife’s response to the draft assessment format it is emphasised that the program does contribute to promoting peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development and building effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions SDG 16. It is now incorporated in the Program Document that the program specifically contributes to <i>“reduce corruption, ensure transparency and accountability, as well as inclusive, participant-based, and representative decision-making processes at all levels [of the PPN Program cooperation and implementation]”</i>.</p> <p>In conclusion, the DOF BirdLife’s program is assessed to build on a strategic orientation that strengthens civil society in Kenya, Uganda and Nepal to enhance sustainability and climate change resilience, to maintain or improve forest conservation status, and to improve the basis for sustainability and upscaling of the participatory forest management, and to contribute to the engagement in the SDG’s.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 4, which is given, when there is solid indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		4
<b>Criteria 2</b>	<b>Relevance of civil society partners and their local, national and/or global networking partners</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>The proposed programme describes how DOF BirdLife in phase III will continue the implementation within the framework of global partnership for nature conservation, BirdLife International, and with the three existing partners, <b>Nature Kenya (NK)</b>, <b>Nature Uganda (NU)</b>, and <b>Bird Conservation</b></p>		5

**Nepal (BCN).** DOF BirdLife wishes to expand the number of countries, why the national BirdLife partner in Tanzania, **Nature Tanzania (NT)**, will be partnering with the programme regarding the Participatory Forest Management activities. NK has been partnering with DOF BirdLife since 2002, NU since 2010, and BCN since 2014. All three organisations have a track record as national CBOs/NGOs within the thematic field of biodiversity and nature conversation/management and of policy influence. The partners are assessed by the external review as recognized partners for local stakeholders and national governments. The application presents a response to some of the queries raised by the Danish MoFA in their comments to the concept note by underlining that the previous phases have led to tangible improvements regarding livelihood, and that the program effectively has included women and vulnerable groups and enhanced their voice.

The program document accounts for the capacity development to strengthen partners included in the third phase. The focus is mainly on follow up on the external review's recommendation regarding 1) enhanced synergies and skills transfer among the implementing partners, and 2) strengthen institutional capacities of the partners with a focus on addressing specific challenges. (These recommendations are well reflected in the ToC and the results framework.) The sustainability of results is presented as, on the one hand connected to the emphasis on output level related to institutional capacity, and on the other hand, on the importance of fundraising. The track record and approaches within capacity development to strengthen partners in using and maintaining results sustainability of fundraising initiatives is presented only for BCN, which shows the vulnerability of a system of funding mainly provided by DOF BirdLife and other international partners. The three civil society partners are together with DOF members of BirdLife International, a global partnership of conservation organisations of NGO's focusing on conservations of birds, their habitats and global biodiversity, working with people towards sustainability in the use of natural resources. The application mentions the local engagement and empowerment as one of four focal areas of work and adds that the conservation promoted benefits for both nature and people.

In conclusion, DOF BirdLife is assessed to present partnerships engagements contributing to the development of strong, independent, vocal, and diverse civil society in the global South through meaningful, equal, and mutually committing partnerships with the capacity to promote the catalytic role of civil society.

*The score based on the assessment criteria is 5, which is given, when there is comprehensive indication that supports the criteria.*

<b>CAPACITY</b>		<b>Score 1-5</b>
<b>Criteria 3</b>	<b>Organisational capacity and popular involvement</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>The review of the PPN program phase II and the assessment of the concept note overall assessed DOF BirdLife to have the relevant systems and staff capacity to manage the programme and the programme related information, communication and knowledge sharing in Denmark. The application presents an image of a strong organisation with 38 employees, of which the international team consists of two professionals. The international work is characterized by strong national partners responsible for implementation and with DOF BirdLife as responsible for overall oversights of all aspects. The program management system includes a Program Management Committee composed by management level in the three partner organisations and the international team in Denmark.</p> <p>In DOF BirdLife's international strategy describes overall both the policy and the program ambitions, and refers to DOF BirdLife's institutional strategy 2021-2024, and BirdLife Internationals approach to global engagement.</p> <p>The approach and efforts related to the popular engagement are presented in the document "Development education and popular engagement 2022 – 2025" and shows the capacity to engage and involve the population in Denmark in development cooperation. The aim is to increase awareness on nature conservation challenges and solutions nationally and internationally, as well</p>		5

<p>as greater insight into global climate and conservation issues and Danish development assistance in general. Inclusion of volunteers plays an important role in the efforts to engage Danish people in development cooperation and DOF BirdLife continues to ensure that its members can engage internationally on a voluntary basis. The membership includes 18.000 individual members. In conclusion, DOF BirdLife is assessed to demonstrate effective organizational capacity, including human resources, to enhance development effectiveness of the organization by maintaining satisfactory professional competency and technical capacity. DOF BirdLife has a record of involving relevant groups and stakeholders in the Danish society to broaden and sustain popular involvement and engagement with development cooperation.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 5, which is given, when there is comprehensive indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		
<b>Criteria 4</b>	<b>Financial management and administrative capacity</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:  DOF BirdLife managed an annual turnover in 2020 of dkk 40,6m., of which only 13% is from international projects. CISU is the main donor with dkk 5,2m. Based on the review report and the application, DOF BirdLife is assessed to have systems, procedures, and capacities to assess and monitor financial performance, including internal financial and administrative control systems. The Board of DOF Birdlife approved in June 2021 a new comprehensive ‘Behaviour and Values Policies and Guidelines’ encompassing Code of Conduct Policy, Dignity at Work Policy, Safeguarding (PSHEA) Policy, and Anti-corruption and irregularities Policy. By the end of 2022, DOF BirdLife and the three partners will have training in and started implementation of PSHEA. In conclusion, DOF is assessed to maintain a satisfactory internal level of financial management and administrative capacity, adequate for meeting the overall requirements and responsibilities related to management of CISU grants.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 4, which is given, when there is solid indication that supports the criteria</i></p>		4
<b>Criteria 5</b>	<b>Analytical capacity and learning</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:  Based on the external review report and the application, DOF BirdLife demonstrates an ability to ensure context and stakeholder analysis as a basis for programme design, planning and innovation. The programme rationale and approach demonstrate a good understanding of the local context and the challenges and potential vis-à-vis promoting PFM as a mean to improve environmental management and livelihoods. Moreover, the planned change in approach for phase III is firmly rooted in the results and lessons of PPN II as e.g., the decision to move away from training in IGAs to organizing communities in cooperatives and exploring options for private sector engagement, aiming at ensuring better profitability and long-term sustainability. The strategic move to establish regional clusters as a mean to be focused on the organisation’s international development efforts, create synergies and ensure sustainability is assessed as innovative.</p> <p>The application goes through three major risk areas identified through a risk analysis, COVID-19, drought, and unsustainable natural resource extraction/large-scale infrastructure developments. Even though the narrative around the three risk areas is exhaustive, it is not possible to conclude if a proper risk management system is present, including guidelines and methodologies.</p> <p>In DOF BirdLife’s response to the draft assessment format it is emphasised that the Partnership has, apart from agreeing on the main approach/scope/coverage/roles-responsibilities etc., deliberately postponed the design and formulation of a proper risk management system with guidelines and methodologies pending approval of the identified risk areas by the CISU Assessment Committee and MoFA.</p> <p>In conclusion: DOF BirdLife is assessed to have capacity to undertake comprehensive context analysis, and to utilize evidence-based learning from program implementation to inform analysis, planning and innovation of strategies and operational approaches. Capacity to provide relevant policies, guidelines and methodologies documenting the applicants risk management cannot be assessed as it deliberately has been postponed until the beginning of the new phase.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 3, which is given, when there is indication that supports the criteria</i></p>		3

Criteria 6	Delivering and documenting results	Score:
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>Based on the external thematic review, DOF BirdLife is assessed to have a track record on delivering good progress on all program components. It is noted, though, that the thematic review at the same time emphasize that the indicators in the result framework for PPN II was not conducive for results-oriented monitoring, as they to a large extent was activity oriented. It is also noted that DOF BirdLife in 2020 began a participatory process with consultant support to develop indicators and templates for results-oriented reporting for capturing outcomes and impact for the PPN III.</p> <p>Also based on the external thematic review, DOF BirdLife is assessed to show a track record on prioritising budget cost in a cost-effective manner. This is deducted from the review conclusion that the financial management of PPN II was fully satisfactory, even though spending was behind schedule due to COVID-19.</p> <p>In conclusion, DOF BirdLife is assessed to have demonstrated ability to deliver results progressively in a cost-effective manner in previous Danida funded interventions, underlining that previous critique of lack of result-monitoring at outcome level, has been mitigated by an effort to develop indicators and templates for results-oriented reporting for capturing outcomes and impact for the PPN III.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 4, which is given, when there is solid indication that supports the criteria</i></p>		4

PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES		Score 1-5
Criteria 7	Theory of Change and programme synergy	Score:
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>The application presents clearly the context in the six forest sites in Kenya, Uganda and Nepal, and how to ensure a sustainable conservation through local development and strengthening of local living conditions. Nature Tanzania is added as an associated partner in an effort to strengthen the regional cluster concept but as neither site-specific activity is planned in Tanzania for the next phase, not will Nature Tanzania have budget responsibility, a contextual analysis is not included. A stakeholder analysis has been made as a participatory process with local authorities, private companies, forest owners. and the (indigenous) people living in and by the forest. The Theory of Change for the PPN III Program is that <i>by</i> involving local communities in PFM and conservation while providing them with opportunities for increasing incomes through sustainable enterprises and climate smart agriculture and engage in influencing PFM legislation and development of planning processes, <i>then</i> their livelihoods will improve, reducing the need of encroaching new land, while enhancing their capacities to push for sustainable use of forest resources and better law enforcement. <i>This</i> will improve forest biodiversity, maintain the forest areas, and increase carbon stocks and thus contribute to achieving the impact objective of the program: <b>Forest sites conserved creating sustainable benefits for biodiversity, people, and climate.</b> The ToC is assessed to reflect that partners and applicant have made a thorough context analysis, know what to change, have identified the stakeholders, and rights holders and duty bearers are identified. This will be addressed again during the assessment of the HRBA.</p> <p>The application presents a clear narrative about the intervention logic and uses the ToC to explain the link from context and stakeholder analyses to intervention logic and key assumptions, to objectives and outcomes. The development triangle does not feature very prominent as concept in the application, but the elements and the balance between them are incorporated, “the intervention is still balanced with a clear and prioritized focus on policy and advocacy and partner capacity building as important efforts to achieve sustainable changes, while service delivery and organizational capacity building are cross-cutting, supportive, and strategic activities in all three components, just as the PPN Program has a strong civil society orientation and building strong civil societies to conserve forest ecosystems and improve livelihoods in forest adjacent communities continues to be the focal point of the program”.</p>		5

<p>In conclusion, DOF BirdLife is assessed to present how the respective programme interventions create synergy to the overall programme approach in the form of a Programme Theory of Change. DOF is also assessed to present a clear and relevant Theory of Change for each of the main thematic programme outcomes that constitute the proposed engagement. The country level is only prominent at the target level. The proposal is also assessed to include justified strategic choices of intervention that contribute to the objectives and outcomes of the programmes and present three relevant risks that may hinder or delay programme outcomes.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 5, which is given, when there is comprehensive indication that supports the criteria</i></p>		
<b>Criteria 8</b>	<b>Result Framework and M&amp;E system</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>DOF BirdLife presents in annex 4.1 the results framework, which has a narrative version in section 4.4 of the application. The expected outcomes are: 1) Livelihood: Enhanced sustainability and climate change resilience of local community land-use and livelihoods, 2) Conservation: Community forests conservation status improved or maintained, and 3) Upscaling: The basis for sustainability and upscaling of PFM improved. The narrative explains well the coherence between objectives, expected outcomes and the problems addressed.</p> <p>The monitoring and evaluation plan reflects that the recommendation from the thematic review regarding the need for a more clear and tangible measure of the outcomes that is generated from the activities has explicitly been followed. The cluster approach presented to ensure synergy and peer-learning is assessed as an innovative follow-up on the thematic review.</p> <p>In conclusion, DOF BirdLife is assessed to present a coherent Results Framework at programme level and have a proven system to operate sub-results frameworks at thematic and country level for relevant parts of the proposed programme. DOF has a comprehensive description of the M&amp;E approach to be applied on a programme level.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 5, which is given, when there is comprehensive indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		5
<b>Criteria 9</b>	<b>A human rights-based approach (HRBA)</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>The external review pointed out that the PPN II promoted a transparent and inclusive forest management, and that communities were enabled to raise their voice to influence decision-making duty bearers at local level. It was also addressed that less emphasis was on training the local government in their obligations as duty bearers.</p> <p>The PPN III has increased the focus on capacity building of partners in influencing the enforcement of PFM legislation and has carefully followed the recommendation from the thematic review in outcome 3.</p> <p>DOF presents as annexes to the application the gender policy paper and the indigenous people policy paper both from 2013. Even though it is acknowledged that these policy papers are strong on a HRBA, it is also questioned if it is time to revisit the papers to ensure that they are updated.</p> <p>In conclusion, DOF is assessed to present a proposed programme with interventions based on a HRBA, gender equality, and the principle of poverty orientation with a particular focus on poor, marginalised and vulnerable groups (the SDG principle of 'leaving no-one behind').</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 5, which is given, when there is comprehensive indication that supports the criteria</i></p>		5
<b>Criteria 10</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>The application points rightly out that sustainability permeates the entire program planning and implementation, which challenges a traditional assessment of the compliance with the criteria. An exit strategy for one of the programme interventions in Uganda, the Echuya forest site, is presented. The mechanism to do it is a handover to a BirdLife partner in Germany.</p> <p>In conclusion, DOF BirdLife is assessed to present a program with a totally integrated approach to sustainability, reflecting how the key expected changes achieved during the programme period strengthens civil society entities that promote social justice. Likewise, is the program based on a</p>		5

comprehensive responsible climate and environmental conduct in line with the sustainability model (presented in the Guidelines for the Civil Society Fund). <i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 5, which is given, when there is comprehensive indication that supports the criteria</i>		
<b>Criteria 11</b>	<b>Financial resources and Cost Level</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>The total program budget amounts to DKK 17.360.000 of which DKK 16.640.000 is applied for with CISU – with an average four-year annual distribution of DKK 4.160.000. Expected liquid funding amounts DKK 180.000 and expected co-financing is DKK 540.000.</p> <p>DKK 13.638.404 is the total of the PPA costs, covering the three outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Enhanced sustainability... DKK 5.255.976 - 38,5% of PPA</li> <li>2) PPN forest' conservation... DKK 4.573.332 - 33,5% of PPA</li> <li>3) The basis for sustainability.... DKK 3.809.096 - 27,9% of PPA</li> </ol> <p>The balance between the three outcomes is assessed as reasonable.</p> <p>With regard to the three cost categories (A1, A2, A3), DKK 1.753.476 (11%) covers direct activity costs A1, DKK 10.700.000 (64%) covers implementation cost at partner level A2, and DKK 1.184.928 (7%) covers the program support costs A3. The three cost categories seem to have been used correctly.</p> <p>The geographical breakdown of the budget shows that 28% of total costs are spent in Kenya, 22% in Uganda, and 15% in Nepal, which is assessed as reasonable.</p> <p>Danish pay roll costs amount in total to DKK 2.275.424, equivalent to 13,7% of the total applied budget.</p> <p>On this basis, there is a solid indication that the detailed budget will show a relationship between expected results, intervention logic and size of target group, including cost effectiveness of Danish costs (spending on administration, travel, and salaries both in partner country and in Denmark).</p> <p>In conclusion, DOF BirdLife is assessed to present a clear and transparent budget that clearly identifies and separates costs incurred at partner level and costs relating to the Danish applicant. Furthermore, DOF BirdLife is assessed to be capable of reviewing costs and outcomes during program implementation in order to reallocate budgetary resources to enhance cost effectiveness.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 4, which is given, when there is solid indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		4
<b>Criteria 12</b>	<b>Popular engagement and development education</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>DOF BirdLife presents a plan for Development Education and Popular Engagement for 2022-25 (annex 2.3), which reflects the importance of volunteers and the efforts to engage Danish people in development cooperation. DOF has an outreach to 18.000 members and continues to ensure that its members can engage internationally on a voluntary basis. Volunteers in DOF BirdLife contributes to collection of data on biodiversity which is used directly in the management of international projects just as volunteers contribute with technical assistance depending on their professional profiles. Volunteers also function as representatives for DOF BirdLife for example in development networks and in connection with the communication of DOF BirdLife's international activities, just as members are encouraged to implement voluntary international activities/projects in coordination with the secretariat staff and complementary to the secretariat-driven projects/programs. It is assessed that DOF has a very large engagement with members, and the proposes engagement of members in the international work of DOF is assessed as a real opportunity.</p> <p>The SDG's are not explicitly mentioned in the plan for Development Education and Popular Engagement, but the ambition to build strong, sustainable, and resilient communities, is very much the same as SDG 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable.</p> <p>In conclusion, the DOF BirdLife is assessed to engage with relevant groups and stakeholders in Denmark to strengthen understanding of and interest in selected global development challenges, the role of local partners and civil society in general.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 4, which is given, when there is solid indication that supports the criteria</i></p>		4

<b>Overall conclusion and budget (based on scoring and former budget level):</b>			
Scoring aggregated and weighted	<b>Dansk Ornitologisk Forening</b>	<b>Average score for all applying programmes</b>	<b>Gain in % of Dansk Ornitologisk Forening</b>
	89,2	77,2	10%
Budget:	Applied amount/year:	Gain due to competition:	Final budget amount/year
	4.160.000	434.307	4.590.000

**Embassy screening (if any):**

Comments from Embassies	
Response from applicant (if any)	

Comments from Embassies	
Response from applicant (if any)	

## QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

File number/F2 reference: 2019-1911

Programme/Project name: DOF - People Partner with Nature for Sustainable Living (PPN)  
– *Integrating Livelihoods and Conservation Phase III (2022-2025)*

Programme/Project period: Jan. 2022 - Dec. 2025 (48 months)

Budget: 18.360.000

Presentation of quality assurance process:

*Quality assurance has been implemented by Civil Society in Development, CISU, who are managing the pooled funds on behalf of the MFA and external consultants. Project documents have also been reviewed by the desk officer. The MFA has also provided input and comments for an earlier version of the concept note.*

The design of the programme/project has been appraised by someone independent who has not been involved in the development of the programme/project.

*Comments: The project design has been appraised by CISU and by an external assessment consultant. The partners are recommended to systematically monitor the TOC, including the underlying assumptions for change, and with focus on the partner component and the results of the Core Cost Grants.*

The recommendations of the appraisal has been reflected upon in the final design of the programme/project.

*Comments: Yes.*

The programme/project complies with Danida policies and Aid Management Guidelines, including the fundamental principles of Doing Development Differently.

*Comments: Yes.*

The programme/project addresses relevant challenges and provides adequate responses.

*Comments: The programme People Partner with Nature for Sustainable Living (PPN) is a conservation program now entering into its third phase. The programme objective of PPN is formulated as 'Forest sites conserved creating sustainable benefits for biodiversity, people and climate'. The DOF BirdLife's program is assessed to build on a strategic orientation that strengthens civil society in Kenya, Uganda and Nepal to enhance sustainability and climate change resilience, to maintain or improve forest conservation status, and to improve the basis for sustainability and upscaling of the participatory forest management, and to contribute to the engagement in the SDG's.*

Issues related to HRBA, LNOB, Gender, Youth, Climate Change, Green Growth and Environment have been addressed sufficiently in relation to content of the project/programme.



*Comments: DOF is assessed to present a proposed programme with interventions based on a HRBA, gender equality, and the principle of poverty orientation with a particular focus on poor, marginalised and vulnerable groups (the SDG principle of 'leaving no-one behind'). DOF BirdLife is assessed to present a program with a totally integrated approach to sustainability, reflecting how the key expected changes achieved during the programme period strengthens civil society entities that promote social justice. Likewise, is the program based on a comprehensive responsible climate and environmental conduct in line with the sustainability model (presented in the Guidelines for the Civil Society Fund).*

Comments from the Danida Programme Committee have been addressed (if applicable).  
*Comments: N.A.*

The programme/project outcome(s) are found to be sustainable and in line with the partner's development policies and strategies. Implementation modalities are well described and justified.

*Comments: Yes.*

The theory of change, results framework, indicators and monitoring framework of the programme/project provide an adequate basis for monitoring results and outcome.

*Comments: Yes.*

The programme/project is found sound budget-wise.

*Comments: Yes.*

The programme/project is found realistic in its time-schedule.

*Comments: Yes.*

Other donors involved in the same programme/project have been consulted, and possible harmonised common procedures for funding and monitoring have been explored.

*Comments: N.A.*

Key programme/project stakeholders have been identified, the choice of partner has been justified and criteria for selection have been documented.

*Comments: DOF BirdLife is assessed to present partnerships engagements contributing to the development of strong, independent, vocal, and diverse civil society in the global South through meaningful, equal, and mutually committing partnerships with the capacity to promote the catalytic role of civil society.*

The implementing partner(s) is/are found to have the capacity to properly manage, implement and report on the funds for the programme/project and lines of management responsibility are clear.

*Comments: DOF BirdLife is assessed to demonstrate effective organizational capacity, including human resources, to enhance development effectiveness of the organization by maintaining satisfactory professional competency and technical capacity. DOF BirdLife has a record of involving relevant groups and stakeholders*

*in the Danish society to broaden and sustain popular involvement and engagement with development cooperation.*

Implementing partner(s) has/have been informed about Denmark's zero-tolerance policies towards (i) Anti-corruption; (ii) Child labour; (iii) Sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH); and, (iv) Anti-terrorism.

*Comments: Yes.*

Risks involved have been considered and risk management integrated in the programme/project document.

*Comments: Yes.*

In conclusion, the programme/project can be recommended for approval: Yes

Date and signature of Desk Officer: 05.11.2021



Date and signature of Management: 05.11.2021