ANNEX I TO FINANCING AGREEMENT N° ACP/FED/038-593

TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

|  |
| --- |
| Information for Potential Grant ApplicantsWork Programme for GrantsThis document constitutes the work programme for grants in the sense of Article 128(1) of the Financial Regulation (Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012), applicable to the EDF in accordance with Article 17 of Regulation (EU) 2015/323 in the following sections concerning grants awarded directly without a call for proposals: 1.3.2  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Title/basic act/ CRIS number** | Biodiversity and Protected Area Management – BIOPAMA II CRIS number: ACP/FED/038-593financed under the 11th European Development Fund (EDF) |
| **2. Zone benefiting from the action/location** | Africa Caribbean Pacific (ACP) RegionThe action shall be carried out at the following location: African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) states |
| **3. Programming document** | Intra-ACP Cooperation – 11th European Development Fund – Strategy Paper and Indicative Programme 2014-2020. |
| **4. Sector of concentration/ thematic area** | Sector: "Climate change, resilience building and the environment "Sub-sector"2.2.2. Environment"Objective 2.3 "Contribute to the implementation of environment-related international commitments by ACP countries’ institutions and networks" | DEV. Aid: YES[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| **5. Amounts concerned** | Total estimated cost: EUR 60 000 000Total amount of EDF contribution: EUR 60 000 000 |
| **6. Aid modality(ies)****and implementation modality(ies)**  | Project ModalityDirect management – procurement of services – administrative arrangement with the Joint Research Centre (JRC)Direct management – grants – direct award to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) |
| **7 a) DAC code(s)** | 410 General Environmental Protection; 41030 Biodiversity;41010 Environmental Policy and Administrative Management |
| **b) Main Delivery Channel** | Institutions du secteur public (JRC) – 10000ONG internationale (IUCN) – 21000 |
| **8. Markers (from CRIS DAC form)** | **General policy objective** | **Not targeted** | **Significant objective** | **Main objective** |
| Participation development/good governance | ☐ | ☐ | x |
| Aid to environment | ☐ | ☐ | x |
| Gender equality (including Women In Development) | ☐ | x | ☐ |
| Trade Development | x | ☐ | ☐ |
| Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health | x | ☐ | ☐ |
| **RIO Convention markers** | **Not targeted** | **Significant objective** | **Main objective** |
| Biological diversity | ☐ | ☐ | x |
| Combat desertification | ☐ | x | ☐ |
| Climate change mitigation | ☐ | x | ☐ |
| Climate change adaptation | ☐ | x | ☐ |
| **9. Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) thematic flagships** | B4Life Thematic Flagship |
| **10. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)** | Main SDG Goals: 15 and 6 Secondary SDG Goals : 13 and 14 |

**Summary**

The proposed action is part of the EU Biodiversity for Life Flagship initiative which supports efforts to halt loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services. It is a follow-up to the BIOPAMA I programme (2011-2016). Protected Areas (PA) and the landscapes within which they are located have a central role to play in preserving the biodiversity and ecosystem services that the majority of rural communities depend on for sustainable livelihoods. However protected areas, particularly in developing nations, are underperforming for many reasons, notably lack of resources, lack of political support, insufficient support from local communities, and insufficient up-to-date information for good policy and decision making. These shortcomings stem from the fundamental problem that PAs have not been able to demonstrate a sufficiently high level of return on investment to justify ignoring short terms economic benefits of other development options. The overall aim of the project is to contribute to improving the long-term conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific regions in protected areas and surrounding communities. The project will continue to build institutional and technical capacity at the regional, national and site levels for improved PA and biodiversity management; with access to and application of data and information related to biodiversity and PA management and governance being used to inform and strengthen policy decisions and management actions. The action will be structured around the work of a series of Regional Observatories (RO) for protected areas across the ACP managed by regional institutions, and housing Regional Reference Information systems (RRIS) with tools and services that stakeholders can use to monitor and report on the status of biodiversity and PAs. The project will also support specific actions on the ground in priority conservation landscapes aimed at strengthening PA and natural resource management effectiveness and governance. By adopting a landscape approach, the project will contribute both to better PA management and to enhancing local livelihoods through sustainable use of the natural resources. The project will also continue to build capacities at the multi-stakeholder level.

The project is fully in line with the EU Agenda for change, the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2020 and the series of strategic approaches for biodiversity conservation that the EU is currently developing for sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and Asia. It also contributes directly to at least four Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and three RIO principles, and will promote gender equality and good governance.

The total budget for the action is EUR 60 000 000, over 6 years. The lead implementation agencies will be the Joint Research Centre (JRC) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

# Description of the action

No single programme can address the vast array of different components of biodiversity conservation, sustainable livelihoods and effective PA management across the geographically and biologically diverse ACP region[[2]](#footnote-3). Interventions at very many different levels are required including policy and legal frameworks, institution building, land tenure et natural resource use rights, community-based natural resource management, law enforcement, infrastructure development, tourism and other ‘green activity’ development, ecological monitoring, and sustainable funding mechanisms to name but a few. This programme will focus on the specific issue of information pertaining to biodiversity and PA management and governance and how this information can be used to strengthen governance, management and policy making. It should be clearly understood that this is but one element of an array of interventions that are necessary to achieve the broader biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihood aims.

The programme, initiated in 2011, is structured around a series of Regional Observatories (ROs), managed by regional institutions, housing Regional Reference Information systems (RRIS) with tools and services that stakeholders can use to monitor and report on the status of biodiversity and PAs (MEAs, SDGs, Aichi, the ‘Larger than…’ series of EU strategic approaches for wildlife conservation), and develop appropriate policies, strategies and action plans to improve the effectiveness of interventions. A global observatory, managed by JRC, serves as an umbrella structure for the ROs and houses the global Reference Information System (RIS) linked to the Digital Observatory for Protected Areas (DOPA) platform[[3]](#footnote-4). It provides access to global data sets and develops analytical tools and services tailored to the specific needs of the ROs. The first phase was devoted to developing the RIS and physically establishing the RO with their RRIS. The second phase is needed to consolidate the ROs and render them fully operational through the active participation of regional, national and local stakeholders and the integration of regionally available information through appropriate data exchange protocols. A particular effort will be placed on ensuring that the ROs are tailored to the specific needs and conditions of the Regions.

# **1.1** Objectives and results

This programme is relevant for the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It contributes primarily to the progressive achievement of SDG Goal(s) Goal 15 (protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss), but also promotes progress towards Goal(s) 6,13 and 14. This does not imply a commitment by the countries benefiting from this programme.

***Overall objective***

To contribute to improving the long-term conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific regions in protected areas and surrounding communities through better use and monitoring of information and capacity development on management and governance.

***Specific Objective 1(SO1)***

(*Consolidation of RRIS*)

Reference Information Systems for biodiversity and protected areas management are maintained and enhanced at Global, ACP and Regional Levels, combining best-available data with query, analysis and reporting functions tailored to the specific needs of priority conservation landscapes in ACP countries. This will also contribute to better informed climate change mitigation and adaptation actions.

**Result 1.1** The on-going development of DOPA, at the global scale is informed by regional inputs and ensures the provision of comparable and harmonized indicators and metrics on PAs, delivering the information and guidance in various forms through a dedicated Reference Information System (RIS) focused on the ACP countries.

**Result 1.2** Protected area decision making at regional, national and site level is enhanced by provision of data, information and guidance through Regional Reference Information Systems (RRIS) operating through the BIOPAMA Regional Observatories.

**Result 1.3** Information and decision support tools provided by the ROs for monitoring management effectiveness and governance in conservation landscapes are regularly improved, updated, tested and implemented through effective engagement and partnerships with national and regional agencies.

***Specific Objective 2 (SO2)***

(*Operationalisation and institutionalisation of ROs*)

The Regional Observatories (ROs), mandated by regional institutions and hosting the RRIS, are used by stakeholders to improve planning and decision-making for biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management and governance.

**Result 2.1** The capacities of key stakeholders to use the tools and services of the ROs are developed through targeted capacity building initiatives

**Result 2.2** ROs produce periodic status reports on biodiversity and sustainable Natural Resources Management (NRM) initiatives which are systematically shared with decision makers and the wider conservation and donor community. Such reports should take into account possible synergies with other international frameworks, such as the Agenda 2030 and the Paris Agreement, particularly when data and information is available.

**Result 2.3** Regional and national decision making processes make use of information on PA and natural resource management and governance provided by the ROs.

***Specific Objective 3 (SO3)***

(*Site-based actions*)

On the basis of management and governance priorities, planning and implementation of biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services and sustainable natural resource management activities are strengthened through targeted actions in priority conservation landscapes in insular (including SIDS islands countries) and continental territories in the ACP region. Co-benefits on human well-being as well as on mitigation and adaptation actions will be explicitly sought whenever possible.

**Result 3.1** PA assessments by national PA agencies, using appropriate assessment tools, are implemented systematically for planning and decision making.

**Result 3.2** Required management actions, as identified by appropriate management and governance assessment tools, are implemented in pilot PAs in the conservation landscapes, including SIDS. Co-benefits on human well-being as well as on mitigation and adaptation actions will be explicitly sought whenever possible.

**Result 3.3** Communities living in pilot priority conservation landscapes benefit directly from improved governance and management of natural resources and ecosystem services, including through enhanced resilience/reduced vulnerability to the impacts of climate change.

**Result 3.4** Conservation stakeholders in the landscapes (PA/national administrations and civil society) have improved knowledge on sustainable financing mechanisms and are better equipped to use them.

## 1.2 Main activities

***Result 1.1*** *(The on-going development of DOPA, at the global scale is informed by regional inputs and ensures the provision of comparable and harmonized indicators and metrics on PAs, delivering the information and guidance in various forms through a dedicated Reference Information System (RIS) focused on the ACP countries*)

* Provision of systems development skills, technical guidance, expertise and capacity development in the development of tailored queries, analysis, reporting products, indicators and other functions;
* Develop linkages between the global tools of DOPA, the ACP tools of the RIS and associated tools linked with regional priorities to ensure that regional information needs are addressed and delivered through the ROs;
* Harmonize and update Global and Regional RIS with other major global databases (WDPA hosted by United Nations Environmental Programme – World conservation Monitoring Center (UNEP-WCMC)) and relevant information management platforms (Panorama, Green List Standards);
* Support and enhance abilities of countries to report regularly to international conventions/treaties/agreements, as well as the SDGs;
* Establish synergies and data exchange agreements with global reference databases and information tools, including whenever possible beyond biodiversity-specific ones (e.g. UNFCCC);
* Enhance data collection and validation functions of the DOPA and RIS;
* Compute new and improved indicators at site, country and ecoregion level, at increasing spatial resolution and according to improvements in baseline data; where relevant, taking into account international guidance available on, e.g., biomass accounting for carbon;
* Improve the documentation and traceability of DOPA indicators;
* Develop analytical and decision-support tools to underpin key conservation decisions, with a focus on analysis of information derived from Earth Observation (DOPA Analyst).

***Result 1.2*** *(Protected area decision making at regional, national and site level is enhanced by provision of data, information and guidance through Regional Reference Information Systems (RRIS) operating through the BIOPAMA Regional Observatories.)*

* Enhance existing ROs and their associated RRIS through provision of the right capacities and means, technologies, equipment and institutional support;
* Support establishment of 2 new ROs (West Africa and Southern Africa);
* Continue to develop RRISs and their accompanying regional portals as unified, comprehensive, secure, on-line data and information platforms;
* Assist in designing, sourcing content for, and maintaining RRISs to present relevant open source information and other specialized information obtained from governments, NGO’s, partners and other sources regionally and internationally;
* Establish formal agreements with regional and national protected area agencies and other relevant data holders for data sharing and development of tools;
* Collect and integrate key data sets and RRIS functionalities with existing established information portals relevant to PA planning, management effectiveness, governance, land tenure, monitoring, ecological connectivity, ecosystem services and climate change and infrastructure;
* Establish RRISs as regional information collection and data nodes for the WDPA in agreed partnership between JRC, IUCN and UNEP-WCMC.

***Result 1.3*** *(Information and decision support tools provided by the ROs for monitoring management effectiveness and governance in conservation landscapes are regularly improved, updated and tested and implemented through effective engagement and partnerships with national and regional agencies)*

* Conduct a regional assessment of existing decision support tools to identify gaps that the ROs and the RRIS should address;
* Collect and analyse management effectiveness and governance data at PA level, including through IMET and other effective tools, through targeted field campaigns (**test phase**);
* Continue to develop IMET (Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool) and adapt it to regionally-specific needs;
* Develop a regional PA dashboard/barometer for quick review and reporting on status of relevant PAs;

***Result 2.1*** *(The capacities of key stakeholders to use the tools and services of the ROs are developed through targeted capacity building initiatives)*

* Train national directors of PA institutions, and directors of key institutions from other sectors directly involved with decisions affecting PAs on how to use and apply the RRIS tools, including IMET;
* Provide training in specific fields of expertise that will enhance stakeholders’ capacities to use, and contribute data to, the RRIS (e.g. Geographic Information System - GIS, Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool- SMART/CyberTracker, survey techniques, marine and coastal spatial planning, etc.);
* Develop specific training module(s) on RO tools and services to be integrated into course curricula of existing regional and international PA capacity support providers, and ensure that each RRIS is a central regional information point for PA capacity development;

***Result 2.2*** *(ROs produce periodic status reports on biodiversity and sustainable NRM initiatives which are systematically shared with decision makers and the wider conservation and donor community)*

* Promote the RRIS as the principal regional instrument for monitoring and reporting on PAs, status of biodiversity and conservation, management effectiveness and governance, and climate change issues and facilitate reporting on these topics through the production and wide distribution of State of Protected Areas (SoPA) Reports;
* Develop effective coordination and collaboration with UNEP-WCMC to ensure that SoPA reports contribute to the development of Protected Planet Reports and the Protected Planet website by providing key input on regional protected areas issues;
* Ensure that SoPA reports provide effective technical and policy input to other IUCN Global and Regional Initiatives and Knowledge Products such as the Green List, Panorama and Key Biodiversity Areas -KBAs;
* Engage regional institutions/initiatives with similar interests, public-private partnerships and funding initiatives in defining, supporting and contributing to the SoPA reports;

***Result 2.3*** *(Regional and national decision making processes make use of information on PA and natural resource management and governance provided by the ROs)*

* Strengthen engagement with Regional Economic Communities and other decision making fora by ensuring the alignment of RO tools, products and activities with regional strategic priorities and operational programs;
* Engage key national and regional policy and decision-making stakeholders with information from ROs that is suitably framed and presented to strengthen informed leadership, and have positive influence in decisions about governance structures, policy and legislation;
* Facilitate networking with key national and regional policy and decision-making stakeholders, as well as with networks of experts, to ensure access to best available expertise to address key regional conservation and development challenges;

***Result 3.1*** *(PA assessments by national PA agencies, using appropriate assessment tools, are implemented systematically for planning and decision making)*

Activities under this result concern the rolling out of appropriate management and governance assessment tools (IMET or equivalent tool allowing detailed quantification, follow-up in time and comparison of situations) across the ACP region. This is a major undertaking as it could potentially involve several hundred PAs and training of a wide array of national stakeholders, particularly PA agency national-level and field staff, and civil society groups involved in sustainable NRM. Indicative activities include:

* Establish a process for identifying priority countries/agencies for support with mainstreaming the use of appropriate management and governance assessment tools, and elaborate a strategy and work plan for implementation;
* Establish agreements with regional and national institutions;
* Establish and mobilise teams of trainers with cross-disciplinary expertise;
* Conduct training sessions in the use of regionally appropriate management and governance assessment tools and their application to NBSAP processes and other relevant national processes that involve PA planning and decision making;
* Collect and analyse management effectiveness and governance data at PA level, including through IMET and other effective tools, through targeted field campaigns (**rolling out on selected priority sites**);
* Ensure that data generated by the assessment exercises are integrated into the RO/RRISs and so that they can be used to track and respond to management and governance priorities and identify priority management actions;

***Result 3.2*** *(Required management actions, as identified by appropriate management and governance assessment tools, are implemented in pilot PAs in the conservation landscapes, including SIDS)*

Given the geographical scope of the ACP and the number of conservation areas, activities under this Result will have to be restricted to a limited number of pilot sites. The activities will be funded by the Action Component (SIDS and Continental) mobilised through a grant making process and/or a service voucher programme, according to European Commission procedures. An outcomes-based form of financing will be considered. Actions that have been identified through IMET or similar assessments processes will be eligible for funding. Results of these actions should be integrated into the ROs. The use of an appropriate management effectiveness tool by the beneficiary will be a condition for access to funding (such an exercise, before and ideally after the implementation will be a condition for access to funding and will allow proper monitoring and evaluation of the impact).

* Establish a mechanism for mobilising Action Component grants: criteria/eligibility for access to funds (including the use of a management effectiveness assessment tool), granting process, reporting/evaluation.
* Identify existing regional and/or national grant-making initiatives with which synergies can be established e.g. GEF Small Grants, IUCN-SOS Project, BEST 2.0.
* Define the criteria for identifying priority pilot sites;
* Mobilise grants and monitor implementation. Indicative examples of the type of activities that could be funded include: surveys of key species and habitats (training in methods and implementation); monitoring of threats and pressures, including wildlife trafficking and climate change (e.g. IWT and communities assessments); law enforcement monitoring (SMART etc); socio-economic monitoring; analyses/assessments of legal frameworks; support for deployment of management effectiveness assessment tools (IMET or equivalent) as precondition of grant acceptance; elaboration of Management Plans; activities with co-benefits beyond conservation (e.g. on human well-being or climate change mitigation and adaptation) will be prioritised.
* Ensure that information from grantee sites is integrated in the RO/RRISs.

***Result 3.3*** *(Communities living in pilot priority conservation landscapes benefit directly from improved governance and management of natural resources and ecosystem services)*

As for Result 3.2 the geographical scope and diversity of contexts across the ACP means that actions under this Result will have to be restricted to a limited number of pilot sites (for example Indigenous Community Conservation Areas, Trans-Frontiers Conservation Areas - TFCAs). The activities will also be funded by grants from the Action Component with similar modalities and conditions. Indicative activities include:

* Assist sites in better documenting their community based resource management areas in terms of bio-physical location and values, traditional knowledge and practices, management objectives and outcomes, and governance structures;
* Support communities/ Indigenous peoples' and Community Conserved territories and Areas (ICCAs) through case studies and/or policy briefs on community based models of PA management and biodiversity conservation, in particular those with enhanced co-benefits;
* Dialogues bringing community voices to regional/national decision-making around protected areas and natural resources management;
* Support existing community fora (e.g. ICCA consortia, Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association, CAMPFIRE, etc.) with planning and implementation of conservation and sustainable livelihoods activities, taking into account climate change challenges and opportunities;
* Support community based organisations operating in and around PAs in business planning (including value chains, tourism management, etc.) and enterprise development.

***Result 3.4*** *(Conservation stakeholders in the landscapes (PA/national administrations and civil society) have improved knowledge on sustainable financing mechanisms and are better equipped to use them)*

* Review financing mechanisms in pilot sites/networks/countries and provide acquired information through tailored communication products, policy briefs, presentations, forums/dialogues, shared case studies and inclusion in specific capacity development activities;
* Engage with initiatives involved in establishing financing mechanisms (e.g. Caribbean Challenge Initiative) or establishing public-private partnerships for sustainable financing e.g. Blue Finance;
* Conduct natural capital mapping and ecosystem valuation exercises (using for example the TESSA[[4]](#footnote-5) toolkit) and provide tailor-made recommendations to key national decision makers.

**Communication – a cross-cutting activity**

It should be noted that **communication** will be a major cross-cutting activity that will be covered in activities under all the Results. BIOPAMA communications will serve as the primary source of information about the programme to a wide range and diverse set of stakeholders from actors on the ground to EU and ACP policy and decision makers. It will also extend to communicating the benefits of protected areas for the current global challenges, targeting an extended audience beyond the programme’s stakeholders groups and by using additional means and resources to communicate those messages. Communication activities will maintain and improve existing channels (e.g. the BIOPAMA Website, social media, Yammer network, press releases, participation in regional and global fora for PA, etc.) as well as developing new means for communications (e.g. infographics to communicate complex and scientific messages in an easy to understand manner; video stories on success stories; policy briefs; special reports such as ‘State of Protected Areas’ for each region; engaging regional champions, high profile individuals and organisations; development of smart phone apps).

## 1.3 Intervention logic

BIOPAMA II is a programme designed to support and consolidate the work of a series of Regional Observatories across the ACP region that were established during the first phase with support of IUCN at global and regional level. The overarching aim of these Observatories is to pull together and make available scientifically and technically accurate and-up-to date information on biodiversity conservation and natural resource management in order to provide the basis for more transparent and evidence-based policy and decision making. While much information can be gathered “remotely” (from global data bases, remote sensing data, etc.) much of the really key information about the state of biodiversity conservation and natural resource use has to come from the field, but accessing this information requires considerable investments from local stakeholders. The latter therefore need to see the benefits to them of investing in assembling and sharing the information that decision makers higher up the chain need. Systematic use of management effectiveness and governance assessment tools (IMET or equivalent) is one of the ways this can be achieved. Apart from the information itself it is also important that it is framed, presented, socialized, and adjusted for audience type, interests and needs.

The intervention logic focusing on working with local partners and institutions already established, which know the particularities, needs and demands of the regional and national context of each of the regions involved in order to a) consolidate the capacities of ROs to process and analyse information, and b) support field actions that help local stakeholders to better manage the natural resources for which they are responsible, ensures that there will be direct links between the RO and local stakeholders, and thus buy-in to the process from the bottom up. Furthermore by simultaneously implicating regional and national institutions responsible for natural resources, and PA managers and civil society groups involved in NRM on the ground, governance and transparency will be enhanced. Without good governance and transparency there is no guarantee that information, however good it is, will be used to make better policies and decisions.

# Implementation

## 2.1 Implementation modalities

### 2.1.1 Procurement (direct management) by administrative arrangement with JRC

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subject in generic terms, if possible | Type (works, supplies, services) | Indicative number of contracts | Indicative trimester of launch of the procedure |
| Subject-administrative arrangement with JRC | Service | 1 | January 2017 |

JRC will take the lead for implementation of activities relating to the RRIS and the daily operations of the ROs (SO1). It will also collaborate closely with IUCN on activities relating to Result 3.1, Communications and Capitalisation of results.

The technical expertise and experience gained from developing the RIS and RRIS makes the JRC the obvious choice of institution to be responsible for maintaining and further developing these tools. In addition, it will also have the responsibility for providing the technical support and supervision necessary for the general functioning of the Regional Observatories (maintenance of IT structures, integration and updating of information, etc.) and the development and field testing of specific tools, including the Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool (IMET) adapted to the different contexts across the ACP regions.

This direct management by administrative arrangement will enable JRC to deploy administrative and technical staff at ISPRA, and embed technical support staff, with the necessary resources, in the ROs housed by UWI for the Caribbean, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) for the Pacific, EAC for Eastern Africa, SADC for Southern Africa, Observatoire des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale (OFAC) for Central Africa and the yet-to-be confirmed hosting organisation for West Africa.

### 2.1.2 Grant: direct award (direct management)

(a) Objectives of the grant, fields of intervention, priorities of the year and expected results:

IUCN will take the lead for implementation of activities under SO2 and SO3. IUCN, with its global network of members, is well placed to coordinate the implementation of activities in the regions. The main purpose of the grant is to redistribute financial support to third parties. Where appropriate, IUCN will provide financial support to the competent regionally active organisation tor the implementation of specific project activities. For example in central Africa, where the Central African Regional Protected Area network (RAPAC), together with its various technical partners, has been particularly successful in obtaining buy-in from national institutions to test and adopt IMET, the financial support to RAPAC on the bases of their technical capacities and de facto monopoly in rolling out IMET in West and Central Africa could be envisaged.

In addition, for activities under Results 3.2 and 3.3, it is foreseen that funding will be dedicated to activities in Small Island Developing States, and the other will be for Continental territories. Both will target actions relating to management and governance of biodiversity and natural resource in priority conservation landscapes containing protected areas. Information resulting from these actions will be fed back to the RRIS.

The description of the action of the grant agreement with IUCN will specifically define the types of entities eligible for financial support and include a fixed list with the types of activity which may be eligible for financial support. The criteria for the selection of the third parties recipient of this financial support, including the criteria for determining its exact amount, will also be specified; among others a criterion for eligibility will be that the beneficiaries (public administrations, communities) use IMET or equivalent tool as part of their management process.

Depending on a risk analysis, specific remedial measures might be included in the contract, should IUCN procedures to sub-contract and/or sub-grant not offer sufficient guarantees.

(b) Justification of a direct grant

Under the responsibility of the Commission’s authorising officer responsible, the grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to IUCN. Under the responsibility of the Commission’s authorising officer responsible and in line with art 190(1)(f), the recourse to an award of a grant without a call for proposals is justified because the action presents such characteristics as to require the specific technical competences of IUCN to implement the action.

IUCN is the world’s oldest and largest global environmental organization, with almost 1,300 government and NGO members and more than 15,000 volunteer experts in 185 countries. With its global network of members, it is therefore well placed to coordinate the implementation of activities in the ACP regions. It is one of the world’s foremost conservation organizations and has a universally recognized capacity for mobilizing expertise through its various specialist groups and Commissions (Species Survival Commission, World Commission on Protected Areas, Commission on Ecosystem Management, Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy, Commission on Education and Communication, World Commission on Environmental Law, Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group). It plays a central role globally in policy development in all aspects relating to nature conservation. IUCN’s work focuses on valuing and conserving nature, effective and equitable governance of nature’s use, and deploying nature based solutions to global challenges in climate, food and development. IUCN is therefore well-placed to take responsibility for promoting the work of the ROs with regional and national stakeholders through lobbying, knowledge sharing and communication.

(c) Essential selection and award criteria

The essential selection criteria are the financial and operational capacity of the applicant.

The essential award criteria are relevance of the proposed action to the objectives of the call; design, effectiveness, feasibility, sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the action.

(d) Maximum rate of co-financing

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for this grant is 100 %.

In accordance with Articles 192 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 applicable in accordance with Article 37 of Regulation (EU) 2015/323, full funding is essential for the action to be carried out due to the very nature of the action as well as the implementing partners.

(e) Indicative trimester to conclude the grant agreement

1st trimester 2017

## 2.2 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

The Commission’s authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Article 22(1) (b) of Annex IV to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realization of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

## 2.3 Indicative budget

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **EU contribution (EUR)** |
| **2.1.1 Procurement: direct management with JRC** | **16 100 000** |
| **Specific Objective 1**: (Enhancement of RRIS)Reference Information Systems for biodiversity and protected areas management are maintained and enhanced at Global, ACP and Regional Levels, combining best-available data with query, analysis and reporting functions tailored to the specific needs of priority conservation landscapes in ACP countries. | **16 100 000** *Lead JRC* |
| **2.1.2 Grant: direct award to IUCN** | **43 900 000** |
| **Specific Objective 2** (Operationalisation and institutionalisation of ROs)The Regional Observatories (ROs), mandated by regional instances and hosting the RRIS, are used by stakeholders to improve planning and decision-making for biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management and governance. | **15 900 000***Lead IUCN* |
| **Specific Objective 3****(**Site-based actions**)**On the basis of management and governance priorities, planning and implementation of biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management activities are strengthened through targeted actions in priority conservation landscapes in insular (including SIDS island territories) and continental territories in the ACP regions. | **26 500 000***Lead IUCN* |
| **2.8 Communication and visibility** | **1 500 000***Lead IUCN* |
| **TOTAL** | **60 000 000** |

## 2.4 Organisational set-up and responsibilities

All corresponding agreements will be signed by the Commission. For a project with such a large geographic scope, in which there are two implementing partners tasked with implementing a wide array of activities, it will be essential to ensure that there are sufficient resources to ensure effective technical oversight and monitoring of project implementation. Two structures will be required:

* **Steering Committee.** The Steering Committee will pilot the overall implementation of the project. Representation will include, but not necessarily be limited to, EU, ACP secretariat, IUCN and JRC. Indicative periodicity of meetings is once per year.
* **Technical and Scientific Advisory Committee (TSAC).** The Technical and Scientific Advisory Committee will provide technical and scientific support and advice to the Steering Committee. Resources will be made available to ensure that a panel of independent experts are available to participate actively and regularly in the work of the Committee. It will be established within the first 6 months of implementation and will be consulted regularly (at least every six months).

## 2.5 Performance monitoring and reporting

The specialist IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Unit will be mobilised to support the design of a monitoring and evaluation programme in concertation with the JRC and the Directorate General for International Cooperation and Development.

As the core business of this action is to establish regional structures (observatories housing RRISs), where information on protected areas and biodiversity are collected and monitored, the programme will generate much of the information for its own performance monitoring and reporting. However since this action is a follow-up to BIOPAMA I, which has not yet been completed and reported on, certain baseline figures that will be used for performance monitoring and reporting can only be established once the final report has been submitted (April 2017). This is the case for example for the indicators of level of pressures/threats to biodiversity and natural resources in PAs and surrounding communities (Overall Objective). These levels will be established at the start of BIOPAMA II on the basis of information available at the end of BIOPAMA I. Similarly monitoring of the further development of the RRIS and the various decision support and analytical tools will be based on the situation as it is at the end of BIOPAMA I.

A major component of BIOPAMA II is the continued development and rolling out of appropriate management effectiveness and governance assessment tools. Not only will these form the basis for the performance monitoring of the field activities undertaken under the Action Component (Result 3.2 & 3.3), but additionally they will generate considerable quantities of information that, after integration into the RRISs, will be exploited to inform the State of Protected Areas reports (Result 2.2).

JRC will be responsible for monitoring the development and testing of the RRISs and the Decision Support and Analytical Tools (including management effectiveness and governance assessment tools). IUCN will be responsible for the performance monitoring of the capacity building activities for the stakeholders using the RO and its services as well as the implementation of the site-based action components. Both organisations will work in close collaboration, and in support of, the RO host organisations and their regional technical partners, to implement the performance monitoring and reporting activities.

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process and part of the implementing partner’s responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (outputs and direct outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the logframe matrix. The report shall be laid out in such a way as to allow monitoring of the means envisaged and employed and of the budget details for the action. The final report, narrative and financial, will cover the entire period of the action implementation.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

## 2.6 Evaluation

Having regard to the nature of the action, a mid-term and a final evaluation will be carried out via independent consultants contracted by an implementing partner.

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out for evaluation of achievements, potential problems identification and corresponding corrective measures.

The final evaluation will be carried out for accountability and learning purposes at various levels (including for policy revision), taking into account the particular complexity of the thematic and context.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

## 2.7 Audit

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

Indicatively, one (1) contract for audit services shall be concluded under a framework contract in 2019.

## 2.8 Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.

This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action, to be elaborated at the start of implementation and supported with the budget indicated in section 2.3 above.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented under the IUCN lead and with the appropriate support by the European Commission, partner countries, contractors, grant beneficiaries and/or entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in, respectively, the financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations.

The BIOPAMA communications serve as the primary source of information about the programme -and the impact of the EU and ACP Group intervention - to a wide range and diverse set of stakeholders. It also extends to communicating the benefits of protected areas for the current global challenges, targeting an extended audience beyond the programme’s stakeholders groups and by using additional means and resources to communicate those messages. The communications activities will be implemented to support the achievement of the BIOPAMA II programme’s objectives, under two major communications objectives:

* Achieving high quality visibility and outreach activities to communicate the programme, its results and successes and ensure the high visibility of the impact of the EU and ACP intervention.
* Delivering and maintaining a strong BIOPAMA presence at the EU and ACP Group level.

All the proposed communications activities will serve to achieving the above mentioned communications objectives and to support the implementation of the BIOPAMA programme’s three specific objectives. In addition, some communications activities will target directly the observatories and the action component campaigns. A budget of EUR 1 500 000 is foreseen to achieve the BIOPAMA II communications (including activities, staff time, travels, equipment, local office and office costs) for six years and covering global and regional actions.

.

# APPENDIX - Indicative Log frame matrix

The activities, the expected outputs and all the indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the action, no amendment being required to the financing decision. When it is not possible to determine the outputs of an action at formulation stage, intermediary outcomes should be presented and the outputs defined during inception of the overall programme and its components. The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the action: new lines will be added for including the activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) for the output and outcome indicators whenever it is relevant for monitoring and reporting purposes

|  | **Results chain** | **Indicators** | **Baselines****(incl. reference year)** | **Targets****(incl. reference year)** | **Sources and means of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall objective** | To contribute to improving the long-term conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific regions in protected areas and surrounding communities through better use and monitoring of information on management and governance. | 1. Pressures on PAs and in surrounding communities2. Management effectiveness indicators | 1. To be set on basis of BIOPAMA I final report (April 2017)2. To be set on basis of BIOPAMA I final report (April 2017) | 1. To be set on basis of BIOPAMA I final report April 20172. To be set on basis of BIOPAMA I final report (April 2017) | 1. DOPA, RIS, RRIS,IUCN Green List of Protected & Conserved Areas (GLPCA)2. Management effectiveness assessment reports |  |
| **Specific Objective 1** | Reference Information Systems for biodiversity and protected areas management are maintained and enhanced at Global, ACP and Regional Levels, combining best-available data with query, analysis and reporting functions tailored to the specific needs of priority conservation landscapes in ACP countries. | 1.1. # of PAs for which up-to-date data are available in the RRIS.1.2. # of Decision Support and Analytical Tools available in RRIS | 1.1. To be set on basis of BIOPAMA I final report (April 2017)1.2. To be set on basis of BIOPAMA I final report (April 2017) | 1.1. 100% of PAs have up-to-date data in RRIS by 20231.2. Baseline maintained or increased by 2023 | 1.1. RRIS 1.2. RRIS | Data sharing agreements in place with key data providers at all levels |
| **Result 1.1** | The on-going development of DOPA at the global scale ensures the provision of comparable and harmonized indicators and metrics on PAs, delivering the information through a dedicated Reference Information System (RIS) focused on the ACP countries. | 1.1.1. # of DOPA indicators and metrics available through the RIS | 1.1.1. # and list of indicators as documented in final report April 2017 | 1.1.1. Baseline maintained or increased by 2023 | 1.1.1. DOPA, RIS outputs | Data sharing agreements in place with key data providers at all levelsOngoing institutional support for DOPA internationally (UN CBD)Ongoing improvement of WDPA |
| **Result 1.2** | Protected area decision making at regional, national and site level is enhanced by provision of data through Regional Reference Information Systems (RRIS) operating through the BIOPAMA Observatories. | 1.2.1. # of RRIS established and operational in Regional Observatories1.2.2. # countries using RRIS for official decision-making and reporting | 1.2.1. RRIS x 4 at beginning of programme1.2.2. Baseline 0 at beginning of programme | 1.2.1. At least 6 RRIS fully functional in 2023.1.2.2. At least 60% of countries covered by project using RRIS for decision-making and reporting by 2023 | 1.2.1. Regional Observatory reports1.2.2. Citations and reference to RRIS in relevant reports (NBSAPs, CBD reporting, national frameworks, PA management plans, etc) | Institutional arrangements, continued commitment and political will, and enabling environment are workingAction plans for observatories implemented, capacities of key focal points sufficiently in place |
| **Result 1.3** | Information and decision support tools provided by the ROs for monitoring management effectiveness and governance in conservation landscapes are regularly improved, updated, tested and implemented in partnership with national and regional agencies. | 1.3.1. # of management effectiveness tool adaptations responding to regional priorities / specificities developed in this programme1.3.2. # of management effectiveness assessments and repeat assessments undertaken in this programme  | 1.3.1. Baseline 0 at start of programme1.3.2. Baseline 0 at start of programme | 1.3.1. Functional adaptations of tools available for at least terrestrial PAs, marine PAs and community managed areas for each of the regions by 20231.3.2. At least 200 PAs have at least one management effectiveness assessment available by 20231.3.2. All PAs subject to IMET management effectiveness assessments in BIOPAMA I have at least one repeat assessment in BIOPAMA II | 1.3.1. RRIS1.3.2. Management effectiveness assessment data | National authorities endorse the approaches, with sufficient resources and capacity to enable national engagementPA management effectiveness and governance assessments done transparentlyLegal, policy and data sharing framework exists |
| **Specific Objective 2** | The Regional Observatories (ROs), mandated by regional institutions and hosting the RRIS, are used by stakeholders to improve planning and decision-making for biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management and governance | 2.1. Frequency of use of ROs2.2. # of status reports produced (PA status reports, MEA / Aichi / CDB / SDG target monitoring reports) using RO data  | 2.1. Frequency in Yr 1 (2017)2.2. Baseline 0 at start of programme | 2.1. Progressive increase in frequency of use of ROs from Yrs 1-6 compared to baseline2.2. At least 1 status report per region per year. | 2.1. Reports from Regional Observatories2.2. Status reports | Regional institutions hosting ROs remain politically committed to supporting the work of the ROs |
| **Result 2.1**  | The capacities of key stakeholders to use the tools and services of the ROs are developed through targeted capacity building initiatives | 2.1.1. # people trained in use of tools and services of ROs from this from this programme2.1.2. # of relevant organisations benefiting from capacity building activities | 2.1.1. Baseline 0 at start of programme 2.1.2. Baseline 0 at start of programme | 2.1.1. By 2023 at least 300 relevant users trained per RO 2.1.2. By 2023 at least 10 relevant organisations per RO  | 2.1.1 & 2.1.2.:* Training workshop reports
* Monkey surveys
* Capacity development effectiveness assessment using new IUCN guidance
 | Availability and willingness to engage on capacity development plans from BIOPAMA-1  |
| **Result 2.2**  | ROs produce periodic status reports on biodiversity and sustainable NRM initiatives which are systematically shared with decision makers and the wider conservation and donor community. | 2.2.1. # reports, briefs, etc. produced from this programme2.2.2. # of roundtable/dialogue events sharing key outputs with decision-makers, donors, other conservation actors | 2.2.1. Baseline 0 at start of programme2.2.2. Baseline 0 at start of programme | 2.1.1. By 2023 at least two State of PA (SOPA) reports produced by each RO2.2.2. At least 1 roundtable dialogue held in each region every year  | 2.2.1. SOPA reports2.2.1. References in Protected Planet reports and other relevant documents and assessments2.2.2. Reports of meetings | Data sharing and willingness to engage by all necessary stakeholders and partners (govt, donor, key partners, WCPA, etc.) |
| **Result 2.3** | Regional and national decision making processes make use of information on PA and natural resource management and governance provided by the ROs | 2.3.1. # of key regional and national key decision-making platforms making use of info provided by ROs from this programme2.3.2. # of decision-makers from other relevant sectors (e.g. agriculture, mining, finance,) making use of info from ROs from this programme | 2.3.1. Baseline 0 at start of programme2.3.2. Baseline 0 at start of programme | 2.3.1. Progressive increase from Yr1 to Yr6 2.3.2. Progressive increase from Yr1 to Yr6 | 2.3.1. Citations and reference to ROs in relevant policy and planning documents2.3.2. Citations and reference to ROs in relevant policy and planning documents |  |
| **Specific Objective 3** | On the basis of management and governance priorities, planning and implementation of biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management activities are strengthened through targeted actions in priority conservation landscapes in insular (including SIDS island territories) and continental territories in the ACP regions | 3.1. Management effectiveness and governance indexes from conservation landscapes benefiting from Action Component support | 3.1. Management effectiveness indexes in beneficiary conservation landscapes at start of Action Component support | 3.1. Management effectiveness indexes in beneficiary conservation landscapes in 2023 | 3.1. Management Effectiveness assessments (IMET or equivalent) | Management effectiveness and governance assessments endorsed by national authorities and done transparently |
| **Result 3.1** | PA assessments by national PA agencies, using appropriate assessment tools, are implemented systematically for planning and decision making | 3.1.1. # PA agencies using management effectiveness assessment tools | 3.1.1.# in Yr 1 (2017) | 3.1.1. At least 20% increase annually | 3.1.1. State of Protected Area reports3.1.1. RRIS reports |  |
| **Result 3.2** | Required management actions, as identified by appropriate management and governance assessment tools, are implemented in pilot PAs in the conservation landscapes, including SIDS | 3.2.1. Level of improvement in management effectiveness and governance indices in pilot PAs receiving Action Component grants | 3.2.1. Management effectiveness and governance indices at start of action | 3.2.1. Improved management effectiveness and governance indices at end of action | 3.2.1. Management effectiveness and governance assessment reports |  |
| **Result 3.3** | Communities living in pilot priority conservation landscapes benefit from improved governance and management of natural resources and ecosystem services | 3.3.1. Level of improvement in management effectiveness and governance indices in pilot priority conservation landscapes receiving Action Component grants | 3.3.1. Management effectiveness and governance indices at start of action | 3.3.1. Improved management effectiveness and governance indices at end of action | 3.3.1. Management effectiveness and governance assessment reports  |  |
| **Result 3.4** | Conservation stakeholders in the landscapes (PA/national administrations and civil society) have improved knowledge on sustainable financing mechanisms and are better equipped to use them | 3.4.1. # of natural capital and ecosystem valuation exercises conducted in targeted conservation landscapes | 3.4.1. # of beneficiary sites where evaluations have already been done at start of project (2017) | 3.4.1. ≥ 50% increase by 2023 | 3.4.1. Valuation (TESSA) reports |  |

1. Official Development Aid is administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. It should be noted that the term PA in this document covers the very broad range of governance systems that exist across the ACP including the ‘informal’ types of community-based governance and management where the principal motivation is for cultural and livelihoods reasons rather biodiversity conservation *per se* (eg Pacific region). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. The Digital Observatory for Protected Areas is a set of web services and applications that can be used primarily to assess, monitor, report and possibly forecast the state of and the pressure on protected areas at multiple scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Toolkit for Ecosystem Services Site-based Assessment - TESSA [↑](#footnote-ref-5)