

For external dissemination

Independent Review of Fauna & Flora International's Halcyon Land & Sea and Halcyon Marine Initiatives for the Arcadia Fund

Michael P. Wells & Associates

31 August 2016

Michael P. Wells
Marea Hatzios
John Pilgrim

With contributions from:
David Grossman
Gaye Thompson
Mary Toy

Inselberg in the Niassa National Reserve, Mozambique. Credit: J A Bruson

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
1. Main Findings and Recommendations	2
Overview	2
Objectives	2
Impacts and Achievements	2
Local Partners	4
Unique Value of Halcyon Funding	5
Halcyon Marine: A Successful Pilot	6
FFI Capacity.....	6
Managing Risks	7
Long-Term Financing as a Persistent Challenge.....	8
FFI's Niche.....	9
Recommendations	10
2. Responses to Arcadia's Review Priorities and Questions.....	13
3. Case Study Projects Reviewed	25
Golden Stream Corridor Preserve, Belize.....	26
Chuilixi Conservancy, Mozambique	28
ADEPT and Zarand, Romania	31
Marine Conservation in the Myeik Archipelago, Myanmar.....	36
Gökova Bay Marine Protected Area, Turkey	39
No-Take-Zones – Firth of Clyde, UK	41
Sustainability Rating for the Fisheries Sector	43
Flower Valley, South Africa	46
Awacachi Ecological Corridor, Ecuador	48
Ulu Masen REDD, Aceh, Indonesia.....	50
Aceh Small Islands Initiative, Indonesia	51
National Policy on Bottom Trawling for Shrimp in Costa Rica.....	54
Community Conserved Areas, South Kenya	57
Improving Policy and Practice to Reduce Plastic Pollution, UK.....	59
Annex 1. Issues facing the most challenging Arcadia projects	62
Annex 2. Examples of FFI project learning applied elsewhere.....	66

Introduction

This report contains the findings and recommendations of the independent review of the Arcadia Fund's support to Fauna & Flora International's Halcyon Land & Sea and Halcyon Marine Initiatives.

This version of the report has been slightly edited to remove sensitive, site-specific information.

Our approach and methodology followed the October 5, 2015 proposal submitted to Arcadia. All of our review objectives and plans have been met and the review was successfully completed in mid-2016.

Field visits, including interviews with FFI's local partners as well as discussions with independent experts, were a key component of our work, supplemented by document reviews. We also interviewed FFI's leadership and staff, both in Cambridge and in the field.

Our findings from the individual projects we reviewed are summarized here. We visited Arcadia-funded FFI sites in seven countries, carried out full reviews of two more projects that did not involve field work – all as originally planned – and then added six more desk reviews of additional Arcadia-funded FFI sites.

We have shared and discussed with FFI draft reports on our findings on all of these projects, amounting to over 160 pages.

We received excellent cooperation from the FFI leadership and staff.

This report is organised in three main sections:

1. Main findings and recommendations.
2. Responses to the review questions specified by Arcadia.
3. Summarized findings and lessons from the projects selected as case studies.

1. Main Findings and Recommendations

Overview

1. Support from Arcadia has averaged about \$1m per year for Halcyon Land & Sea since 1998 through a series of 5-year grants, plus another \$1.25m per year since 2012 for Halcyon Marine. FFI's total annual income has increased from \$4m to \$31m during this period. FFI reports that the Arcadia investments have been used to leverage \$130m in additional funds for Land & Sea and \$12m for Marine, thus exceeding the co-financing targets on all Halcyon grants.

Objectives

2. FFI manages the two Halcyon programmes in clearly distinct ways: Land & Sea has encouraged FFI to pursue high priority conservation opportunities with financial support that is stable, flexible and readily adjustable, often for land acquisition or to support new land management approaches; while Marine has been used to initiate and pilot an entirely new conservation initiative, notably with funding for both projects and FFI staff positions. Both programmes have been global in their geographic scope.
3. The goals of Halcyon Land & Sea, which have changed only slightly since 1998, are to: (i) secure areas of exceptional conservation value which are unprotected or under-protected and are at risk of destruction or degradation using the most locally-appropriate approaches, (ii) build the local and national capacity to manage these sites into the long-term, engaging the local community in this process wherever possible, (iii) develop mechanisms to underpin the long-term financial sustainability of these sites, and (iv) develop an improved enabling environment for site conservation, through strategic interventions at both policy and practice levels.
4. The Halcyon Marine goals are to: (i) secure important areas of marine biodiversity under effective management (through new designations and/or improved site operations), and use these as demonstration sites and as a basis for wider replication, (ii) inform and influence policies and practices affecting the marine environment within national governments and the corporate sector and apply innovative financial models to bring about change in marine management, and (iii) support key national and local institutions to enhance their operations and help them deliver effective marine conservation.

Impacts and Achievements

5. Our work indicates that the Halcyon funds have been used strategically and consistently by FFI to achieve impressive gains in (a) areas protected for conservation, both terrestrial and marine, (b) capacities of local partners, and (c) influence over wider conservation debates, priorities and policies. FFI has selected its priority sites well, then stayed engaged and persevered over significant time periods in situations that have thrown up unexpected

challenges as well as opportunities. An expanding FFI has also used the Halcyon funding to innovate and develop skills and expertise in new areas. We found that FFI's reporting to Arcadia on the progress made has generally been thorough and balanced.

6. FFI's approach to site selection is deliberately ad hoc. The organisation does not follow a global prioritisation scheme, such as biodiversity hotspots. Instead, FFI either seeks out or responds to requests where it considers there are opportunities for important long-term conservation gains and where local partners with potential can be identified. Partly as a result, there are some countries where FFI is conspicuously absent – such as Brazil, and others where they were initially among a very few active international organisations – notably Myanmar, Romania and South Sudan. Even within countries already popular with international conservationists, FFI has not avoided working in problematic regions including Kenya's border with Somalia or Ecuador's border with Colombia. Nonetheless, most of FFI's work is within areas considered as priorities by international NGO peers and, crucially, the selection of each of the projects we reviewed had been well justified on the basis of both scientific and conservation opportunity criteria.
7. FFI has worked at some important conservation sites over impressively long periods, in some cases persisting in the face of formidable obstacles and challenges that threatened to derail their projects. In so doing, FFI has had to make difficult decisions, including changing partners and deciding whether to continue investing limited resources into high-risk investments that did not show strong signs of a payoff in the near future. Sometimes this has led to outcomes completely different from those expected or imaginable at the outset. Based on the case studies we have examined in depth, however, which included some extremely complicated situations, FFI's judgement about getting involved, staying involved, disengaging and/or changing direction has generally proved sound, considerably aided by the stability, flexibility and longevity of the Halcyon funding.
8. The long-term financial sustainability of conservation programmes is an enduring challenge. The Halcyon projects we reviewed included a variety of approaches to securing reliable sources of long-term financing at site levels. Some have been successful, others are still exploring options and all seem likely to require FFI's long-term engagement. In practice this means redoubling efforts to establish sustainable livelihoods, biodiversity-friendly businesses and private sector income generation mechanisms that support or at least are consistent with conservation. There are sufficient promising examples in the Halcyon portfolios to demonstrate the value of increasing investments in this area.
9. In aggregate, Arcadia has supported a significant body of work that represents an impressive return on the funds invested. This is not to suggest a total picture of success, however. Conservation is hard and both advances and setbacks have been encountered. But compared to what others are attempting and achieving in this field, and considering the opportunities and constraints faced, FFI has performed very well indeed in its use of Halcyon funding.

Local Partners

10. A key to FFI's success has been its genuine commitment to work supportively with local partners. These engagements have often continued over extended time periods as new or nascent partner organisations take on new, more autonomous roles that reflect their own ambitions and internal dynamics as well as those of FFI. While most of these partners are NGOs or even individuals that FFI has encouraged to form NGOs, some are government agencies or universities, especially in Asia.
11. FFI has been a genuine collaborator in these relationships, respecting their partners' own goals even while pushing for progress, remaining in the background while their partners take credit for any gains, and recognizing individual projects as components of longer-term relationships. Playing such a role effectively has required considerable skill, judgement and sometimes patience and fortitude in a variety of different contexts, where FFI's capacity to adapt its approach to local conditions has been critical. While this is an art more than a science, there are clear signs that FFI learned effectively from the few cases where their initial partner choices did not work out, eventually requiring a shift in partner or withdrawal. Such exemplary approaches are almost certainly crucial to helping develop a genuine in-country demand for conservation where biodiversity is concentrated, and few other NGOs can match FFI in the quality of their work with local partners.
12. While many of FFI's partner relationships have been commendably long term, the question arises as to whether or when they might end. Conservation sites and their supporting organisations have varying potential for financial self-sufficiency, with some likely to require perpetual support, including continuing financing. FFI's experience shows a variety of approaches to gradually disengaging as partners become more independent in fundraising and governance, sometimes with FFI maintaining a seat on a leadership board/council or an informal advisory role. In some cases this has taken more than a decade, a time horizon well beyond the focus of most donors. FFI prepares annual "legacy" reports on each project exited, thereby facilitating periodic management review even after partial or complete disengagement. Some positive conservation impacts can take many years to crystalize and may not be easily traced back or attributed to important catalytic steps taken by FFI or other partners at earlier stages.
13. Our work indicates that FFI has generally made excellent judgements in its partner relationships, and has reflected on and learned from the relatively few examples that have run into problems. We were particularly impressed by FFI's willingness to explore with us specific projects where, in retrospect, different and better decisions might have been taken at key points. Certainly the partners themselves are consistently highly appreciative of FFI's role and style of relationship management, including FFI's readiness to speak the plain truth when needed.

Unique Value of Halcyon Funding

14. The Halcyon funds have been used productively to: (a) support innovative and higher risk conservation approaches, including strategic purchases of land; (b) kick-start promising projects that were not geographically or thematically attractive to other donors; (c) help build technical staff expertise in new areas, notably in marine conservation since 2012; (d) bridge transition periods in long-term programmes that other donors could not respond to; (e) flexibly accommodate modifications in project/programme plans during implementation; (f) launch FFI's entire work programme in Latin America; and (g) fund unusual requests at short notice. In the modern conservation world there are relatively few donors prepared to provide support on this largely unrestricted basis and FFI clearly would not be the organisation it is today without the Halcyon funding.
15. The characteristics of the Halcyon funding most valued by FFI are the opportunities to make initial investments quickly, to be entrepreneurial, and to adjust annual spending to needs as opportunities arise. The latter feature is very beneficial for conservation programmes as opportunities and challenges change over time, sometimes rapidly, and an effective response is often hard to achieve within the structure of most donor grants.
16. The Halcyon funding has thus played a unique role within FFI, providing stable and flexible support over time even as it has contributed a decreasing proportion of FFI's total income. These funds, together with the co-financing they have been used to leverage, have helped FFI achieve its aim of limiting funding from official/public sources, which are almost invariably project linked, to no more than 33% of total revenues. This is a sound policy, as we are familiar with examples of conservation NGOs that have become over-reliant on project-specific funding to the eventual detriment of their staff and their programmes.
17. FFI has taken considerable care with the Halcyon funding in full recognition of its unique attributes and value to the organisation. Any FFI programme wishing to access the Halcyon Land & Sea funds has to apply internally then pass through successive filters that include an informal discussion, a briefing paper and eventually a full proposal to the Senior Management Team (the Halcyon Marine projects for the initial 2012 grant were largely pre-selected, also following a rigorous process). At each stage careful consideration has been given to the fit between anticipated activities and the Halcyon Land & Sea criteria, as well as the potential availability of funds from other donors. Unsuitable concepts have usually been identified and discouraged at the discussion phase without investing too much time or money.
18. FFI's Director of Conservation Science and Design, a senior staff member with regular access to the FFI leadership, has been the gatekeeper for the Halcyon Land & Sea funds for well over a decade, combining detailed knowledge of the Halcyon-supported projects with a full understanding of FFI's previous experience as well as the capacity to take on new challenges. This gatekeeper role has not only been carried out with rigour and insight,

but also extended into the oversight of on-going projects, thus making a key contribution to the successes achieved and effectively representing Arcadia's interests within FFI.

Halcyon Marine: A Successful Pilot

19. Halcyon Marine was launched in 2012 with a \$5m, 4-year grant, recently extended until 2018 with a further \$3.8m. There are now 26 active projects in 19 countries (FFI's marine activities prior to 2012 had been small and uncoordinated). FFI has embedded the marine programme in all four of its geographic regions, where work with local marine conservation stakeholders, including government agencies, has been based on the use of science to inform debate and support sound management interventions.
20. In a departure from the Halcyon Land & Sea funding, the Halcyon Marine grant financed not only projects plus 15% overhead, but also the recruitment of a senior marine coordinator whose effective leadership has contributed significantly to the programme having achieved a high standing throughout FFI and beyond. This direct Halcyon investment in human resources has proved critical—both in terms of the design and quality of operations and in the strategic growth of the programme. The marine grant budget was also used to support a small allocation of FFI staff time to a successful and very cost-effective UK campaign to ban microplastics use in cosmetics.
21. Although still at a relatively small scale, the marine programme has developed rapidly to become a promising global operation, leveraging significant additional funding and partnerships, and already demonstrating some success in shifting the needle on conservation in remote frontiers, including Myanmar. Subject to expanded funding, the prospects for building on this strong start and achieving further gains on a broader front appear very good. The timing may be helped by several countries' current interest in establishing more Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) to progress towards their 2020 Aichi biodiversity commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity.
22. The 2016 bridge grant from Arcadia of \$3.8m to sustain current investments and help consolidate the marine programme through 2018 will help FFI further diversify its funding base while refining an investment strategy for the next major phase of work. Building on the successful completion of the programme's pilot phase will require significant new levels of investment, not only of funds into projects but for the hiring of key staff to fill out FFI's marine team.

FFI Capacity

23. FFI has grown considerably since Arcadia started providing support, from a handful of staff under the Chief Executive in the 1990s to today's several hundred employees (mostly in regional programmes) and 20 department directors under a Senior Management Team of six. We observed an organisation with a core of experienced, longer-term employees balanced by well-qualified and highly-motivated new hires in specific areas. Our work

brought us into particularly frequent contact with the three Regional Directors (the Africa role was vacant and being shared on an interim basis). We were particularly struck by their capacities to not only lead complex multi-country programmes but also to show detailed knowledge and understanding of what had been going on at the level of individual projects and partners. This suggests a relatively flat management structure and lack of hierarchy, both contributing to a strong impression that everyone at FFI is under pressure to perform and that each staff position is an important one.

24. While such leanness in the organisation is generally positive and cost effective, the projects we reviewed included cases where the loss of key FFI project personnel at certain points in time had been disruptive. This highlights how limited the extra capacity is within the organisation to provide cover or temporary additional supervision. Some projects could have been stronger with greater involvement from relevant technical specialists and, in a few cases, from management. We suspect that FFI is now much better placed to deploy technical experts and to deal with unpredictable staff transitions than it was a decade ago, but this challenge will require renewed attention if the organisation continues to expand.
25. Our observations suggest that FFI has had to invest considerable additional core staff time to ensure the success and added value of the Halcyon projects – particularly in the Land & Sea portfolio. It is hard to persuade donors to support organisational costs, including premises, fundraising and communications as well as the salaries of administrative and senior technical and management staff. FFI has estimated its organisation-wide overhead ratio for full cost recovery to be about 25%. Having originally covered only Halcyon project costs, Arcadia subsequently provided an additional 15% for overhead/indirect organisation costs. However, it seemed likely to us that the total non-budgeted inputs to Halcyon's long-term projects from technical staff and management alone have probably exceeded 15% of project costs (in some cases the time of Regional Directors is included in project budgets). These unfunded costs have had to be financed from other unrestricted funds, thereby adding to the fundraising burden already imposed by the Halcyon co-financing stipulations.

Managing Risks

26. We generally found that FFI had been neither excessively risk adverse nor risk seeking in its work. Calculated risks have been taken, with an implicit expectation that some will fail. As FFI staff have pointed out, there are known risks in specific situations involving political support, partner and staff performance, uncertainties around completion of land purchases, long-term funding, eventual viability of new business concepts, etc., that can be distinguished from the unknowable risks that are likely to be associated with any long-term conservation effort. We did not encounter any important decisions that might be characterized as too timid, although we noted cases where FFI had used Halcyon funding boldly to take on very significant challenges and to stay tenaciously engaged after major challenges emerged. In a few cases FFI made a decision not to proceed,

withdrawing from four Halcyon projects and choosing not to proceed with two others, all for sound reasons that do not appear outside the normal range of conservation experiences. FFI's "most challenging projects" are listed in Annex 1, six of which were case studies for this review.

27. We do consider that more attention could be paid to risk assessment within FFI in two specific areas, particularly for the Halcyon-supported projects: (i) Halcyon Land & Sea projects have contributed to the cost of land purchases in a variety of countries, usually working with local and national lawyers who are best placed to identify and address in-country legal issues. However, comparable organisations we are familiar with usually have legal staff at headquarters to coordinate and quality control any legal work being contracted in other countries, especially when involving land acquisition. The risks are naturally higher where legal systems are weak, including many of the countries where FFI works; (ii) we were generally very impressed at how closely FFI has monitored their partners' development. However, we encountered cases where FFI had identified conflict of interest situations within local partners that probably would have been unacceptable in western Europe or the USA, but were being tolerated on a temporary basis out of a concern not to appear heavy handed with partners operating in a different culture with different standards. We understand that such situations will occur from time to time – especially in relationships with small, emerging organisations that FFI has no formal jurisdiction over – but such situations do require careful monitoring and responses.

Long-Term Financing as a Persistent Challenge

28. Long-term financing for site-based conservation has been an explicit goal for Halcyon Land & Sea and continues to present a major challenge. FFI definitely has an entrepreneurial perspective, particularly among its top leadership, and can point to a few commercial enterprises that are generating significant revenue flows for conservation. But the Halcyon experience suggests that such opportunities are hard to identify and can take a decade or more to become financially viable and self-sufficient. Promising innovations include safari tourism in Kenya and in Chuilexi Mozambique; commercial fynbos plant harvesting in South Africa's Flower Valley and land purchases in Romania to generate future EU subsidies. There are very few quick wins here. The typical limited-duration projects supported by most donors have a poor record in establishing viable commercial enterprises to support biodiversity. FFI has used Arcadia support to move beyond such short-term approaches, but it is not clear that adequate financing is consistently available to take advantage of commercial opportunities.
29. FFI was an early mover on REDD (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries), which emerged as a major potential global funding source for tropical forest conservation in 2007. FFI used Halcyon funding to establish the early Ulu Masen pilot project in Aceh Indonesia, although this had to be reconfigured following a political shift and difficulties with an initial commercial partner. However, this early experience led FFI to raise additional (non-Halcyon) funding to develop an international portfolio of a dozen REDD projects that are now

preparing to sell certified forest carbon credits as a potential sustainable financing source. While expectations for REDD as a global mechanism have subsequently been tempered, FFI used Arcadia funding to move quickly and strategically to explore what was (and could still be) an important emerging long-term financing opportunity.

FFI's Niche

30. While FFI has expanded significantly since receiving its first support from Arcadia in 1998, the organisation's identity is still self-consciously that of a medium-sized NGO in a conservation world dominated by larger actors. FFI insists, with justification, that it should not be compared directly to the big international conservation NGOs (the BINGOs: CI, TNC, WCS and WWF¹). Nevertheless, we were impressed by the relative sophistication of FFI's project monitoring and performance reporting systems, mechanisms for institutional learning and commitment to the publication of conservation stories and lessons. While this was not the primary focus of our enquiries, we came away with an impression of an organisation that had invested sensibly and productively in adopting new operational and programme management systems that could provide a solid foundation for future expansion, even though some of these improvements are still new and relatively untested.
31. As the BINGOs have recently been estimated to spend 80% of the total global conservation budget, FFI's own niche in the conservation world is important to characterize. Being more than 100 years old does give a sense of solidity and effectiveness even if this does not guarantee continuing relevance. Nonetheless, we found that FFI's staff and partners understand and share the organisation's strong sense of its identity within the conservation world. What FFI refers to as its 'differentiating factors' in its latest business plan do indeed correspond with the findings of our review, i.e., a unique role characterized by (i) collaboration through lasting partnerships, (ii) leadership through innovative models, and (iii) a lean entrepreneurial style allowing fast and flexible engagement on critical issues. The most comparable NGO we are aware of is FFI's Cambridge neighbour BirdLife International, although BirdLife has a different approach to working with national partners.
32. We have observed an increasing trend towards regranting in the conservation world. This often involves an international NGO acting as an intermediary by receiving a relatively large programme grant from a foundation or public agency and then redistributing at least part of this in the form of multiple subgrants to smaller organisations, often local NGOs, and being paid a fee to do so. Donors usually agree on the programme's goals and intended outcomes without getting involved in the selection of subgrantees or their relationship with the intermediary. It seems a safe bet that a not insignificant portion of the 80% referred to in the previous paragraph has been regranting to smaller organisations, adding up to a large sum.

¹ CI = Conservation International, TNC = the Nature Conservancy, WCS = Wildlife Conservation Society, WWF = World Wildlife Fund.

33. In previous work we have identified a key distinction between regranteeing that supports (i) genuine local organisational capacity building, from (ii) simply subcontracting a local organisation to do a job inexpensively, often without making any contribution to overhead costs or organisational development. FFI's approach is firmly the former. The latter, which is reasonably widespread and is often expedient for the intermediary, seems considerably less likely to contribute to long-term conservation.
34. At this point FFI appears to combine some of the best characteristics of being large – i.e., it has convening power and access to decision makers, at least on a moderate scale – with those of being small – i.e., being effective at local levels and operating flexibly and effectively with a relatively simple management structure, thus avoiding the need for a complex bureaucracy. Certainly the BINGOs can have greater reach, policy clout, access to funding and influence, but they arguably pay a heavy cost for this in terms of organisational complexity and, especially, the inflexibility associated with hierarchies and bureaucracies that can separate their leadership from their work on the ground.
35. Establishing coherent management systems while staying nimble, responsive and entrepreneurial has been an explicit FFI goal and has required continual focus. Having made sound progress in this respect, FFI now seems well positioned to increase the scale of its impacts without dramatically altering the organisation itself. Our sense is that FFI could expand further while maintaining the dual gains from being both large and small. Even if FFI doubled its income it would still be considerably smaller than WCS, the smallest of the BINGOs. The results of this review suggest that an expanded FFI could achieve even greater impacts while providing a very useful and important complement to the BINGOs in the international conservation world.
36. Optimally, any such expansion should go beyond project financing and an allocation for overheads. Funding would also be required for technical and management staff positions, to cover new staff in key areas as well as a greater share of the unfunded senior staff costs currently being incurred. Some of the clearest opportunities for greater impacts include a general expansion of the existing Halcyon project portfolios (Land & Sea and, especially, Marine) supported by: (i) redoubling efforts to support sustainable financing – i.e., biodiversity-friendly business ventures that experience shows can take a decade or more to become independent and viable, (ii) providing global legal services at a headquarters level, and (iii) acquiring more expertise and depth in specific technical areas that can support multiple projects.

Recommendations

37. Arcadia has shown significant trust by allowing FFI considerable flexibility in the use of its funding. That trust has been rewarded by the considerable care FFI has taken in using the funds and the impressive results obtained by both Halcyon Land & Sea and Halcyon Marine. Consistently balanced judgement has been demonstrated on decisions such as the geography of

investments and project risks versus benefits. Our findings suggest Arcadia should continue, and if possible expand, support for this successful model of grant making. Our assessment is that FFI has laid the foundation for a considerable expansion, although this would require increased funding not only for projects, but also indirect/overhead costs and additional staff positions.

38. Although Arcadia contributes to overhead costs in addition to direct project costs, FFI still appears to be investing significant unfunded technical and management staff time to ensure the effectiveness of the Halcyon projects. This may be unnecessarily weighing FFI down and encouraging site selection decisions based on the likely availability of other donor funds, especially to meet the matched funding requirement for Halcyon Marine grants. Given FFI's consistent success in reaching all of Arcadia's co-financing and leverage goals, perhaps consideration could be given to relaxing these requirements.
39. FFI is well aware of the need to mobilize long-term financial support for the sites where it works and can justifiably point to a significant body of experience in this area. To have a more convincing and significant impact over time, however, our view is that this work needs to step up to a higher level, ideally supported by longer-term and larger-scale funding analogous to a venture capital fund that links multi-year start-up funding with FFI's entrepreneurial expertise and more systematic strategic planning for financial sustainability at all priority conservation sites. Such investments seem likely to be needed over time frames closer to a decade than the traditional 3-5 year donor funding horizons.
40. Greater impacts can be achieved beyond projects by working at the policy level, as the case studies show FFI has done effectively in Costa Rica shrimp trawling, UK microplastics, Kenya coastal co-management and, potentially, Myanmar standards for environmental impact assessments. Such work often involves being part of diverse stakeholder alliances and can require substantial staff and management time to work with partners as well as under-resourced government departments. Our work suggests that FFI could achieve significant gains if more resources were available to support such policy efforts, recognizing that FFI has already both the needed skills and the convening power.
41. Halcyon Marine has made a successful start with a diverse set of interventions, targeting areas of opportunity with modest investments. Building on the very successful completion of the programme's pilot phase to generate larger scale impacts in the future will require significant new levels of investment. The innovation of providing specific funds for the Programme Coordinator position could usefully be expanded to include key staff to further develop the capacity of FFI's marine team, notably in fisheries economics and market transformation.
42. Two areas under the heading of risk assessment deserve further consideration: (i) a capacity at headquarters to coordinate and provide quality control for the diverse legal services used by FFI and partners worldwide seems advisable, especially in the area of land acquisition, and

(ii) while FFI's work with its in-country partners is generally exemplary, it does seem essential to respond on a timely basis to potential partner governance risks such as conflicts of interest.

43. FFI has noted and used lessons from experience while giving careful thought to how learning can most effectively take place. Specifically, FFI could usefully document, and potentially share, the lessons learned in: (i) land purchase and long-term site management; and (ii) developing partner capacity, particularly in facilitating organisational change during the development of emerging/individual-led partner initiatives into more sustainable and resilient organisations. These are both areas where FFI has demonstrated considerable skill and judgement in complex situations while learning from a few early missteps, and the lessons should be of value to future leaders and staff, and perhaps other organisations.

2. Responses to Arcadia's Review Priorities and Questions

44. This section does not repeat points already made in the preceding Main Findings and Recommendations section.

1. Recognizing and affirming success (i.e. strengths, distinctive advantages), e.g.:

- a) Achievements to date, both in terms of the areas protected and conservation approaches developed.***
b) Internal factors/assets/strengths making those achievements possible (funding base, capacity within FFI and its partners)
c) Relevance, effectiveness and impact of Halcyon to date.

Achievements

45. Both Halcyon Land & Sea and Halcyon Marine have made impressive progress towards their objectives, including securing new areas for conservation, building in-country management capacity through identifying and empowering local partners, and fostering opportunities for enterprises linked to these investments to enhance the durability of conservation measures and their long-term sustainable financing.
46. FFI has informed Arcadia of its achievements through annual reports for both Halcyon Land & Sea and Halcyon Marine. Our review has found this reporting thorough and balanced. We will not repeat the content here beyond a brief summary.
47. There are few, if any, satisfactory high-level quantitative indicators that adequately capture progress in conservation. The physical size of areas protected is a popular measure that is easily understood, although we recognize, as does FFI, that this leads to more significant questions including: what exactly was FFI's contribution, how important are these particular sites, how effectively are they managed, how much local support do they have, what threats do they face and how will their long-term futures be financed. The answers are hard to measure at the site level and virtually impossible to aggregate at a programme level. We explored these and other key qualitative questions at an individual site level through our case studies, as described in a later section of our report, to form the basis for our overall findings.
48. FFI reports that Halcyon Land & Sea has since 1998 helped to conserve over 9m ha and directly contributed to the enhanced management of 56m ha, an area almost as large as Kenya. FFI reasonably makes the distinction between cases where "we have a significant impact on the conservation of an area without actually actively securing or managing it on the ground" (= helped to conserve) versus cases "where active intervention in a relatively small area influences a wider landscape" (= contributed to enhanced management). The \$18m received from Arcadia for Halcyon Land & Sea has been used to leverage \$130m in additional donor contributions.

49. Halcyon Marine has helped enhance the management of over 1m ha of coastal and marine habitat since 2012 and Arcadia's initial \$5m grant has leveraged another \$12m million from donors and partners (Arcadia recently provided another \$3.8m). Halcyon Land & Sea support to the Blue Marine Foundation had previously contributed to establishing the 54m ha Chagos Marine Reserve in the Indian Ocean in 2010.

Conservation Approaches

50. The diversity of FFI's approaches is illustrated by (a) the sites we visited (showing the dates of the Halcyon investment):

51. **Golden Stream, Belize** (1998-2014): Key land plots purchased, significant FFI staff inputs to build tiny partner to self-confident NGO with national influence.

52. **Niassa/Chuilexi, Mozambique** (2002-2015): Sustained support to Park Manager, then innovative transition to private company to secure country's first park tourism concession while addressing poaching and navigating complex and challenging relationships with government.

53. **Northern Rangeland Trust** (NRT), Kenya: (2007-13) Developed in-country partner capacity through direct mentoring and investments in conservancies, then stepped back after introducing new international partner with additional financing, leaving spinoffs from initial work now covering a vast area of northern Kenya².

54. **ADEPT and Zarand, Romania** (2009-12): Helped develop and transform two separate NGOs from a few key individuals to capable, internationally-funded and recognized organisations, one working on farmed landscapes and the other on a conservation corridor, including land purchases to secure long-term EU financing.

55. **Myeik Archipelago, Myanmar** (2012-16): Pioneering work with government agencies and universities to build a base for marine conservation, including locally-managed marine reserve pilot projects.

56. **Gökova Bay Marine Protected Area, Turkey** (2012-16): Helped develop and finance a very young NGO to organize community-led patrols of No-Take Fishing Zones as the first example of MPA enforcement in Turkey.

57. **Firth of Clyde, UK** (2012-14): Provided behind-the-scenes support to help an NGO develop while it proposed the first MPA in Scotland, leading to multiple-site gains and progress in policy based on science.

58. And (b) our desk studies:

² A Kenya-based international consultant we commissioned to review the NRT visited key sites and reported back informally but was then unable to complete the assignment. Our report reflects the consultant's findings, although a separate case study has not been included.

59. **Awacachi, Ecuador** (1999-2015): Land purchase to be followed by NGO support, although initial partnership failed. Helped establish new NGO with support from distance to exceptionally challenging project.
60. **Aceh Small Islands** (2012-16): Built on post-tsunami grassroots efforts to rehabilitate damaged coastal habitats and fisheries, through uptake of better management practices embedded in customary laws, with support from traditional leaders. Project ran into problems and is being reviewed.
61. **Flower Valley, South Africa** (2000-08): Began with purchase of land and existing flower business, followed by additional land purchases. New NGO was established and supported/mentored to expand significantly then mobilize and influence international funding for a larger region.
62. **Ulu Masen, Indonesia** (2011-14): Built on long-term relationships in Aceh to respond to Provincial Governor's request for a pioneering REDD pilot project. The Governor's departure led to retrenchment then a significant and eventually successful adaptation to a smaller scale, more bottom-up approach.
63. **Shrimp Trawling, Costa Rica** (2014-16): Supported multisector engagement on policy reform for the destructive shrimp bottom trawl fishery, generating a national debate on wider reforms in the fishing sector in Costa Rica.
64. **Community Conserved Areas, S. Kenya** (2014-15): Supported multi-site co-management implementation by long-term in-country NGO partner. Momentum lost after external funding used up, compounded by staff changes.
65. **Marine microplastics pollution** (2012): Direct programme of policy work by Arcadia-funded staff for a UK opportunity. FFI mobilized a science team and launched a coalition with NGO partners to engage with private sector and encourage policy change.
66. **Seafood Sustainability Ratings** (2012-14): Collaboration with partners to encourage banks to adopt and promote a sustainability rating methodology to their clients.

Internal Factors Contributing to Achievements

Funding and Financial Sustainability

67. The financial sustainability of conservation measures is an enduring challenge. FFI has long had sustainable financing, conservation enterprise and sustainable livelihoods as a priority for Halcyon Land & Sea, and continued this focus in Halcyon Marine.
68. Funding has been more of a significant limitation in projects with ambitious land purchase plans and where there have been opportunities to invest in businesses, e.g., in tourism, that could have generated long-term financial support for conservation programmes. Having access to such venture

capital on a larger scale could give FFI and its partners the flexibility to take advantage of such opportunities when they occur. While there are obviously risks attached, FFI's entrepreneurial experience and the care with which they have managed their funding to date both suggest a reasonable likelihood of success, especially if backed up by new dedicated staff positions in areas such as financial appraisal and business development.

69. In terms of establishing independent and reliable long-term financial support for conservation there have been a few clear wins among the projects we reviewed in depth, notably in Africa – Flower Valley (South Africa), Chuilexi (Mozambique) and the northern Kenya conservancies – with other projects still pursuing promising opportunities. Successful small- and medium-sized enterprises can take many years to establish and generate consistent financial returns, and many initiatives fail for lack of good business planning and management skills, weak markets and secure land tenure/access rights. FFI seems well aware of the constant temptation to pursue viable commercial enterprises or promote income-generating sources that turn out not to generate conservation benefits. The conservation world is unfortunately full of examples of expensive, well-intentioned projects that fail this test and, consequently, are of little conservation value.
70. The requirement of cofinancing for access to Halcyon Marine funds has been a double-edged sword. It has, on the one hand, reduced the risk to Arcadia of facilitating FFI's entry to uncharted waters. On the other hand, it has required substantial fundraising on the part of programme and project staff who are already stretched. A proposed increase in the match requirement from 0.5 to 1:1 in the next phase of Arcadia Marine funding, may actually undermine progress and expansion in this critical area as staff time is diverted to fundraising. A match requirement at the project level would necessarily also reduce the degree to which FFI undertakes high risk-high reward projects. Such projects have been among the most exciting in the Halcyon portfolio, but are inherently less likely to attract co-financing.

Staff Capacity

71. Our review found that FFI has high quality and very motivated staff whose capabilities are clearly a major factor behind project successes. The considerable extent to which dedicated staff work extra time is perhaps not unusual in the NGO and conservation worlds, although it does add to the value obtained by donors and lead the real costs of conservation to be understated.
72. FFI's combination of limited bureaucracy, flat management structure and overall leanness became clear to us during this review. While these are all positives in an organisation that appears to be working very well with high staff morale, it also means that staff capacity is stretched and senior management time is limited. We do not sense this is an acute problem, but it does mean that unexpected departures of key specialist staff or managers can cause delays in projects and in decision making. The same point could be made for many other organisations of similar size, of course, including those operating less effectively than FFI. We suspect FFI is

considerably more resilient to unexpected staff losses now than it was 5 or 10 years ago.

73. FFI arguably does have capacity gaps in some specific thematic areas, e.g., fisheries economics, marine impact investing, and SME development linked to alternative livelihoods in biodiversity-rich areas. Although FFI's Conservation Livelihoods and Governance (CLG) Team have helped lay the groundwork for such efforts, they are limited in what they can deliver with a team of two and a focus on social aspects of conservation livelihoods.
74. We also encountered two risk assessment issues related to staff capacity, as noted in the preceding Main Findings section: (i) the lack of legal capacity at headquarters to coordinate, review and provide quality control for land purchases and other in-country legal work commissioned by FFI, and (ii) delays in addressing sensitive in-country partner governance and internal control issues requiring seasoned manager inputs.

Partners

75. FFI has generally done a good job of selecting local partners, often at a very early stage when the candidate was no more than one or a few motivated individuals with an idea, then supporting the development of this idea and eventually encouraging a transition to a more self-confident and strategic organisation. FFI's approach to these relationships has been deliberately and explicitly humble, recognizing that these are organisations with their own ambitions and styles, and not simply an FFI field operation. FFI certainly does not claim credit or seek the limelight at their partners' expense.
76. FFI has been effective in helping partners raise and manage project funding that has not only supported necessary conservation activities while providing important experience, but also enhanced their partners' credibility with local stakeholders – especially government agencies. This can appear formulaic, but success requires considerable experience and sound judgement in dealing with a wide range of individuals and organisational dynamics over extended periods of time while being ready to make hard decisions, including persuading reluctant founders to take on new roles, give up long-term relationships or even step aside. Doing this at long distance on the basis of phone calls and periodic visits where there are no field offices in place is very demanding and FFI's effectiveness in this role is generally impressive, with a few exceptions where more frequent contact would have been desirable.
77. FFI has approached its partners' organisational development increasingly systematically, and has deployed its "health check" diagnostic tool with good results. Sometimes these relationships have involved pushing for difficult leadership or other personnel transitions; comparable to the founder of a start-up company being replaced once there is an opportunity to develop a more coherent organisation (although we suspect this is probably harder in conservation than in the business world). Naturally partners do not always work out as hoped, and sometimes a change in partner is required, but FFI's success rate seems high in both selecting and

developing the right partner(s), and they now have accumulated considerable experience in how to do this well in a variety of situations.

Relevance, Effectiveness and Impact

78. As a whole, FFI’s Halcyon-funded conservation efforts have performed impressively in terms of their relevance, effectiveness and impact (the three OECD/DAC evaluation criteria accepted as international best practice), as described in the Main Findings section of this report.

- 2. Aspects that could be improved (i.e. weaknesses, internal limiting factors), e.g.:**
- a) Challenging (Failed) projects to date - are there common trends, lessons to be learnt?**
 - b) Is funding a substantial limiting factor in addressing projects effectively?**
 - c) Is FFI’s staff capacity sufficient or overstretched (e.g. vis-à-vis the staffing/achievements of comparable programs elsewhere)?**
 - d) Are there specific capacity areas that prevent local partners from becoming self-sustaining and achieving long-term conservation?**

Challenging Projects

79. At our request, FFI prepared a list of Halcyon projects that had, to use their preferred terminology, proven to be challenging, together with a brief explanation. FFI responded thoughtfully and Annex 1 contains the result, which can be summarized as follows:

80.

Current Status of Challenging Projects	Number
FFI withdrew and is no longer involved	4
FFI withdrew without a significant investment	2
Project continues after difficulties and/or changed direction	8
Total	14

81. We have reviewed all of these projects with the FFI staff and leadership, and we consider their assessments of each situation to be reasonable as well as refreshingly frank. The six projects in the first two categories all encountered issues that are relatively common in the conservation world and FFI was able to make a pragmatic and inexpensive withdrawal. Two of the six were small grants.

82. The eight continuing projects ran into difficulties for diverse reasons. These have been the most demanding for FFI and occupied the most management time. Some have been quite successful and none could be

described as failures. The adequacy of financing is always an issue, but our strong impression is that FFI has allocated its limited financial resources wisely, and especially the Halcyon funding, among its field projects. There were some disappointments resulting from partner choices that did not work out, although it is important to note that: (a) some notably successful projects have changed partner in mid-course, much as an organisation might change leadership, and (b) there is often a very limited range of partners to choose from at the early stages of an innovative project in a remote area, and frequently only one. None of these projects revealed systemic or widespread failings and the problems were usually context specific.

83. Six of the eight continuing projects were included in our selection of case studies for this review and three of the eight are located in the Indonesian province of Aceh. Of these eight, South Sudan is unusual insofar as FFI expected this to be highly challenging with potentially high rewards if it worked, planned accordingly and was not surprised when the political and security situation deteriorated to the point where work had to be suspended.

Challenging Project Case Studies

84. **Awacachi in Ecuador** was one of the first Halcyon projects supported and is frequently referred to within FFI as their most challenging long-term project. The problems included an unsuitable initial local partner as well as limited in-country staff capacity and escalating environmental threats, all in a remote area that was both new to FFI and dangerous due to armed conflict and the narcotics trade. There is no doubt that the early stages of this project in particular were a formative learning experience for the several current FFI personnel involved in various capacities since 1998 as well as for the wider FFI organisation (as in “we’ll never do anything exactly like this again”). As explained in our case study summary, this remains an extremely hard place to work although FFI’s persistence has been rewarded with some impressive conservation gains at a very high priority site for biodiversity, albeit at a relatively high cost.
85. **The Community Conservation project on the South Kenya coast** made considerable progress at an early stage in helping pioneer an approach that had proved promising on the shores of Lake Victoria. The concept was to establish locally-managed Marine Protected Areas which have proven popular in the South Pacific. FFI helped clarify the legal and regulatory framework, and deserves some credit for this approach having expanded to include multiple sites. However, the project lost momentum at a key point and some key personnel left. None of this was helped by having the FFI Africa Regional Director position unfilled, which it still is. This project does illustrate the difficulty of providing cover for unexpectedly vacant staff positions for an organisation the size of FFI and the extent to which the organisation is operating without very much spare capacity.
86. FFI views its work in **Aceh, Indonesia**, as some of the most challenging it has undertaken. This programme of work includes one Halcyon Land & Sea (Ulu Masen REDD) and two Halcyon Marine projects (Aceh Small Islands

and Aceh Impact Investment). FFI's long presence led to good relationships at levels from local communities through to provincial government which laid the foundation for some exciting and innovative work. This work has, however, been impacted by a dramatically shifting context, starting with the devastating 2004 tsunami. Although long-term civil conflict in the province ended formally with a peace treaty in 2005, considerable social tension remained. These formidable challenges were followed by a great opportunity when a former FFI staff member was elected provincial governor of Aceh in 2007 with a grand pro-environmental vision. These initiatives underscore the challenges of working in Indonesia and the need for a long-term commitment on the part of FFI and its partners to achieve lasting gains in conservation:

- The Governor of Aceh established a logging moratorium and asked FFI to launch the pioneering Ulu Masen REDD project (see page 8). While major progress was made during his term, the Governor was replaced in 2012 by a governor with a different agenda, changing the policy environment for conservation in Aceh almost overnight. FFI had to re-think its approach – as did other international organisations working in Aceh – and managed to adapt its plans and innovate using new policy instruments to develop more bottom-up approaches.
- The Aceh Small Islands Project, also inspired by the Governor of Aceh, aimed to scale up traditional marine management work that FFI had been supporting. A 2012 Halcyon Marine grant of \$306,000 helped build the confidence of local communities to adopt the LMMA approach, patrolling their fishing grounds with support from the Navy and reducing destructive fishing practices. But the 2014 loss of the governor and a turnover in key staff in the local FFI office, resulted in a critical leadership gap and loss of institutional memory. Project reporting from the field has been uneven and future disbursements have been put on hold by FFI pending a review of the project and phasing in of new staffing arrangements.
- FFI also sought to increase private sector support for marine conservation in Aceh through marine impact investing, although an assessment of local businesses involved in the production and marketing of reef fish indicated that such an approach would be premature. Not only was there a significant lack of awareness about the impacts of unsustainable fishing practices on reef health, hence on future supply of fish and profitability, these businesses seemed incapable of managing an impact investment loan. Thus there was little chance of such an innovative tool succeeding without first investing in business skills development and environmental awareness.

87. **The Sustainable Seafood Financing** project proved hard to assess as it appeared an outlier for Halcyon Marine. The project involved working with banks, including one key partner, to develop and then introduce a new sustainability rating tool for their seafood clients. We received rather different stories and perspectives from FFI, its partners and bank staff that

we were ultimately unable to reconcile. Staff changes at both FFI and the bank during the project have likely contributed to this, and to changing engagement from the bank over time. This project appears to have struggled to create demand for its rating tool because fisheries issues remain relatively low risks for banks, and seems to have been ahead of its time in this regard. This project has always been envisaged as an experimental one, and unsurprisingly questions thus still remain about the way the tool should function, be used and be marketed. Nonetheless, it appears to have raised broad awareness, generated significant interest and seems likely to have future uptake in some way – even if not as originally envisioned.

88. Finally, the linked **Niassa and Chuilexi projects in Mozambique** have indeed been very challenging for FFI, with a total Halcyon investment to date of over \$5m over 14 years, by some distance the largest single site Halcyon investment. After initiating the work and investing in significant development over a decade, FFI withdrew from the management of the larger Niassa Reserve, which WCS took on. FFI has recently made some promising progress on strengthening conservation and viable tourism concessions within Chuilexi, which lies inside Niassa. Elephant numbers are impressive, although the near-industrial scale of ivory poaching in nearby areas makes it premature to label these efforts as a success.

Funding, Staff Capacity and Local Partners

89. These factors have been discussed elsewhere in this report.

3. External factors that could limit/impede long-term success (i.e. threats), e.g.:

- a) Is there too much dependency on a small number of funders? Is Halcyon's funding base diverse/dynamic?***
- b) Is the scale of projects appropriate? Is resilience to long-term change built in?***
- c) Are the conditions of projects (e.g. institutional capacity, land tenure, financial sustainability, etc.) appropriate to enable long-term conservation?***

90. Halcyon Land & Sea has one other donor apart from Arcadia. While it would be beneficial and could contribute to greater impacts if other donors were to contribute to the Halcyon core funds under the same conditions as Arcadia, this does not appear particularly likely as most donors seem to prefer funding a venture at the launch stage. However, the existence, longevity and achievements of Arcadia's investments do appear to have directly encouraged other philanthropic donors to consider or actually make substantial grants (FFI informed us of at least two). In addition, FFI has been very effective in leveraging Halcyon funds at the individual project level to mobilize considerable cofinancing. None of this would have been possible without the core Halcyon funding.

91. The scale of projects, the efforts made to build in long-term sustainability and the “conditions” of projects have generally been carefully considered and addressed appropriately by FFI, as illustrated by our case studies. In some cases projects have taken several years to reach a scale where they can have significant impacts, usually due to initial capacity constraints among local partners. As discussed elsewhere in this report, long-term financial sustainability continues to be an area requiring serious attention.

4. External factors that could build up strength (i.e. opportunities for development), e.g.:

- a) *Is there perhaps undue focus on success, at the expense of attending to even more valuable but riskier projects?***
- b) *Are there important unexploited opportunities that Halcyon could feasibly address if more funding was available?***
- c) *Is there merit on focusing Halcyon partly or entirely on specific geographies (i.e. applying greater intensity of effort over a narrower geographic scope)?***
- d) *Has the dissemination of FFI results and lessons has been optimal.***

External Factors

92. FFI does not appear afraid to take risks and, having done so, is prepared to work hard over long periods of time to try to ensure success. We do think FFI could benefit from even more financial flexibility to seek and experiment with long-term funding options for the sites where they are currently working.
93. If more Halcyon funding was to be available, our review suggests that greater impacts could be achieved by:
- 1) Expanding funding available for projects using the existing Halcyon models, with contributions to indirect costs/overheads that are no less than at present. There is no shortage of conservation opportunities, FFI staff have plenty of ideas and there is a dwindling pool of philanthropic funders working in this area.
 - 2) Supporting new management staff (following the successful Halcyon Marine model) as well as technical staff positions in specialized areas, e.g., fisheries economics, legal services and SME support.
 - 3) Setting up a new Halcyon fund to provide flexible support at varying stages of development for private sector business concepts with the potential to provide long-term financing for conservation programmes, including the acquisition of existing businesses, with appropriate/experienced staff to “gatekeep” (following the successful Land & Sea model) and provide hands-on support.

94. In terms of geographic focus, the FFI model of seeking outstanding conservation opportunities wherever local partners can be identified and making sure there is a strong scientific basis for site selection decisions has worked well, providing a useful complement to the approaches of other, larger conservation NGOs. We do not see any reason to modify this approach for the Halcyon funding.

Dissemination of Results and Lessons

95. FFI has invested in disseminating results of its programmes to wider audiences through a variety of channels, including the Oryx journal. In addition to featuring work supported with Halcyon Funds in special editions of FFI journals and on-line magazines, FFI has made an impressive library of high quality videos and photographs of their work accessible to the public. This investment is seen as an effective communications and conservation tool reaching audiences around the globe. A recent blog on the FFI website features the extension of the Halcyon Marine Programme with new funds from Arcadia, with a brief review of the highlights of the programme.
96. We found FFI to be an organisation that takes learning seriously. A conscious effort has been made to document institutional experience within not only project and donor reports, but also an increasing number of detailed and honest case studies that explicitly outline external challenges faced, internal mistakes made and lessons learned. Those that have already been completed provided important source material for our reviews. We understand that FFI is also thinking about how to share these – especially the key lessons – beyond internal staff, in order to advance conservation as broadly as possible. FFI has shared lessons in this way before by, for example, making available ‘Guidance for working with other organisations’.
97. FFI has, however, realised that most learning occurs individual-to-individual and deliberately structured its learning strategy to encourage communication and reflection within the organisation. A variety of tools have been provided to facilitate communication (e.g., an intranet, social network groups) and learning (e.g., ‘After Action Reviews’), with varying value and uptake. More importantly, communities of practice seem to have developed around individuals with clear thematic expertise, such as the Sustainable Livelihoods & Governance team or the network of marine experts, both in headquarters and regional offices. These communities appear effective at FFI’s current scale but, if FFI grows substantially, may require greater formalization (e.g., allocation of clear ‘subject matter experts’) and focused attention to sharing the institutional memory of key longstanding individual staff members.
98. While documenting lessons learned is now fairly common, documenting cases where these lessons have been applied seems more problematic. We challenged FFI to produce some examples where lessons learned in projects had been applied elsewhere. The result, included as Annex 2, provides a useful demonstration of how seriously FFI takes the learning process. Most organisations we work with are committed in principle to

learning from their own and others' experiences, and nearly all of these are still struggling with how best to do this. The extent to which learning takes place 'organically' (person to person, through working together, informal chats, etc.) vs. being formally studied is hard to answer. We are familiar with organisations where experienced staff have left and the overall institutional memory diminished as a result, suggesting that learning cannot simply be relied on to happen automatically. On the other hand we also work with organisations that develop large volumes of learning materials for their staff, relatively little of which seems to actually be used. We were pleasantly surprised to observe the extent to which FFI has already invested in staff and systems for institutional learning, both formal and informal, even while continuing to wrestle with the question of how to implement this most effectively. Technology has certainly facilitated efficient access to learning materials for staff and partners.

3. Case Study Projects Reviewed

Land & Sea (L) and Marine (M) Projects	Period of Arcadia Support
Full Review and Site Visited	
Golden Stream Corridor Preserve, Belize (L)	1998-2014
Chuillexi Conservancy, Mozambique (L)	2010-15
Includes Greater Niassa Reserve (L)	2002-13
Zarand, Romania (L)	2012-17
Includes ADEPT (L)	2009-15
Myeik Archipelago, Myanmar (M)	2012-16
Gökova Bay Marine PA, Turkey (M)	2012-16
No-Take-Zones – Firth of Clyde, UK (M)	2012-14
Northern Rangelands Trust, Kenya (L) ³	2007-13
Includes Sera Conservancy (L)	2003-12
Includes OI Pejeta Conservancy (L)	2004-07
Full Review (site visit not applicable)	
Seafood Sustainability Rating, UK (M)	2012-14
Desk Review Carried Out	
Flower Valley, South Africa (L)	2000-08
Awacachi Ecological Corridor, Ecuador (L)	1999-2015
Ulu Masen REDD, Aceh, Indonesia (L)	2011-14
Aceh Small Islands Initiative, Indonesia (M)	2012-16
Shrimp Trawling Policy in Costa Rica (M)	2014-16
Community Conserved Areas, Kenya (M)	2014-15
Reducing Plastic Pollution, UK (M)	2012

Note on Case Study Selection

99. Our sample selection was based on multiple criteria: (i) overall geographic balance, (ii) a balance between Halcyon Land & Sea and Halcyon Marine projects, (iii) the inclusion of diverse types of projects (land purchase, capacity building, etc.), (iv) a mix of older and more recent projects, with greater emphasis on projects that have received significant funding during the last five years, (v) the inclusion of projects that have either received significant Halcyon support and/or leveraged significant cofinancing, (vi) projects identified by FFI as strategically significant as well as particularly important learning opportunities (conversely, we de-emphasized projects where FFI has carried out a recent case study or where other donors have commissioned recent evaluations), (vii) logistical feasibility and accessibility given the need to travel between January and April, and (viii) we

³ See footnote 2 on page 14.

opportunistically added projects that could be visited cost-effectively as an extension of field visits to projects already identified as high priority.

Golden Stream Corridor Preserve, Belize

100. FFI's strategic investment of US\$2.1m of Halcyon funds in the purchase of Parcels 1 and 2 of the Golden Stream Corridor Preserve (GSCP) and the building of Ya'axche capacity and expertise, plus FFI's own considerable investment of staff time and resources, has resulted in the creation of a critically important biodiversity corridor linking the Maya Mountains and the Caribbean Sea as well as the existence of a competent and capable conservation management organisation that appears set to continue to grow and achieve prominence within Belize's conservation community.
101. FFI and Ya'axche have been very successful in developing a well-managed important biological corridor in southern Belize and actively seeking to benefit local communities in the Maya Golden Landscape (MGL). Because of FFI's initial purchase of Parcels 1 and 2, Ya'axche's appointment as co-manager of Bladen and Mayan Mountains North Forest Reserve, and integrated management of the Golden Stream Private Protected Lands (GSSPL), the MGL is one of the few remaining areas in Belize where rivers still meet the sea unimpeded, providing an invaluable wildlife corridor. Specifically, much of the biodiversity in the MGL has been preserved through FFI's support of Ya'axche in developing effective MGL programmes which help to control hunting, illegal extraction of forest products (timber, Xate, gold), slash and burn land clearance, and watershed destruction (dams).
102. While the Parcel 1 purchase was an instrumental step to the development of the physical GSCP, FFI's technical assistance and funding support in the early stages were critical for Ya'axche to begin to develop the individual and organisational capacities to manage the GSCP. In addition to capacity building, FFI's technical assistance included initial area assessments, social programme development, GEF project development and a baseline survey. Very importantly, FFI's support in capacity building and technical support enabled Ya'axche to learn to effectively manage the MGL, not only through science (monitoring, research and evaluation), but also in community development, community education and community support through its agroforestry, education and sustainable livelihoods programmes.
103. After the destruction caused by Hurricane Iris in 2001, additional focus by Ya'axche and FFI was given to community support and sustainable livelihoods as a key component of its biodiversity conservation. While these programmes were originally developed by FFI and Ya'axche as a tool to induce a local buy-in to the GSCP concept, they have now become important drivers for sustainable economic and community development. Examples of successful programmes include a high school scholarship fund, Race Against Fire (a beach cruiser bicycle race), assisting local community groups in starting their own small businesses, educational programmes and a very successful cacao, coffee and beekeeping/honey agroforestry programme. Not only do these programmes help farmers produce crops

more economically, the techniques Ya'axche promotes have helped local farmers withstand changing weather patterns caused by climate change – rain in the dry season, drought in the wet season.

104. In building toward financial sustainability, in 2014 Ya'axche incorporated a business arm, Ya'axche Institute for Conservation and Education (YICE), in an effort to develop for-profit businesses that could help Ya'axche cover core costs, the biggest issue facing Ya'axche's future sustainability. Ecotourism appears to offer the most promise for contributing to Ya'axche's core funding base, primarily in providing a cash flow cushion.
105. The FFI/Ya'axche partnership has been one of mutual collaboration and respect. FFI staff care passionately about Ya'axche, and respect the organisation's skills, abilities and potential. On Ya'axche's part, staff emphasized that (i) FFI responds to Ya'axche's needs, rather than imposing its own agenda, (ii) FFI is always responsive to requests for assistance, (iii) FFI really cares about Ya'axche, and (iv) FFI helps projects develop a strategic plan and then moves on from there. FFI has also produced two significant studies on the Ya'axche/FFI partnership, specifically analysing their relations, programme development, capacity development and the lessons derived from this partnership. Both of these documents have been widely disseminated within FFI and Ya'axche, and have been used by both to strengthen organisational capacities.
106. This progression of the Ya'axche/FFI partnership is likely not a common one in the annals of international NGOs – or small rural Maya villages. Its success is attributable, in part, to FFI's culture of collaboration rather than top-down imposition of its own agenda. It is also attributable to FFI's willingness to spend its own administrative budget on staff time for mentoring, counselling and other forms of non-programmatic support, a necessary component of conservation partnerships not supported by many international funders, the Arcadia Fund being one of the few that does.
107. Ya'axche's organisational and individual capacities have also matured with investment in knowledge management through the addition of a central file server to make programme outputs centrally available, capacity building training for staff members (often through FFI), the adoption of a new more flexible accounting system (Simply Accounting) and innovative accounting procedures developed with assistance of FFI, and FFI assistance in strategic programme and funding planning.
108. From complete dependence on FFI in the early stages, Ya'axche is now almost completely independent of FFI, with 85% of Ya'axche's funding coming from direct grants, thereby meeting one of the key 2011 Halcyon goals. Specifically, the initial FFI direct investment has been used to leverage further funding from other organisations, allowing Ya'axche to expand its donor base, currently 10-12 discrete donors. FFI's role in Ya'axche is now almost entirely technical assistance, capacity building through funding staff participation in workshops/staff development opportunities and mentoring.

109. An important challenge at this stage of the FFI/Ya'axche partnership is continuing to develop core funding opportunities for Ya'axche (as recognized by the 2014 MOU between FFI and Ya'axche).
110. The need for continuing very strong community development, education and sustainable livelihoods programmes is also underscored by demographic changes in MGL communities and the judicial affirmation of traditional Maya land rights. Both of these factors may result in a desire for more development within the MGL by Maya villages eager to establish larger village boundaries, plus the growing economic needs of MGL residents.
111. Ya'axche's expansion into protected area management within the Maya Mountain North Forest Reserve may also require an exploration by FFI and Ya'axche of the cultural differences between Ya'axche's historically Maya-centred communities and the more Latin communities near Maya Mountain North Forest Reserve. This exploration should include analysing the possibly different socio-economic needs and attitudes toward natural resources of the two cultures.
112. The likelihood that the achievements and gains of the FFI/Ya'axche partnership will persist is very high. Ya'axche's donor base is broad and doesn't rely on just one or two large donors, and Ya'axche, with assistance from FFI, is actively working on expanding its donor base and size of grants. Ya'axche staff members are committed to its programmes, and community relations are good. As long as core funding issues can be at least partially solved, Ya'axche and its management of the MGL should be sustainable for many years to come.
113. A key element to this story is that Lisel Alamilla, formerly Executive Director of Ya'axche, was Minister of Forestry, Fisheries & Sustainable Development from 2012 to 2015. This helped FFI develop ties within the Government and to contribute to drafting the 2015 National Protected Area System (NPAS) Act, which included private protected areas (PPAs). However, Alamilla was not reappointed in 2015 and the Ministry she previously headed was reorganized. While the 2015 NPAS Act was officially enacted into law by the Belize legislature before elections, no regulations have been drafted, and movement on PPAs has stalled.

Chuilexi Conservancy, Mozambique – Includes Greater Niassa Reserve, Mozambique

114. FFI first became involved in Niassa National Reserve (Niassa Reserve) in 2002 when it was invited by a company (a partnership between the State – 51%, and Niassa Investimentos Lda.) known as the Society for the Management and Development of Niassa Reserve (SGDRN) to be a strategic partner in efforts to ensure long-term conservation and management of the Reserve. Chuilexi Conservancy was created ten years later inside the Niassa Reserve and has recently been the main focus of FFI.

115. After the 'destabilization' war in Mozambique ended in 1992, the SGDRN (financed and led by Norwegian businessman Halvor Astrup) was instrumental in initiating and supporting the rehabilitation of the Niassa Reserve, then continued to finance much of the Reserve infrastructure and operational rehabilitation after a lease from the government ceded management rights to SGDRN for ten years. In 2000, SGDRN's interest in conservation management led them to approach FFI, and in 2002 they signed an MOU with the objective of strengthening capacities in biodiversity conservation, law enforcement and community development, as well as developing a long-term strategy for the Reserve. When in 2011 SGDRN's contract was not renewed, FFI successfully identified and secured three key concession areas designated for ecotourism which held one of the highest densities of animals - together forming the Chuilexi Conservancy.
116. The move from a fairly standard partnership advising and technically supporting a conservation management entity to taking the innovative steps in creating and participating in multiple private company financing and management structures to secure the concessions making up Chuilexi Conservancy were unique in FFI's experience. This was also a ground-breaking approach in Mozambique, where private sector partnerships in conservation were starting to get established but not previously been delegated conservation responsibilities inside a public protected area such as Niassa National Reserve.
117. Chuilexi has successfully been able to begin its activity and take sound steps towards the vision of a self-sustaining concession based on tourism revenue. The Arcadia Fund was fundamental to the initial financing and FFI has since managed to use Halcyon funding to leverage double and triple the value of these annual provisions to finance infrastructure development, security measures and monitoring. This has had positive results in reducing elephant poaching within its first four years of operation, and in setting up the basis for a collaborative community programme aimed at eventually creating the institutions that will participate directly in management and securing benefits through a 25% shareholding in the concession-holding company/ies.
118. Witnessing the challenges and accomplishments of partners operating in Niassa such as SGDRN and WWF, FFI has successfully drawn on these lessons in the development of the Chuilexi business model. Chuilexi Conservancy business model appears to have taken on board and is attempting to mitigate many of the business risks of operating in such a remote area.
119. FFI staff, with their relevant knowledge, connections and experience of conservation in Mozambique, have been the driving force behind setting up Chuilexi. Their efforts have been central to (i) leveraging funding, (ii) the successful use of strategies reflecting lessons learnt from other stakeholders operating in Niassa, (iii) well-planned business start-ups and (iv) the recruitment of local ex-staff of the Reserve who now form a solid workforce for Chuilexi.

120. The tourism enterprise in Chuilexi is increasing employment opportunities, especially for women. Currently around 80% of Chuilexi's employees are from local communities. Mentoring and on-the-job training are the main tools Chuilexi is investing in to train its local staff, with specific emphasis on key middle management skill such as monitoring and information management as well as conservation and security for game scouts. Providing alternatives to income from illegally collaborating in resource extraction is vital not only for local economic development but also to securing community interest in abandoning these activities.
121. Sustainability on the ground depends in no small part on the collaboration of the local population living in the protected area. Chuilexi's resident communities live along one of the main illegal trading routes and their leaders and representatives have begun to collaborate in Chuilexi's community programme. The programme is an entry point for men and women to take up alternative income generating activities instead of illegal resource extraction. Tourism is also expected to be a strong contributing factor to minimising local involvement and building peer pressure opposed to these activities.
122. While barriers to open dialogue between local stakeholders persist, FFI has shown commitment to ensure closer collaboration with partners. Chuilexi's recent formation of the Niassa Conservation Alliance (NCA) together with two other concessions was timely and should help establish closer operational collaboration and support to the Reserve management. The NCA will probably require changes over time, including being formalised into a legally recognised association, depending on the demand from its members.
123. New collaboration opportunities with WCS, who took over the contract from SGDRN in the management of the Niassa Reserve in 2011, have also arisen. At the time of contract renewal, FFI was happy to focus on managing a smaller area. Both the NCA and other potential partnerships will require continued very careful management of local and national government relations.
124. Significant challenges were overcome to realize the early potential of private conservation management of the three concessions making up Chuilexi Conservancy, largely through the availability of Halcyon funds to take up opportunities in an innovative and timely fashion. But future challenges will force FFI to change its operational strategy yet again.
125. Engagement with Government was hampered in the past. Now, Chuilexi needs to find a way to participate in Government decision-making to ensure the communities in the Conservancy will have a strong basis for future resource management and to take up the opportunity of attractive benefit sharing from participation in the company. It also needs to work on Government relationships at all levels so that the Niassa Conservation Alliance created by Chuilexi is not viewed as a threat but as a useful partnership that can help in sustainable Reserve co-management as well as in maintaining a high standard of conservation practices in the Reserve.

126. The successful creation of all these partnerships is a means for FFI to reach beyond Niassa Reserve, to demonstrate lessons and effective and efficient conservation practices to other conservation and tourism managers and operators in Mozambique and the region. For this to take place significant investment must be made in nurturing relationships with key local and other stakeholders with common interests. This may require FFI to establish other mechanisms to provide support to the National Conservation Areas Administration in Maputo - outside its normal operating zone and it will require a higher degree of acceptance of the consequences of deciding to do business in Mozambique – as a Mozambican not-for profit company. Transparency will be a necessary trade-off to give confidence and defuse potential uncertainties from Government representatives about the motives of the private companies and foreign interests managing State property; as Chuilexi gains its expected long-term security of concession tenure so it will have to manage the fears that the authorities tend to have about loss of control over State assets.

ADEPT and Zarand, Romania

127. Romania has one of the largest areas of undisturbed forest in Europe covering 27% of the country and supports more than one third of the European brown bear, lynx and wolf populations. It also contains some of Europe's few remaining small-scale farmed cultural landscapes that are rich in biodiversity and have only begun to be appreciated recently as key conservation targets.
128. Since joining the EU in 2007 Romania has experienced rapid economic growth while struggling to emerge from the hardships and distrust of the Ceausescu years. Land use has intensified under pressure from international markets. While EU membership has increased the incentives for large-scale commercial farming practices that threaten biodiversity and rural livelihoods, it has also funded conservation (notably for the protected areas established through the pan-European Natura 2000 programme) and provided regulations requiring more environmentally-sensitive infrastructure development. The small scale nature of the farming can hardly be overstated: 4m of the EU's 12m farmers are in Romania and 3m of these are farming 1-5 ha. Land gets divided on inheritance, leading to highly complex multiple ownership of even small plots, compounded by a restitution process for areas previously appropriated under communism.
129. FFI has been active in Romania since 1999. Halcyon funding has supported two NGOs working separately although on overlapping issues: ADEPT works to protect the farmed landscapes of Transylvania, while the Zarand Association – which FFI helped establish – has targeted a 3,000 km² conservation corridor in the Carpathian mountains, with wolves and bear as flagship species. Both NGOs recognize and support small-scale sustainable farming by traditional communities as a key element of effective conservation. The evaluation field visit focused mainly on Zarand.

ADEPT

130. Since 2004 ADEPT has worked to maintain High Nature Value farmland (HNVF), including managed grasslands with some of the highest small-scale plant diversity in Europe. ADEPT works with farmers, communities, universities, other NGOs and government agencies at local and national levels, and even with EU authorities in Brussels. This breadth of activities has stretched the organisation close to and perhaps beyond its financial and management capacity.
131. An initial Halcyon Land & Sea strategic small grant for capacity building in 2009 was followed by a larger grant in 2013 from Halcyon Land & Sea for further capacity building and to purchase botanically-rich micro-sites in the 'Saxon' region of Transylvania. These have been described as among the best lowland hay meadows and pastures left in Europe, and they depend on the continuation of traditional farming, especially livestock management practices.
132. Over a 10-year period, ADEPT has catalysed or implemented an impressive range of generally convincing small-scale activities supportive of HNVF conservation and livelihoods, including agricultural practices, rural tourism and locally-branded food production and marketing. They give every indication of an enthusiastic and highly energetic NGO team. FFI seems justified in describing ADEPT as working on a demonstration site for the effective integration of conservation with economic and social development within Europe and as a driver of policy change at the national and international level.
133. The conservation challenges in the Romanian countryside are considerable. Farms are becoming consolidated and commercialized, using methods that provide few local jobs. People are drawn to opportunities in urban areas and the rural population is aging. Building trust and encouraging collaboration among initially-sceptical communities is slow and difficult, as experienced in other post-Communist EU states. Building capacities for the production and sale of locally-branded food products – a key strategy in making small-scale farming economically attractive – has had to navigate complex and restrictive EU regulations that were established with industrial scale enterprises in mind.
134. As FFI's 2013 Halcyon proposal pointed out: "the bulk of ADEPT's success is achieved through their active engagement, advising and networking with and on behalf of local farmers; crucially this work feeds into effective policy development at the national and EU levels. This type of 'advisory' and policy work is very important but rarely funded within projects. To date the bulk of ADEPT's funding has been sourced from a corporate sponsor, which has now reduced its support. The remainder of funds come from a number of projects, which provide time for staff to undertake predominantly field research but do not contribute to the delivery of essential core advisory and conservation activities [a universal conservation NGO funding dilemma]."

135. The 2013 Halcyon grant financed land purchases, a 3-year capacity development programme and bridging financing to cover operational costs until subsidies were secured for the purchased land. The main target was to purchase several sites amounting to 650 ha of HNMF. Land purchases turned out to be harder and more complex than expected, while prices have risen dramatically (apparently due to speculation) and it is currently anticipated that funds will be invested in 320 ha of HNMF. While tiny (14-65 ha each), the sites purchased appear to have been scientifically and strategically selected for their conservation value and for the valuable acquired right to match purchase offers for immediately adjacent areas.
136. FFI has worked extensively to strengthen ADEPT's organisation and management capacity. The NGO was started by a small group of British expatriates. This group made the initial approach to FFI, leading to a Halcyon small grant that was used to refocus ADEPT more towards biodiversity conservation and to refine their goals and narrative in a more structured way. Over time FFI became more convinced of ADEPT's potential, while recognizing that the organisation needed considerable strengthening to go beyond being a hobby for the founders.
137. The Eurasia Director at FFI helped recruit and mentor young Romanian staff. The 2013 Halcyon grant was a huge step for the organisation by supporting important steps towards becoming more professional. The Eurasia Director is the FFI project manager with part of his time written into the project until later in 2016. He led a strategic planning process based on FFI's health check framework, giving ADEPT detailed feedback on the organisational changes needed. ADEPT now has a strategy and clear terms of reference for their staff, under in-country leadership. A new office manager and a biodiversity specialist have been recruited. A growing tension between focusing locally on field work vs. policy issues in Brussels and Bucharest was resolved through a decision to work primarily with communities and then use lessons for policy (and not to be primarily policy focused). While FFI anticipates less direct involvement after 2016, ADEPT has made it clear that their strategic advice will continue to be very welcome.

Zarand

138. The Zarand project focuses on a forest wildlife corridor (c. 150 x 20 km) linking the Western and Southern Carpathian Mountains, 80% forested while the remainder has been cultivated for generations. The forests contain wildlife diversity that once occurred throughout Europe, with numerous species listed under EU-directives as requiring strict protection. Bear, wolves and lynx are the flagship species.
139. FFI began working with an independent biologist in 2010 after he identified a critical corridor not reflected in the protected area network which had expanded dramatically – at least on paper – as a result of the EU's Natura 2000 programme. FFI saw potential in the wider Zarand area to secure the corridor while addressing the needs of local communities. This would apparently be the first practical demonstration of ecological connectivity in the Danube region, which has for many years been a focus for regional

collaboration on environmental issues. A complex, multi-level approach was developed, including:

- Contributing to EU stopping construction of a motorway until mitigation measures were in place in the form of a wildlife-friendly bridge.
- Using a Halcyon small grant to help the newly-formed Zarand Association to successfully secure a €3.2m EU LIFE+ project (conditional on FFI co-financing).
- Using a larger Halcyon grant for 2013-19 to establish an FFI/Zarand Association project team as co-financing for the EU project which then became key to funding most of what followed.
- Halcyon funds were used to acquire the 415 ha Vorta forest, to be managed to generate sustainable income for the Association.
- FFI was awarded joint custodianship with the Zarand Association of a key Natura 2000 protected area of 20,000 ha, one of 17 in the corridor totalling 435,000 ha – all based on the Romanian biologist's work.
- Building the capacity of the Zarand Association, which now has a highly-qualified and apparently well-functioning team of 14 mainly funded from the Halcyon grant, with leadership from FFI. The longer-term aim is to build the capacity of the Zarand Association and to facilitate handover of local project leadership to them, following existing 5- and 10-year plans.
- Implementing a wide range of community-level measures to support conservation and sustain small-scale agriculture, including the production and marketing of locally-branded food products.
- Using the EU project funding to acquire land to establish "micro-corridors" at the corridor's weakest points, to obtain valuable conservation sites (as "stepping stones") as well as block possible larger purchases by others (amidst rapid land speculation fuelled by both domestic and international investors). The land purchases have proven extremely complex and time consuming, with the ownership of even small parcels often held by many different people who need to consent to a sale.
- Preparing regional action plans for wolf and bear conservation, leading the project to become the national focal point for the Large Carnivore Group for Romania. Local communities seem remarkably tolerant of large predators, despite the threat to their livestock. Hunting is a well-established activity and there is some poaching, although quite limited when compared to other parts of the world.
- FFI/Zarand collaboration with numerous local municipalities as well as the Romanian Gendarmerie which has established anti-poaching teams in the area with financial support for equipment from the EU project.

140. FFI's overall approach seems thorough and systematic. The corridor site selection appears very well conceived and justified from a scientific perspective. The combined attention given to science, mapping, management and policy is impressive. This is a project area where FFI argues convincingly that diverse approaches at different nested spatial scales have the potential to impact a much larger landscape. Each of the

Association's activities appears to have been carefully designed, and where necessary adapted based on emerging experience. In some cases the solutions sought appear imaginative, if not ingenious, and to be based on a genuine understanding of local culture and politics. The potential to establish a sustainable, multiple-use landscape mosaic appears strong; in fact, if it can't be done here, one wonders if or how it can be achieved in other countries where conservation organisations are working with similar goals, often in less favourable conditions.

141. The familiar rhetoric of planning to work with local communities appears realistic here and the specific initiatives launched – mainly to encourage small-scale farming and local food production and marketing – seem well thought through and promising. As others have experienced in Eastern Europe, encouraging people to organize and work together is not easy in post-communist societies, requiring skill, sound judgement and considerable persistence.
142. The extent of cooperation with a wide range of local and national government agencies is impressive and appears to have contributed to a significant gain in awareness of the corridor, even while requiring huge investments of time. Many of the constraints and risks faced are institutional, and FFI has been realistic in acknowledging these. The Gendarmerie environmental law enforcement unit appears committed and serious; discussions with senior officers who came from Bucharest suggest a sophisticated organisation with wide-ranging international contacts and experience in collaborating with projects in other countries (not just funded by other countries in Romania).
143. Local capacity within some official organisations is somewhat limited and the countryside is threatened by diminishing interest in rural livelihoods combined with trends towards large-scale commercialization of food production, including land grabbing. The programme's efforts to provide positive incentives for small-scale agriculture are well founded although vulnerable to larger-scale social and economic trends.
144. Leveraging the benefits of EU membership has been critically important and no doubt will continue to be so. The Natura 2000 site designations appear vital and 25% of Romania is now designated as Natura 2000 sites. The management of the protected areas has been outsourced by the Ministry of Environment to a variety of bodies, including NGOs, hunting associations, local governments, researchers and other government agencies.
145. The combined and well-resourced FFI/Zarand Association team seems highly skilled and effective. A key challenge is whether and how the Zarand Association can become autonomous, how long this will take and how much support will be required, a familiar set of questions when building and preparing to hand over to a local partner. There is definitely movement in the right direction, although as always in such situation the individuals are key. The Association is, not surprisingly after so few years, still an immature organisation that seems likely to require support from FFI well beyond the horizon of the current EU project that ends in 2017 (the Halcyon grant extends to 2019).

Marine Conservation in the Myeik Archipelago, Myanmar

146. **FFI has built effectively on the success of its terrestrial programme in Myanmar to launch the first targeted programme in marine biodiversity conservation in the country.** FFI's Myanmar programme is relatively large; the size and breadth of the programme, which extends from the far north in Kachin State to the Andaman Sea along the southern border with Thailand, is largely due to the pioneering efforts of FFI's Country Director. He first came to Myanmar about 8 years ago, while country director in Indonesia; he began exploring opportunities to work with civil society and local NGOs in the forestry sector during his vacations, and eventually transferred to Myanmar in 2011 as the new Country Director. At the time, no other NGO was working in the marine space and there was little, if any, government oversight. The governance vacuum was exploited by local, corrupt elites with substantial fishing fleets, as well as by foreign trawlers and artisanal fishers, mostly from Thailand. The Director and his team recognized the need to step into this void to begin to address the multiple threats that were eroding Myanmar's once vast marine resource wealth. This includes the collapse of fish stocks, the loss of mangrove forests converted for rice cultivation and exposed to the eroding effects of cyclones and coastal development, and the degradation of coral reefs. The latter, due primarily to blast fishing and other destructive fishing techniques, occurs throughout the Myeik Archipelago, and south into Thailand.
147. In 2012, the Country Director and his team succeeded in getting a grant over 4 years from the Arcadia Marine Programme, with the long-term goal of contributing to the Government's plans to develop a network of MPAs across the country to help safeguard priority species and habitats. Although these funds have been well spent and very effective in creating local awareness of issues and building up basic capacity from a very low level to begin to improve management, these achievements have come at a high cost. Oversight required to manage the Arcadia funds and related co-financing and to optimize their effectiveness, has required a significant additional investment of staff time—over and above that supported by the grant.
148. **Arcadia funding has been strategic and timely in paving the way for marine conservation in Myanmar.** The timing and flexibility of support from the Arcadia Foundation has been critical to helping FFI gain a foothold in the marine space in Myanmar, and to begin to address a number of the mounting threats to marine biodiversity. These run the gamut from rapid development in the offshore oil and gas sector along the West Coast, to IUU fishing from neighbouring Thailand, and the highly destructive fishing by bottom trawlers in Myanmar's domestic fleet, violating traditional fishing grounds and scouring sea grass beds and soft bottom habitats close to shore. Initial funding from Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin in 2011, followed by a full grant from Arcadia Funds, allowed FFI to move strategically and decisively into a new area of conservation where no other NGO was active. These funds were also catalytic and attracting funding from other donors, who recognized the need to protect globally important

biodiversity under threat in the marine realm, and to help fill a crucial conservation vacuum in Myanmar. This included co-financing from other sources.

149. FFI built on its existing relationship with the Forestry Department to create an entry point for mangrove conservation in Myeinmahla Kyun, and later leveraged this entrée in the marine sector to work with the Fisheries Department to develop a vision for protecting marine biodiversity in the Myeik Archipelago—a marine hotspot in the Andaman Sea. The FFI marine team was innovative in introducing the concept of Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs), a successful, bottom-up approach to marine conservation and management in the Pacific Islands, to several small island sites in the Myeik Archipelago, with no real tradition of self-governance. FFI used Arcadia Funds to begin to empower local communities to take action to protect their coral reef and fisheries resources from external threats by demarcating and patrolling their fishing grounds. At the same time, FFI was able to attract additional funds to help build the capacity of government officials and the NRM community to map out and begin to monitor changes in the state of marine biodiversity and to strengthen their commitment to protect it through stricter regulations, greater attention to IUU fishing, and prioritizing additional sites for the creation of a network of Marine Protected Areas. According to the Country Director, had Arcadia not provided the initial scoping funds to identify priority needs and carve out a space for FFI's engagement, FFI would not have a marine programme in Myanmar today. Neither, in all probability, would the other conservation NGOs, who have since entered the marine space on FFI's coattails.

150. **Despite significant progress by FFI the challenges are daunting.** FFI has made impressive strides in laying a foundation for marine conservation in Myanmar, but the problems are formidable. Law enforcement is a huge problem, particularly as it relates to trade in Myanmar's natural resource wealth. As countries bordering Myanmar have exhausted their own supplies of renewable and non-renewable resources, they have increasingly turned to Myanmar to meet their natural resource needs. While illegal fishing from Thailand is a problem mainly in the south, it is mostly domestic commercial interests that are behind the growth of Myanmar's fishing fleets and destructive bottom trawling in the Andaman Sea, and there is no evidence that government will be in a position to intervene any time soon. The Fisheries Department has few if any boats to patrol these waters.

151. At the same time, fishing grounds and critical underwater habitat are being threatened by new offshore oil and gas concessions, which are currently being leased in the absence of marine spatial planning or coastal zone management, and without adequate EIAs and other due diligence. Another concern is elite capture of land on offshore islands, in some of the more desirable tourist destinations. Eco-tourism could be a much-needed source of revenue for indigenous populations in some of the islands, however this will require training for locals, zoning and marine spatial plans, strict enforcement of EIA and other safeguards to protect marine biodiversity and the interests of local communities, and viable profit sharing arrangements.

152. **The political transition in Myanmar is quite fragile.** A democratically elected government has taken over the reins of power for the first time in 50 years, but the old guard will retain key positions (including home affairs, border affairs and defence), making the future uncertain. Expectations among FFI's stakeholders—the rural poor--that the new government will bring economic prosperity and a new atmosphere of transparency and hope will need to be managed along with environmental risks in this new period of political and economic transition.
153. **These challenges notwithstanding, there is still room for optimism.** When FFI took its first tentative steps into the marine conservation realm in 2012 with funding from Arcadia, capacity for marine resources management in Myanmar was weak to non-existent. With Arcadia funding, FFI trained ministry and academic researchers as well as local NGOs in underwater survey techniques and in basic marine ecology and oceanography. The aim was to create a cadre of marine resource managers equipped with the basic tools for science-based decision-making.
154. In addition to capacity building, FFI worked with the Ministry of Fisheries to draft changes in the Fisheries regulations that would formally recognize Locally Managed Marine Areas as a bona fide community co-management approach. This was first piloted in the Pacific—where there is a strong tradition of local marine tenure, and later by FFI in Aceh in conjunction with the introduction of marine spatial planning and the embedding of sound fisheries management practices into customary law.
155. Although FFI has made important strides and earned the respect of government and the NGO community, sustaining and building on these achievements face tremendous challenges ahead. A crucial question is whether this incremental approach will be sufficient to achieve meaningful outcomes in a period of rapid economic and social transition.
156. FFI might consider working more closely with Myeik University, helping develop their capacity to train people in some key fields. For example, there will need for greater focus on risk assessment and risk management in the marine space, especially along the West Coast, where significant offshore oil and gas mining operations are poised to begin. Training public and private sector officials in marine EIA could be a new growth area for universities in Myanmar, as demand for these skills is certain to grow.
157. **Achieving relevant impact at scale will be a continuing challenge for FFI's Marine Programme in Myanmar.** However, opportunities exist for greater synergy between FFI and other big conservation NGOs (BINGOs) launching their own marine programmes in Myanmar. Alongside these partnerships are opportunities for less conventional collaborations with development NGOs and the private sector. Given the size of FFI's budget relative to the magnitude of the problem, achieving impact at scale can only happen with strategic new alliances and leverage of key partners. For example, there is an urgent need for cooperation between NGOs in lobbying government on policy matters. This includes revising the Fisheries Law to include language on LMMAs, developing standards and protocols for EIAs and Social Assessments as part of the permitting process for work in

the marine environment (for example, the work of the Myanmar Centre for Responsible Business), and helping inform MoECaF's work on land use planning and GIS in the context of marine spatial planning. Achieving policy reforms in governance of marine resources (including stricter enforcement) has the potential for significant conservation impact.

158. Opportunities may also exist to partner on a more significant scale with development NGOs and the larger international community, who have a long history of working in community development in Myanmar. Community driven development at this scale may provide a conservation platform for NRM and sustainable livelihoods in poor coastal communities, such as in Tanintharyi.

159. **Conclusion**

160. FFI has made important strides in launching a marine programme in Myanmar and gaining the trust and respect of government, as well as local stakeholders. However, Myanmar is now at a tipping point in terms of the opening of its economy and the direction in which economic growth takes off. If quality of growth is important to decision-makers, then the chances that they will embark on a more sustainable growth path are good. If rapid growth is the goal, as in China, then environmental degradation is likely to ensure, undermining the social and economic benefits of economic development, and putting the poor at even greater risk. With Myanmar posed to go either way, this is a time when investments in conservation are most needed and most likely to pay off. The FFI Marine Programme needs additional resources to bring its demonstration pilots to fruition and begin scaling up. Opting to stay with an incremental approach runs the risk of losing ground as economic growth accelerates and environmental externalities begin to swamp out efforts at local scale.

Gökova Bay Marine Protected Area, Turkey

161. FFI's programme in Turkey is area specific and consistent with FFI's model of identifying a promising local partner to work with, strengthening their institutional capacity and empowering them to carry out marine conservation objectives in response to a particular challenge or target of opportunity. With Peter Baldwin and Lisbet Rausing scoping funds for a marine programme in Eurasia, FFI identified a fledgling organisation (The Mediterranean Conservation Society or "AKD") whose charismatic leader was championing the conservation of a biodiversity hotspot in one of Turkey's iconic seascapes—Gökova Bay.

162. The coastline around the Bay was designated a Special Environment Protection Area (SEPA) in 1988 due to its aesthetic beauty and relatively intact coastal forests, but enforcement was weak and its marine life remained unprotected. A combination of illegal, overfishing and destructive fishing practices led to a collapse of fisheries in the Bay in 2008, with serious economic consequences for the community of fishermen and women and their families. Reversing these trends and restoring the ecological integrity of the Bay became the focus of attention of AKD and

fisheries authorities at the municipal level. In 2010, 6 No-Take Fishing Zones were demarcated and gazetted in the Eastern part of the Bay with help from AKD and support from the GEF Small Grants Programme. However, government funding was not allocated for enforcement, and the MPA remained a paper park.

163. The situation changed with a grant from the Arcadia Marine Fund to AKD from 2012-2015. These funds were instrumental in galvanizing action among local stakeholders to rein in illegal fishing and to implement restrictions in areas that had been designated as No Take Fishing Zones.

164. AKD's achievements during the grant period include:

- Fishermen-led patrols with training and equipment to support effective surveillance in coordination with the Coast Guard
- Refurbishment of the Akyaka Fishing Co-op with greater benefits to members
- Work with fisherwomen to help give them a voice.
- Eliminating large abandoned nets and other fishing gear to control ghost fishing
- Robust environmental monitoring of bio-indicator fish-stock distribution and abundance with the help of AKD research members
- Creating markets for invasive species to encourage their harvest and help keep their numbers under control
- Strengthening relations with central Government, including Coast Guard and maintaining good relations with the Mayor of Akyaka
- Accessing EU funds as a bridge grant with help from FFI

165. A key benchmark of the project is that the community-led patrols organized and empowered by AKD are the first real example of MPA enforcement in Turkish waters. Central government authorities in Ankara have expressed interest in replicating and scaling up AKD's model for community co-management and enforcement of MPAs in other locations in Turkey.

166. Building on the Arcadia grant, and with help from the FFI Marine Team in Cambridge, AKD has succeeded in obtaining bridge funding from the EU, to continue its work with Fishing Coops and producer organisations and to help bring them into compliance with EU Common Fisheries Policy. However, as a young organisation, AKD lacks a strategic plan for fundraising and long term financing of its operations. FFI is working with AKD to map out a coherent strategy for institutional growth and good governance.

167. The challenge of sustainable financing is not unique to AKD, but it is a particular concern because of limited public sector budget support or opportunities for local revenue generation to sustain conservation. An option which bears exploring is the introduction of user fees of for marine ecosystem services that the municipality could recover and reallocate for marine resources management. An example of a fee for service is the installation and leasing of mooring buoys to the many yachts which currently anchor in picturesque harbours in Gökova Bay, many of them overwintering there.

168. Maintaining the support of fishers to comply with fishing regulations and refrain from fishing in the NTFZs is also crucial. This will depend, in part, in being able to demonstrate fish stock recovery in and around the No-Take Zones. Shedding light on this process is why the scientific monitoring of fish population dynamics and habitat quality by AKD and university research partners is so essential. An insistence on scientific rigor and science-based management is a hallmark of the emerging Marine Portfolio. With help from the Conservation Livelihoods and Governance Team, the Marine Team is also applying learning from other Halcyon funded projects on participatory, market systems development to its work with coastal communities. Being able to link improved flows of ecosystem goods and services with sustainable marine enterprise and wider benefit sharing will be important to the long-term success of community co-management projects like those in Gökova Bay, Myanmar and Aceh.
169. FFI made a good choice to invest in AKD which has proven an effective local partner in Turkey. This is consistent with FFI's approach of identifying promising local partners and providing truly collaborative, dedicated support behind the scenes. FFI will need to continue to support AKD for some time, and to dedicate more time to risk management. As important as the financial support it provides is FFI's institutional mentoring of AKD-- in terms of strategic planning, organisational strengthening and governance, and helping identify opportunities for sustainable financing.

No-Take-Zones – Firth of Clyde. UK

170. Scotland's Firth of Clyde has seen a collapse in most fisheries since a coastal trawl closure was repealed in 1984. Fisheries in the area now depend almost entirely on scampi and scallops. This project initially aimed to establish the evidence base behind an existing community-led no-take-zone (Lamlash Bay) on the coast of the Isle of Arran in the Firth of Clyde, to support a Marine Protected Area (MPA) proposal for the island. Further, given a Scotland-wide consultation on MPAs as a requirement under European Union law, the project aimed to inform the national dialogue around MPA planning and implementation.
171. FFI has done an excellent job of leveraging and extending the long-running efforts of a local community-based organisation, the Community of Arran Seabed Trust (COAST), and a more recently-established NGO, the Sustainable Inshore Fisheries Trust (SIFT). It has done so by providing support to science and, particularly, organisational development. Starting from a small entry point of timely research funding at one site by Arcadia, FFI has provided critical support to local partners and leveraged other funding to broaden support across Scotland.
172. Many international conservation organisations and donors would question whether FFI should prioritize support to marine ecosystems in the UK. If the national prioritization is seen as justified on a 'needs' basis, then the local site choice is highly relevant: South Arran is acknowledged to be a key area for marine conservation in Scotland (particularly for its beds of

maerl, coralline red algae). Support to establishment of an MPA was the ideal strategic decision given the national context at the time.

173. Research funding went to support a PhD, building on successful Masters research. The first year was underwritten by the Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin marine programme development grant, with co-financing. An investment was made with Halcyon funds from 2012-2014 to cover the second and third years of the PhD. Concurrently, in-kind support by FFI to fundraising – funded through the marine programme development grant and reported on as ‘Strengthening Community Institutions in the Firth of Clyde’ – is seen as having leveraged additional grants to SIFT and COAST.
174. As a direct result of initial successes on Arran, COAST and FFI jointly developed proposals and fundraised to broaden support across Scotland. Specifically this comprised funding for a Marine Community Support Officer to conduct extension work (reported on as ‘Improving capacity for effective MPA designation and management in Scotland’). While not funded by Arcadia, this important project’s development was also dependent on the marine programme development grant.
175. This was a project in the right place at the right time. Scotland was just starting to debate national MPA establishment and management. COAST was a motivated community-based organisation with dynamic and persistent individuals, but was struggling to input effectively. Support from Arcadia and FFI was the necessary added ingredient to promote success. The clear community-based structure of COAST carried weight within the political context of Scotland during the debate around MPAs, but scientific evidence and international recognition (e.g., the Goldman Environmental Prize) added credibility. Nonetheless, success was hard won against a powerful and well-funded large-scale fisheries lobby. Arran now has a 280 km² MPA established, the first in Scotland. Further, the whole nation now has a significantly higher likelihood of a rational set of MPAs and future legislation that will enable sustainable fisheries management and community engagement in management of these public resources.
176. This project exemplifies FFI’s approach of identifying and supporting small, local organisations that contain dynamic, motivated individuals. Necessarily, young organisations are often those that can most benefit from support, and have the most challenging transitions to make from being driven by charismatic individual founders to a more balanced, resilient, sustainable human resource base. Helping manage this transition seems to be one of FFI’s core niches. Support to organisational development (governance, structure, etc.) has consistently been highlighted by community-based project partners as the biggest contribution FFI has made. This kind of tailored, adaptable support is unusual and unlikely to have been provided by many other partners/donors. COAST perhaps exemplifies the kind of organisation that FFI should be seeking to support – one with strong local roots, clear motivation (as demonstrated by major voluntary inputs, and no desire to change to a majority staffing model) and persistence over time. SIFT has provided a useful complementary focus on fisheries policy and economics, rather than conservation per se, and a broader geographic reach.

177. As a large NGO, FFI could easily find it challenging to provide support to small organisations without appearing threatening, encouraging dependency, or being overly controlling or bureaucratic. Instead, FFI's organisational culture appears very well suited to humble collaboration through support to smaller partners. In the Firth of Clyde, FFI deliberately chose an unthreatening entry point (funding ongoing university research which was valued by the local partner) that would not prompt reliance on FFI support. By entering slowly, listening and learning, before gently providing the support that the local partners needed, FFI has been able to gain trust and respect. Arcadia support has, rather uniquely, given FFI the flexible funding necessary to provide this kind of unplanned, 'on tap' advice and support to COAST and SIFT.
178. FFI was able to provide an unusually valuable senior level of advice to local partners in this project, through significant involvement of the Director of Conservation Science and Design (owing to her base in Edinburgh) and participation of FFI's CEO in the board of SIFT. The value of this senior support shows in the great achievements this project has had, both in Arran and in policy reverberations at a national level.
179. The shift to support through the Marine Community Support Officer has made this a more sustainable programme of work, and provides a model for extension and replication of project success. By selecting a relatively 'easy win' (a tough battle, but one that was much advanced already by COAST) in Arran, FFI was able to focus support efforts and demonstrate success before broadening support. This approach aligns with other notably successful Halcyon projects (e.g., Northern Rangelands Trust), but is in contrast to some other projects where FFI may have been overambitious in what it could achieve with limited resources (e.g., Awacachi, Ulu Masen) or focused on highest potential conservation gains at the expense of proving concept through easier wins (e.g., sustainable seafood financing). FFI has stressed, however, the importance of retaining a clear focus on end goals and theory of change throughout, in order not to get distracted from a big vision into project-level detail.

Sustainability Rating for the Fisheries Sector

180. This project is described by FFI as an experimental effort to help financial institutions (particularly credit lenders) drive change in the behaviour of global fishing companies, through improved due diligence around the investments made and catalysis of sustainability performance improvements of their clients. It aimed to do so through development of a performance-based tool that financial institutions could promote for use by their clients, to identify their level of sustainability performance and obtain preferential financing rates as a result of commitments towards improvements (essentially as an impact investment).
181. The project was a collaboration of FFI (leading finance institution engagement), North Sea Foundation (leading tool design), Synnervate (a consultancy coordinating the project), and Scomber consultancy

(contributing significant knowledge on fisheries, including the Marine Stewardship Council).

182. Arcadia funding in this project was catalytic. It was not seen that many other donors would be likely to invest in such a novel, experimental project, or to be comfortable with the level of change that was necessary in project plans as the team learned and adapted.
183. This project was viewed from the outset as a relatively risky, experimental one, but with high rewards if it was successful. A pilot was thus viewed as the way to test and learn without exposure to high risk of investment. The first pilot did not manage to generate broad demand for the tool, or demonstrate feasibility of the project's theory of change. With hindsight, the pilot may not have delivered sufficient promise to warrant the investment that was subsequently made in full funding of a next pilot phase. A second small pilot phase may have been more advisable. At the time, however, the demonstrable appetite for the project from Rabobank – a key intended user of project outputs – was a significant driver of second phase investment.
184. Some weaknesses in project design and adaptation may have been a result of the FFI project team's relatively limited experience with credit lending, and with Rabobank in particular, at the project outset. This project was acknowledged by all involved as facing a number of serious intrinsic challenges from the outset, which have not been helped during implementation by fluctuations in funding and staff changes. Initial project proposals appear, however, to have under-estimated obstacles to success, inadequately identified a demand-driven niche at the outset, and insufficiently adapted to changing demands of key stakeholders (financial institutions) during project implementation. In future projects involving financial institutions, it would be useful to ensure all of FFI's experience is brought to bear (e.g., through closer collaboration among the Conservation Finance & Enterprise and Business & Biodiversity teams) and/or that additional expertise is brought in house. Likewise, more pioneering, experimental projects such as this appear to warrant a relatively higher level of engagement from more senior FFI staff.
185. The limited extent to which the project identified or adapted to a demand-driven niche is perhaps the most significant lesson. The project relied on engagement of financial institutions, but does not appear to have paid sufficient attention to their needs, desires, constraints and modalities – or sufficiently adapted to changing Rabobank staff and institutional perspectives during the project. As a result, the project had some weak underlying assumptions (e.g., that many banks have capacity for substantial environmental due diligence on projects, or that many banks would be keen to promote a tool for clients to grade environmental performance themselves rather than simply follow a third party tool) and moved in directions (e.g., away from benchmarking) that reduced interest from key potential consumers of project outputs. Further, the project team rightly recognized illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing as an area of major risk to both conservation efforts and financiers, but did not realize how limited a real risk this yet was to banks owing to both limited publicity

on these issues and bank exposure to them in relation to other environmental risks. In future, Halcyon grant forms might help project teams and reviewers to think more about project risks through inclusion of questions about project niche, theories of change, related assumptions/risks, and likely challenges and how it is intended that they be overcome.

186. To successfully engage in fisheries-focused projects, FFI would benefit from directly bringing on board additional relevant expertise, whether permanent or short-term staff or secondees – rather than being entirely reliant on partners. Some project challenges might well have been better understood with broader consultation among other actors in this field during project design.
187. In practical terms, the project focused more on maximizing conservation gains than accepting limited gains at the outset and focusing on proving project concept, stimulating learning, and growing a more sustainable approach (by responding to stakeholder needs, and aiming to gain some easy wins). This focus on maximizing near-term conservation gains (by addressing the worst performing fishery companies) was stated to be a limitation of the funding source. Instead, this appears to have been based on a misunderstanding of the willingness to invest Halcyon funds in work that is paving the way for longer term conservation outcomes.
188. While project results have been limited, this experiment was relatively economical and appears to have moved the subject of fisheries sustainability in the right direction by raising awareness among financial institutions of the need to improve their sustainability policies/standards around fisheries.
189. The core three project partners all view the partnership as having worked well, owing to its transparency, openness and collaborative nature – as well as the mapping out of the project concept by the partners at an early stage. FFI's collaborative nature was held up as a particular strength – owing to its comfort in remaining in the background and not trying to lead the project or overly push its agenda. Given these comments, it is unfortunate that several partners state that key bank stakeholders were not involved from the very outset in development of the project concept and design. This may have improved project design and increased ownership by all involved.
190. The future of this project is unclear, with FFI and its partners having varying views on next directions. The conceptual niche identified by the project remains sound, of leveraging improvements in fishery company sustainability practices through engagement with financial institutions. The specific tools and approach do not quite, however, appear to be appropriate. Demand for the project concept also likely remains restricted at present, given limited material risk of unsustainable fisheries to most financial institutions. Nonetheless, leading institutions like Rabobank recognize the need to get ahead of emerging risks – suggesting that the project concept is not as much 'before its time' as some project partners believe. Until unsustainable fishing becomes a significant material risk for

banks, FFI may want to pull back on directly engaging individual banks and instead explore whether greater leverage can be obtained by working to improve fishery-related content of broadly applicable bank standards, such as International Finance Corporation Performance Standard 6 (for which the Guidance Note is currently being revised).

Flower Valley / Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative. South Africa

191. The project began with a somewhat opportunistic although well considered initial purchase of 583 ha of fynbos land with an existing flower business, followed by additional purchases with partial funding from Arcadia. The title deeds of these properties were endorsed with restrictions on land use to conservation (easements).
192. While the endorsement of title deeds in favour of long term conservation was an innovation, it seems unlikely that this model will be readily accepted to the average land owner given South Africa's land restoration programme in favour of previously dispossessed people and general sensitivity about land ownership. As property in the Agulhas Plain becomes more attractive to the wealthy, however, such easements may prove more practicable in time.
193. With support from FFI, a brand new NGO was developed, the Flower Valley Conservation Trust (FVCT). Through the Trustees' and FFI support, the new NGO and its project activities grew organically to meet expanding demands (starting with a staff of 3 and growing to 27 by 2016). FFI at one stage (2002) seconded a CEO to assist the first Trust employees, a relatively inexperienced young couple. In 2003, following the appointment of an experienced and committed local person as CEO, the trust engaged and worked with partners such as C.A.P.E. (Cape Action for People and Environment) Cape Nature Conservation, SANParks, as well as private and communal landowners.
194. In 2003, FVCT launched a pilot project, within the greater Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative (ABI) of which it was a founding member, aiming to demonstrate that it was possible to conserve and harvest wild fynbos sustainably, in a commercially viable way, while securing and creating jobs for disadvantaged and unemployed local people living in the surrounding rural communities.
195. The pilot project trialled and yielded a "toolbox" containing the following: a code of best practice for the harvesting of fynbos, a series of research studies on the impacts of certain practices, an index of vulnerability of certain species to harvesting as well as certified training courses in sustainable harvesting. Markets with one retailer in the UK (Marks and Spencer) and one in South Africa (Pick and Pay) were secured'. These resulted in a six-fold increase in payments to flower-pickers, thereby improving boosting sustainable livelihoods within the project region.
196. During the project, employment doubled to 150 families harvesting fynbos and those working in export packing sheds. This was supported by multi-

faceted conservation/life-skills training and ethical labour management procedures.

197. Sustainable harvesting of fynbos increased on an area of land from zero to 30,000ha, and later to some 190 000 ha as the Sustainable Harvesting Project became operative.
198. Comprehensive research on sustainable use flower harvesting was incorporated into the Sustainable Harvesting Programme. Alien plant control maintained momentum.
199. The ABI component of the project was awarded a Highly Satisfactory rating for incentivizing best practice in fynbos harvesting in the industry, during a Terminal Evaluation of the greater ABI.
200. The emergence of the C.A.P.E. programme, under which ABI received UNDP and GEF and SA Government support, which fortuitously coincided with the emergence of FVCT and its demonstrable successes on FV, was certainly a factor which assisted the future expansion and influence of FVCT.
201. The approach of both FFI and FVCT has been collaborative, non-prescriptive and adaptable. FFI played a crucial role during the initial phase, both in the purchase of the land, and maintaining an supportive, non-prescriptive role throughout, in “nurturing” the new NGO through the initial phases and beyond, when needed. As lessons were learnt, approaches to implementation were modified (e.g., separating the NGO and initial business components; engaging and working with landowners in finalising the COP) as a result of hands-on experience (i.e. a case of adaptive management, or “learning by doing”). It is tempting to speculate that the absence of an initial log-frame allowed for creative and rapid responses to emerging challenges, by FFI, the Trustees and FVCT itself. FFI continues to have a member as a Trustee.
202. Recently, the Fynsa partner, formed to take over the flower marketing component, ceased to operate with the death of the owner, and the Trust took the decision to focus only on the expanding alien species control and further rolling out of the Sustainable Harvesting Programme. The FVCT however still remained an equal partner with the Grootbos Private Nature Reserve in the tourism business.
203. Securing longer term core funding remains an issue, although FVCT has managed to date. Income raised steadily increased from R2.7 million in 2003, to R59 million in 2014.
204. The initial assumption that the flower business would provide the necessary funding for FVCT proved to be rather optimistic, more so as the achievements of FVCT (in ABI in particular) led to its activities expanding (including taking over management of ABI, preparing for ABI Phase ii, Alien control, education, Sustainable Harvesting Programme, etc.). There was thus a concomitant need for increased funding for its growing core activities (with donors including EU, UNDP/GEF. WWF-Green Trust, Table Mountain

fund and others). Recently FVCT launched an “Adopt a hectare of Fynbos” campaign to generate funds (flowervalley.org.za).

205. In conclusion, the achievements and professionalism of FVCT, an organisation started from scratch and supported by FFI, confirm the notion that “Flower Valley provides an example of a long term project resulting in partner independence in an organisation built from scratch”.

Awacachi Ecological Corridor, Ecuador

206. The overarching Awacachi project concept has always been simple – to create a corridor under conservation management between the Cotacachi-Cayapas Ecological Reserve and the Awá Ethnic Reserve in north-west Ecuador, and to engage local communities in sustainable management of the broader area. This corridor was the largest remaining extent of unprotected lowland Choco forest, of high conservation value, and highly threatened by logging and conversion. The project focus was on purchase of parcels of land to create connectivity under secure tenure. The project stemmed from the ideas of the charismatic leader of a small Ecuadorian NGO, and a member of FFI staff who had volunteered with this NGO. For some time, Rainforest Concern was also a project partner.
207. Given the project scale, the remoteness of the area, and the focus on multiple land purchases to be held under a new Ecuadorian foundation, the realities of implementation were always going to be complex and challenging. FFI took on this project with clear sight of sizeable known risks, weighing these against the huge conservation opportunity. Unfortunately, no-one could envisage quite how complex the project would become. FFI became aware of four key internal issues during the course of the project.
208. First, it became apparent that FFI initially considerably under-estimated the time and money that would be necessary to undertake the complex legal necessities of land purchase in a developing country, to support a small local NGO and to support management of land once purchased. Although the nature of these issues was apparent to FFI at project initiation – this being a novel project for them at the time – the scale and longevity of these issues was not apparent. There has been a consistent tension between the need to rapidly purchase land to compete with logging and oil palm interests, and the need to put in place sound legal mechanisms for land ownership and management into the long term. For example, while the urgency of land purchase opportunities – and the reluctance of Arcadia at the time to fund management – is understood, it was rash to undertake a substantial programme of land purchase without simultaneously trying to set aside funds for long-term management.
209. Second, it appears that FFI underestimated the time and investment necessary to engage sufficiently with local people. An understandable rush to seize land purchase opportunities meant that insufficient attention was given to slowly and carefully building support for the project from local

communities (which, in many cases, were land vendors), resulting in misaligned expectations, disputes and conflict later in the project.

210. Third, FFI later realized that it had undertaken insufficient due diligence before engaging with its local partner, and – given project reliance on such a small, individual-driven organisation with known conflicts of interest – had not put sufficient monitoring, reporting, checks and balances in place to ensure continuing support during the project. Partner roles and responsibilities had not been clearly defined and too much leeway was given to the local partner to act on FFI's behalf.
211. Last, FFI did not initially dedicate commensurate funding or staff to support the project's effective implementation as a result of the previous three underestimations of project complexity and input requirements, because of FFI's small size and overstretched capacity at the time, and perhaps also because of the lower profile of the Americas programme. The project only started to progress well once more staff were in place on the ground to give close support and oversight.
212. The first and third points have been clear lessons for FFI, which have resulted in greater caution in subsequent Halcyon projects (e.g., a project design cycle process, with numerous decision gates; guidance on working with other organisations; promotion of documentation of roles and responsibilities in MoUs with partners). At a higher level, FFI became more risk averse with regard to partnerships with relatively unknown local organisations, based on assurances by just one or two staff members. This led to greater informal cross-checking of potential partners with other known quantities in country, and ultimately to the development of a more regionally-focused FFI structure to ensure good regional knowledge and networks was brought to bear when entering new initiatives. Lessons learned on adequate community engagement are less tangible, but are said to have been incorporated into the understanding of its Conservation Livelihood and Governance Team.
213. Most of these four issues relate to ensuring appropriate levels and types of support are given to a project, local partner, and associated FFI staff. While determined efforts of individual FFI staff have ensured some successes from this project, such challenging projects necessarily need greater senior oversight, to identify problems as early as possible and ensure investment in solving them – even if that involves difficult choices like changing partner or moving away from the project entirely.
214. External factors out of FFI control have also made this a very challenging project. Increasing insecurity in the project area (to the point of the murder of a local staff member and death threats to others) has massively constrained implementation and, in turn, fundraising abilities. This issue has progressed to the point of the current local partner, Fundación Sirua, being forced to significantly reduce staffing and capacity.
215. It is also worth noting that, as with a number of other projects in the Halcyon portfolio, FFI invested heavily in the project ideas of a charismatic and motivated individual on the ground, through partnering with his

organisation. This is a risky strategy, with potentially high gains or costs. In this particular case, it did not pay off, and the project experienced significant time and financial setbacks as a result.

216. Despite all of these challenges, the project has achieved impressive successes that are likely to persist into the long-term. Ultimately, the corridor now represents the largest privately-owned reserve in Ecuador, covering 12,489 ha, with most forest is still standing. In such an unstable region, these gains might well have been lost now with a conservation model that did not have the security of land purchase. The area is under serious consideration for official protection as a Protected Forest or Hydrological Reserve. Activities generating significant local livelihood gains have been implemented during the project. Sadly, the current reality is that the project area is very insecure, and the local partner is (despite continuing support from FFI) struggling to raise funds and implement activities on the ground.

Ulu Masen REDD, Aceh, Indonesia

217. The Ulu Masen region of Aceh is an important area for biodiversity – though not as rich in endemic or threatened species as many parts of Indonesia, it still contains extensive forest in a heavily deforested region. FFI had been involved in the area for some time – with a broad, long-term programme of work – before a new Provincial Governor (previously an FFI staff member) asked them (in 2006) to help establish a programme of work that would pilot approaches to REDD funding for forest conservation, partnering with the Provincial Government of Aceh.
218. By 2011, the project had encountered a number of external complications. Halcyon funds provided crucial bridging funding during a difficult time, enabling continuity of work and ultimately raising of additional funding: they were sought – and received – at a time when few other donors would have been interested in funding the project. FFI directly used its Halcyon grant to leverage substantial EU funding.
219. Soon after Halcyon-funded work started, the election of a new governor necessitated significant changes in the programme's plans, to refocus on building up conservation from the community level. As with many new incumbents, this official was keen to distance himself from his predecessor's initiatives. FFI sensibly scaled down its ambitions, and re-focused on securing sections of the landscape through innovative experimentation with the new national policy options for forest conservation, specifically the Forest Management Unit system (essentially decentralized governance of state forest land) and Village Forest scheme (essentially community licenses for management of state forest land). Significant cross-learning occurred with another FFI project, in nearby Jambi Province.
220. Despite changed plans, significant gains have been made: about 15,000 hectares of managed Village Forest land, buffering a protected area, appears to have been effective in averting or reversing forest loss. This

land, in two districts, was arranged as contiguous 'buffer areas' to ensure optimal conservation value. The earlier REDD project provided the foundation for these outcomes, through continuing good relationships with government and local communities.

221. FFI may have initially taken on more than it was realistic to achieve in the short period during which a pro-environment provincial governor was in place. In contrast to this project, others among the Halcyon portfolios (e.g., Firth of Clyde, Northern Rangelands Trust) appear to have made more of approaches which start small, find easier wins, prove a concept, and then expand. Such an approach was followed by FFI on projects elsewhere in Indonesia.
222. With the Halcyon-funded project, FFI pioneered testing of the boundaries of REDD as a new opportunity for long-term forest conservation funding. The project led learning on REDD within Indonesia, was one of the most important pioneers in this field globally, and provided FFI with the knowledge, experience and capacity to now continue to employ variants of REDD approaches to conservation financing across their project sites. Unfortunately, there is no immediate or medium-term prospect of a sustainable flow of REDD+ money to support forest projects in Indonesia or anywhere else. Nonetheless, FFI remains optimistic about a similar approach to sustainable financing – through sale of village forest 'Plan Vivo' carbon credits on the voluntary market for immediate retirement, thus generating long-term revenue incentives for continued community conservation.
223. Working in Indonesia promises slow progress, many reverses, small chance of success, but the attractive prospect of important gains if anything can be actually done. So it requires great patience, lots of money over time and acceptance of a high failure rate. FFI made admirable advances in these challenging circumstances. Ultimately, at the time of project conception, political support and the opportunity of REDD financing meant that this project was a major gamble, but a reasonable one. Current ambition is much reduced, but FFI remains engaged in an important province, with extensive knowledge and strong community relationships, in case future opportunities emerge.

Aceh Small Islands Initiative, Indonesia

224. The Aceh Small Islands initiative grew out of a long history of FFI presence in Aceh, and a deliberate strategy of working from the ground up to gain the trust of the community and their understanding of the relationship between stewardship of marine resources on the one hand, and improved social and economic outcomes on the other. Over the years, FFI has been able to trace a very positive trajectory of change in attitudes among fishing communities in Aceh province, from the start of FFI interventions in 2005 shortly after the tsunami struck, through a period of slow and steady scaling up with the support of a pro-environment Governor of Aceh. FFI support reached its peak in the Arcadia-funded Aceh Small Island Initiative from 2012 – 2014. Although funding for this initiative was suspended in

early 2015 due to a number of internal changes related to staffing and fund raising, and the loss of political support with the departure of the Governor of Aceh in 2012, much of the social framework laid during this period remains intact. Respect for customary laws and fisheries management under the traditional leadership of the Panglima Laot—a hallmark of FFI’s community-based management approach—continues in the pilot sites, along with community support of locally managed marine areas (LMMAs).

225. The unique confluence of circumstances—a solid foundation of community empowerment and buy-in to good fisheries management practices post-tsunami; the election of a charismatic and visionary environmental leader as governor of Aceh; and a dedicated FFI field staff with the skills to work effectively with government as well as at the local level—created a window of opportunity for marine resources management in Aceh to take root and bear fruit. Funding from Halcyon and the Arcadia Marine Programme was critical to the launch of a new, scaling up phase starting in 2010 under the Governor’s Green Aceh Vision. And in 2012, the new Aceh Small Islands initiative was meant to help realize this vision, taking the project from a modest series of pilots to a province-wide programme. This vision was abruptly interrupted with the departure of the Governor, staffing changes within FFI, the loss of co-financing, and a hold put on further disbursement of Arcadia funding, pending an in depth review of project history, performance and outcomes.

226. Major achievements realized with support from Halcyon Land and Sea and Arcadia Marine Funds include:

- The revitalization of traditional institutions like the Panglima Laot, based on customary marine laws which give power to communities over their local marine resources. This has created a foundation for the development of Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) in which communities have preferential rights, and promoted better fisheries management practices along with protection of vulnerable coral reefs and their rich biodiversity.
- Support for participatory Marine Spatial Planning at the District Level, which underpins future economic development in the area and has the potential to put coastal development on a sustainable growth path.
- An increased understanding among fishers of local, provincial and national marine resource management rules and regulations, and of the links between healthy reefs and improvements in catch of economically important species;
- A significant decrease in destructive fishing practices/compressor diving/poison fishing in Simeulue (and the PISISI MPA) since 2011, when FFI first started working there;
- A perceptions among octopus fishers that coral reef conditions have improved and harvest levels of octopus have returned to pre-2007 levels (when compressor divers first came to the area);

227. Although the perception among fishers is that coral reef conditions and biomass have improved since the introduction of better management practices under the Panglima Laot (with support from FFI/Halcyon Marine), the project has not been able to demonstrate this quantitatively, due to

lack of funds to do undertake the next stage of ecological monitoring at the two pilot sites. Unless monitoring is undertaken soon, it will be difficult to ascribe any changes that may be recorded to the project.

228. Apart from the loss of political support at the provincial level, the departure of the director of field operations in Aceh in 2013 was a factor in the programme's decline after he left. Following his reassignment to Singapore, a crucial gap in fund-raising skills and knowledge of marine issues in the Indonesia field office, has hobbled the marine programme in Indonesia, which had at one time been a showcase of FFI's efforts around the world. It does point to the need to shore up expertise on the marine side and on donor relations and fund raising in Indonesia to channel Arcadia Funds where they have the potential to protect globally important marine biodiversity.
229. While co-financing appears to be a problem for accessing Arcadia funding, there are new opportunities (and challenges) to work in the marine sector in Indonesia. The new emphasis on the Blue Economy as a source of economic growth and the appointment of a dynamic minister as head of the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries who has a particular interest in Simuelue and PISISI—site of the high profile MPA which FFI has been supporting—could be a new entry point for resurrecting efforts to revive political support for marine conservation and Marine Spatial Planning in Aceh. There may also be opportunities to collaborate with ADB on the Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Program (COREMAP-CTI) in Aceh and elsewhere in Western Indonesia, to see where there may be opportunities for synergy and political leverage. Many of the objectives and modalities of the two programmes are similar (including working to empower coastal communities to protect their coral reefs, and supporting Marine Spatial Planning at the District level).
230. Much has been made about the importance of improving livelihoods in Aceh as an integral component of any sustainable programme in marine biodiversity conservation. The revolving fund experience in the two pilot sites was quite positive but too small scale to have much impact. The Conservation Livelihoods and Governance Team have pointed to the importance of income generating activities linked to improved fisheries management and greater fisheries productivity, leading to better community welfare outcomes. Creating a virtuous circle in which protection and management of community-governed marine areas leads to healthy reefs and ecosystem services that underpin community welfare is a common goal across FFI's marine programmes. Greater support for scaling up such programmes and the human resources needed to deliver them (for example, multidisciplinary teams drawn from FFI, CCI and the private sector focusing on SME creation) would seem like a strategic investment for Arcadia.

231. There is no substitute for grass roots involvement and winning the trust of communities who are closest to the resource base, as the basis for any long-term investment in marine conservation in Indonesia. In the words of the CLG Team, “Replicating the LMMA approach from one community to the next comes only where the time and effort can be invested into developing the understanding and trust within the target community; there seems to be no short circuit to this – making larger scale top-down roll-out of this approach inappropriate.” This sort of model needs to be built bottom-up, and takes significant time and energy to develop and embed into the social system. However, once in place, the level of community ownership, buy-in and the appropriateness of these traditional structures, make them likely to be retained. The bottom line is that a long-term commitment is required on the part of FFI and partners in Indonesia to achieve lasting gains in marine conservation, and that once achieved, changes in community attitudes and behaviours are valuable assets that should be nurtured and not be left to erode.
232. The future of the Marine Programme in Aceh is precarious. Without additional external funding, it is unlikely that activities initiated under the project will be able to continue. A plan for sustainable financing of MPA management interventions, reliant on regular/annual budget allocations from District government and on revenues from eco-tourism and other PES schemes, has not been implemented. At risk, too are the valuable biological and socio-economic monitoring programmes set up with Arcadia funding, to determine the effects of better fisheries management and improved livelihoods on marine ecosystem health. FFI conducted thorough biological baselines at project sites in 2012, and these are overdue to be re-surveyed. Failure to do so in the next 6-12 months would make it difficult to draw any conclusions about the relationship between observed changes in reef fish abundance and community-based reef management supported by the project, thereby putting in jeopardy much of the programme’s theory of change.

National Policy on Bottom Trawling for Shrimp in Costa Rica

233. The project is a unique example in FFI’s Marine Portfolio of support for a process of multisector engagement at the national level on policy reform in the Fisheries Sector. In Costa Rica, shrimp bottom trawling by the semi-industrial sector operating on the Pacific Coast has resulted in cumulative environmental and social impacts and led to a collapse of white shrimp stocks and unsustainable rates of by-catch and damage to benthic communities. This project builds on experience from a precursor project in Tárcoles, on the Pacific Coast, supported by development funds from Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin. In that project, an approach was piloted to reduce conflict between semi-industrial bottom trawlers and artisanal shrimp fishers through effective zoning around an Area of Responsible Fishing in which bottom trawling was prohibited. Outcomes from this pilot were meant to inform policy at the national level on more sustainable approaches to shrimp fishing in Costa Rica.

234. The current project was precipitated by a ruling of the Constitutional Court of Costa Rica in 2013, in response to a law suit brought against the government by Mar Viva and others in the environmental NGO community, that the semi-industrial shrimp trawl fishery violated the Constitution of Costa Rica by virtue of its substantial and cumulative impacts on the environment and on poor coastal communities trying to eke out a living through fishing. As a consequence, the Constitutional Court prohibited the authorization of any new shrimp bottom trawler licenses by INCOPESCA, the National Fisheries Institute, or the reauthorization of existing licenses, due to expire in 2019, unless and until reforms to the sector were introduced and shrimp bottom trawling could be scientifically shown to be sustainable in terms of 3 essential criteria: (i) the amount of by catch generated, including the harvest of threatened and keystone species, such as sea turtles, in the trawl ; (ii) degradation of the benthic community by virtue of the scouring effects of the bottom trawl; and (iii) socio-economic impacts on the artisanal shrimp fishery, with which the semi-industrial trawlers were competing directly in shallow, near shore waters. The Constitutional Court's ruling created an opportunity for FFI to provide needed funding and help shape the discourse around these issues by supporting a National Dialogue on proposed legal reforms to the shrimp trawl industry. The Dialogue was co-chaired by INCOPESCA (the National Fisheries Institute) and the Ministry of Environment. Participants included Government, the Private Sector, Civil Society and a broad array of stakeholders across sectors with a stake in the future of the fishery.
235. The process of convening a Roundtable as part of a National Dialogue mandated by the newly elected President of the Country (Luis Solis), to address the Constitutional Court ruling, has been participatory and deliberate. It is the first effort of its kind—engaging over 300 stakeholders in an attempt to find a solution to the crisis in the white shrimp fishery (and other commercial shrimp species) through giving voice to a broad group of participants, including artisanal fishermen and women in economically depressed parts of the country, who have been affected by the collapse of shrimp stocks and direct competition with the semi-industrial trawl fishery operating within a few hundred meters of the coast.
236. FFI's local partner in Costa Rica, CoopeSoliDar was identified by Government to facilitate the dialogue process. Financial support was provided to CoopeSoliDar by FFI with funds from the Arcadia Marine Grant to convene the Roundtable, including the establishment of Working Groups for specific issue areas, and working hand in glove with the ministries of Agriculture (MAG) and of Environment and Natural Resources (Min AE), which co-chaired the process. As the facilitator of this process, CoopeSoliDar was responsible for trying to manage conflict and polarizing positions in the discussions and to keep the process on track.
237. The Dialogue Process was predictably complex with so much at stake. Overseeing CoopeSoliDar's efforts to manage the historic conflict between the environmental NGOs and the Fisheries sector in Costa Rica proved difficult for FFI to do long distance. The process started out well and in a very inclusive way in the fall of 2014, but ultimately became fraught, leading to entrenched positions and the withdrawal of Mar Viva and the

environmental NGOs from the roundtable in July 2015. Although the Dialogue continued in their absence, despite efforts by the Co-Chairs and FFI to bring them back to the Table, the consensus that emerged without them was weakened. The proposed changes to put the Semi-Industrial Shrimp Trawl Fishery on a path to sustainability has lost much of its credibility within the broader environmental and scientific communities. It is unclear whether the associated draft legislation, now being considered by the National Assembly, will be accepted by the Constitutional Court as meeting the sustainability requirements needed to authorize new licenses, even if the parliament approves the bill.

238. Although the National Dialogue was viewed as a success by many in as much as it is without precedent in Costa Rica in terms of stakeholder involvement in policy development and it focused attention on an issue of national importance in a sector that previously had warranted little notice from authorities—it is not clear what the ultimate outcome will be and there is some concern that momentum to effect real change has weakened, as energies have been redirected from negotiating and planning workable solutions to dealing with public conflict. It is likely that the process could have benefitted from closer supervision and engagement by FFI and that the exit by Environmental NGOs could have been potentially avoided. But it is also true that the Environmental NGOs had their own agenda, which was to eliminate bottom trawling altogether from the shrimp fishery, regardless of near-term impacts on the labour market and the livelihoods of fishers and labourers (some 600) rendered jobless as a result. The lack of time and funding for adequate scientific input, in the form of robust, time series data from environmental monitoring of changes over time, and from third party experts who could bring the experience of other countries to bear on Costa Rica's quest for a solution to the shrimp-trawl fishery, challenged the process further.
239. Whatever its flaws, the national dialogue around transforming the shrimp bottom trawl industry has fomented a broader discussion about the sustainability of marine resource use in Costa Rica in general, and the need for a more holistic/integrated approach to sustainable marine resources management in the country. The potential exists for replicating this national dialogue in the context of other fisheries which employ large numbers of people, help meet nutritional needs, support tourism and trade or otherwise contribute to economic growth, but which are teetering on the brink of collapse. Such marine resource management issues need to be revisited urgently while the public is primed to listen and the political will is there to push through reforms.
240. FFI has agreed to stay engaged during the review of the proposed new legislation by Parliament and ultimately, the Constitutional Court for a ruling. It will continue to support the dialogue process in 2016, including (i) helping carve out a greater role for the Research Working Group to try to broaden scientific and technical review of what is being proposed; (ii) continuing technical and policy advice to INCOPECSA, CoopeSolidar, and the Ministry of Environment's Water and Wetlands Division, through greater involvement of FFI senior staff and external expertise; and (iii) knowledge management. The hope is that it will ultimately lead to a process of

transforming fisheries beyond the shrimp sub-sector and to more equitable benefit sharing among fishing communities throughout Costa Rica.

241. This project represents the first of its kind in the Halcyon Marine Programme and is an excellent example of how modest development funds from Arcadia led to an opportunity for FFI to engage at the national policy level by facilitating debate on a contentious bid to reform the shrimp fishing sector in Costa Rica. The flexibility of Halcyon Marine funds allowed timely support by FFI to its local partner in Costa Rica to serve as the moderator of this experiment in participatory policy-making. The process demonstrated both the complexity of trying to achieve consensus around policy reform, and the importance of remaining engaged to help ensure the legitimacy of the process and improve final outcome. FFI has already earned high marks from government and of those participating in the roundtable process for the value of its contribution. In turn, FFI has learned how to leverage a small amount of targeted and timely support, along with the trust it has gained by partnering with respected local institutions, for a chance to achieve impact at a national scale. Such opportunities to engage at the national level should be sought out and replicated in countries like Myanmar and Turkey in the next phase of Halcyon Marine Programme support.

Community Conserved Areas, South Kenya

242. As elsewhere, Kenyan coral reefs are becoming rapidly degraded and fishers have experienced dwindling catches with increasing pressure attributable to ineffective fishing controls, rising number of fishers and poor fishing methods, all exacerbated by climate change impacts. Marine conservation in Kenya has moved towards co-management involving local fishing communities in managing their marine resources especially through Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs), an approach that became widespread in marine conservation in the Pacific in the 1990s. The fisheries co-management structure commonly used in Kenya is the Beach Management Unit (BMU) which legally establishes community rights over local resources. The number of BMUs in Kenya has grown rapidly since 2010 as more fishing communities expressed interest in self-governance and conservation for future economic gain. 24 BMUs were reported to be in existence as of 2015, prioritising mangrove restoration, no-take zones and gear restrictions.
243. The institutional picture is complex. Many government agencies and a variety of NGOs have been involved in BMUs. The popularity of the approach has been attributed to support from local individuals, private partners, NGOs and the State Department of Fisheries (SDF), although the establishment process was often confusing to communities and many fishers remained sceptical, fearing that the government would eventually take over. Most BMUs took 2-4 years to establish. So far there are no national guidelines and there has been a lack of clarity on the legal basis for these BMUs despite the rapidly increasing number that have been established. Financial resources for capacity building and the management

of BMUs has been limited. So far, BMUs appear to have had a relatively high failure rate.

244. FFI has worked on BMUs in collaboration with its long-term partner the East African Wildlife Society (EAWLS), which has been active for 60 years and is a preeminent regional NGO. FFI has helped EAWLS raise funds and develop projects for decades, most recently collaborating on coastal and marine conservation. EAWLS has experienced several rapid changes in leadership and is currently rebuilding. The relationship between the two organisations has been variable over time and FFI has found it particularly hard to work with EAWLS during their recent periods of transition.
245. The BMU concept was first tested as a Kenya-Tanzania-Uganda initiative on the shores of Lake Victoria where over 1,000 BMUs were established as co-management arrangements between communities and governments. Kenya took the BMU concept to the coast in 2006, although the Fisheries Department (later the State Department of Fisheries, SDF) did not have the needed capacity or resources to engage seriously and few communities apparently understood the concept. The situation was exacerbated by unprecedented violence around the 2008 national election that severely damaged trust between the government and communities, and rendered the government largely dysfunctional for at least a year subsequently.
246. In this challenging situation FFI obtained UK Government Darwin Initiative funding to launch six coastal BMUs and strengthen EAWLS' marine conservation capacity. These were the first BMUs on the Kenya coast to be "properly established". Management plans were developed for each of these, but the Fisheries Department's limited capacity resulted in long delays in their approval and eventually the Darwin grant expired. Interim funding was obtained from another foundation but the project was set back further when a key FFI project manager left the organisation. Some of the BMUs have since functioned reasonably well, while others have not. Many problems have been encountered and some overcome.
247. Arcadia marine challenge grant funding in 2011 enabled FFI to plan for replication (which resulted in the development of the parallel project in Pemba, Tanzania). The South Coast Kenya project received funding from Halcyon Land & Sea (Hugh Sloane) in 2012 and from Arcadia (through the Marine grant) in 2014/15.
248. A 2015 independent review found that FFI and EAWLS "played a key role in facilitating the establishment of BMUs on the south coast of Kenya". FFI's own 2016 unpublished self-assessment states that "While some excellent progress has been made towards achieving the original programme vision – namely in helping to create a working example of a management model through which coastal fishers/communities are able to secure rights to engage alongside the authorities, to deliver and receive benefits from sustainably managed fisheries - the complex operating environment for BMUs and the nascence of this model has meant that the majority of BMUs are not yet effectively addressing (or able to demonstrate their influence over) destructive fishing practices, over harvesting and unsustainable use - particularly in response to threats posed by the commercial fishing

sectors". FFI has identified in some detail the challenges that have been faced and is currently reflecting on how best to direct their future efforts.

249. The impression now is that FFI did a lot of good early work in a very difficult political situation and contributed to the popularity of an important and innovative approach to marine conservation that certainly took off in southern Kenya but which can be expected to take several more years to consolidate before real working models emerge. FFI played a particularly important role in helping clarify the legal and regulatory framework for BMUs. However, there was a serious decline in momentum after the Darwin funding was used up. The loss of key personnel by both FFI and EAWLS was a further setback, and the situation has probably not been helped by the FFI Africa Regional Director post being vacant.
250. FFI has been open about the problems encountered and is currently conducting a thorough internal review that was planned and launched independently from our Arcadia review. While we interviewed several knowledgeable people about this project, the scope of our desk review was somewhat limited at FFI's request as their relationship with EAWLS was at a fairly delicate stage and some key former staff members were unavailable for interview.

Improving Policy and Practice to Reduce Plastic Pollution

251. Marine microplastics emerged as a potential topic for FFI during their development of a marine strategy in 2009, having been mentioned in a talk by Callum Roberts who was then on FFI's Council. This was a relatively unknown issue with no other conservation NGOs focusing on it. Further discussions within FFI concluded there was potential for direct intervention on some of the most immediate microplastic sources – microbeads (a cosmetics ingredient with cost-effective substitutes available) and nurdles (plastic pellets, a high volume by-product of oil processing used to manufacture most cheap plastic products – these are cheap and plentiful so often spilt or lost). While microbeads are a consumer/retail/brand name issue, nurdles are a trade association/manufacturing issue.
252. A development grant for work on microplastics was allocated from the Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin marine development grant in 2011 (which led to the Arcadia Marine Programme).
253. The FFI microplastics programme was formally launched in 2012 with six months of research, information gathering and network building among academics and NGOs, to acquire expert knowledge and prepare FFI to engage with corporate business leaders. FFI then developed a microplastics strategy that included the following:
- Focus on plastic ingredients in personal care and cosmetic products in the UK, given FFI's ability to establish the situation and to contact companies.
 - Focus on those plastic pollution sources that are directly attributable and traceable.
 - Engage with consumers, green brands and leading companies.

- Not denigrate plastic as a material, but acknowledge its role in human societies, to achieve credibility and earn the trust of corporate businesses.

254. FFI planned to move as follows:
- Encourage a precautionary principle, moving ahead of the science confirming biodiversity impact while taking emerging scientific findings into account.
 - Identify opportunities for collaboration with partners with complementary skills.
 - Recognize that long-term solutions required policy change with voluntary industry engagement was a viable initial strategy.
255. The first output was the Good Scrub Guide, successfully launched in 2013, listing 17 different brands and 38 plastic-free products, based on FFI's research but actively engaging with the Marine Conservation Society UK (MCS) to act as a public-facing partner. FFI also engaged in the Beat the Microbead coalition, which had been initiated independently in 2011 and was developing an app (which FFI helped to fund) to help consumers make informed decisions at the point of purchase. The Good Scrub Guide and the Beat the Bead app both generated substantial UK and European media attention. FFI's database became recognized as one of the most thorough reviews of microbead use in personal care products globally.
256. In 2014 FFI's team was expanded to two full-time staff. Campaigns by various groups led to a microbeads ban in the USA, providing a significant boost to others and creating opportunities to work towards legislative change in Europe and leverage direct change within industry.
257. In 2015 a total of 28 commitments to either phase-out solid plastic ingredients (11) or never to use them (17) were received from the product ranges of international brands, national brands and a large number of UK high street retailers. FFI was also engaged in European policy discussions that led Cosmetics Europe (the European cosmetics association) to recommend that its members phase-out exfoliating and cleansing microbeads from all products by 2020.
258. This mainstreaming of the microplastics issue led other environmental NGOs to move into this space, including in 2015 the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) and Greenpeace UK. FFI entered into a partnership with Greenpeace, EIA and MCS around a petition to ban microbeads from use in personal care products.
259. In just a few years FFI has developed a position of credibility on this issue and used this as a platform to enter into dialogue with the UK, European and international scientific, NGO, industry and policymaker communities on plastic pollution. Simultaneously, increasing evidence of both microbead and plastic pellet pollution causing direct impact on biodiversity has caused the issue to rise in European and global pollution policy agendas, and has had extensive media coverage. FFI participated in very recent UK Parliamentary hearings on microbeads and a UK ban is now anticipated.

260. Re. the plastic nurdles, FFI found that UK trade associations had adopted the guidelines of 'Operation Clean Sweep', a US industry-led good practice manual with affordable solutions that did not require changes in materials. But there has so far been little implementation in the UK, and this will be FFI's focus.
261. As part of our review we interviewed individuals from FFI's NGO and corporate partners on the microbeads issue. It was obvious from these discussions that FFI has become the 'go to' people for corporate engagement as well as the chemistry of plastics and biodiversity, especially on microplastics where FFI is recognized as having very solid knowledge. Even though FFI's approach is deliberately not confrontational with industry, they were still able to work effectively with Greenpeace UK who might otherwise have favoured more of a "naming and shaming" approach.
262. For FFI to have identified this potential issue, staffed up and then established such a position of credibility and influence within a space of a few years based on solid science, good corporate relationships and effective participation in NGO coalitions, all at modest cost, is an extremely impressive achievement.

Annex 1. Notes on the underlying issues facing the most “challenging” (as a surrogate for “failed”) Arcadia projects

Prepared by FFI June 2016-06-28

Evaluation case studies are marked *

Project	Type	Status	Commentary of problems/challenges encountered
No longer involved			
Kwakachinja, Tanzania	Halcyon, main grant	Withdrew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Project did not progress due to loss of trust by the community in the aims of the project and due to the impact of local politics > We tried various approaches to resolve the situation, but eventually concluded the situation was not tractable to change
Sankuru, DRC	Halcyon, strategic small grant	Withdrew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Project stalled when the focal reserve was found not to be as important biologically as had been thought and was proposed for de-gazettement > In parallel the project was successful in inputting to national engagement and dialogue on REDD, and reinforcing our DRC programme at a critical time > Attempts to shift our support to a neighbouring (more biodiverse) reserve were not successful, so the decision was made to pull back from this initiative
ACRE, Australia	Halcyon, strategic small grant	On hold indefinitely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Project aimed to establish a carbon project based on management of Australian rangelands > A tool was developed and supported by the then government > Following the change in Australian government and their withdrawal of support for the carbon tax the project was put on the back burner due to the significant downturn in the enabling environment
Community Management of Mangrove Ecosystems in Lake Piso, Liberia	Marine	No longer involved (on marine issues)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Project did not progress as hoped (beyond participatory planning) due to limited local staff capacity for marine issues (within FFI and local partners) > A management plan was developed, but the expected opportunity to link to off-shore activities did not emerge,

			partly due to changes in the local context (and the emergence of the World Bank project on fisheries reform) and partly due to the change in Country Manager.
Did not proceed			
Yasquel, Ecuador	Halcyon, main grant	Did not proceed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Purchase did not proceed due to internal conflicts within the vendor family, resulting in its withdrawal from the market > We only invested the cost of initial scoping, due diligence and initial legal costs
Liberia Fisheries Reform	Marine	Did not proceed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Initially listed in Arcadia portfolio, however WB WARF project was rapidly changing the local context > By the time the funding was available we undertook a review of opportunities, but little local appetite for the areas in which FFI was best placed to add value (as the WB project had led to shifts of key staff away from government agencies and a focus on resource-heavy implementation, with little role for lighter-touch strategic interventions)
Ongoing, but difficult or changing direction			
*Awacachi, Ecuador	Halcyon, main grant	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Extremely difficult and complicated project with a lot of learning as we went along > Ongoing difficulties of working in frontier area with significant security issues > Relationships with communities not as good as they should have been; partly due to naive initial choice of local partner and limited FFI capacity for livelihoods work at that time > Ongoing threats to corridor from clearance, law suits related to land acquisition price, mining operations, and illegal logging. > Very difficult to raise funds in this context, especially as local partner remains hamstrung by local issues.
Aceh Impact Investment	Marine	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The fisheries companies which operate in the target area (Aceh small islands) do not have the requisite governance or accountability systems that would enable investment at this stage.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Uncertainty around how continued engagement (e.g. supporting companies to develop internal systems) will deliver biodiversity outcomes. > Although some market support and advice offered, little opportunity to develop a suitably scaled and appropriate vehicle for Impact Investment
*Niassa, Mozambique (evolved into Chuilexi)	Halcyon, main grant	Partner lost mandate; re-evolved project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The huge size of the Reserve, unplanned settlement, and growth in poaching and other illegal activities made effective management a significant challenge > Loss of management mandate by partner > Although willing to form new partnership, new operator wanted exclusive management rights
*Aceh small islands	Marine	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Slow spend of 2012 grant meant it was still operating in 2014 > Ongoing challenges with regard to fundraising and long term financial sustainability > Data collected but not used to inform adaptive project design > Loss of momentum during 2015 due to changes in staffing > Concerns raised over confusions / misunderstanding over areas and status of sites protected triggered internal project audit
*Kenya south coast	Marine	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Difficulty in securing co-finance > Current levels of funding (and human resources) insufficient to be able to support implementation across this range of sites > Weaknesses in processes for co-management > Challenges with local partner resulting in temporary distancing of relationship > Loss of institutional memory through staffing changes
*Ulu Masen, Indonesia	Halcyon, strategic initiative	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Initial project conceived around large scale REDD+ project, but 2013 change in governor's office and a shift away from green focus affected all of FFI's landscape level and especially policy

			<p>work in Aceh</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Issues with original REDD+/PDD developer partner also undermined initial large-scale REDD project > Project adapted by re-focusing on village forest REDD models and reapplying to Halcyon to reallocate the funding for this, and to leverage a significant EU grant for this > Hutan desa work proving successful and building on learning from other village forest initiatives FFI's runs in Indonesia
*Sustainable Seafood Financing	Marine	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Pilot phase > Lack of uptake by banks, and significant shift in appetite within Rabobank as the primary FI partner > Hard to tackle 'illegal' aspects of any trade > Lack of transparency of structure & financing of fisheries sector > Preferred institutional response now appears to be divestment rather than driving change through performance measurement
South Sudan	Halcyon, main grant	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > We knew this one would be difficult before we started, but considered the potential gains worthwhile > We have demonstrated our commitment by staying engaged whilst others left, and this has built trust in-country; up until recently the area where we were working was less affected by the current conflict > We have had to reduce our ambition in relation to expanding fighting, and continue to operate as and how we can, but can demonstrate gains despite this > There have been substantive setbacks linked to the re-emergence of civil war, not least in the loss of the government structures that were emerging and in which we had invested time and energy > We remain conscious of safety risks and regularly update our planning, but at the moment maintain low level, low key operations in areas with lower security risk

Annex 2. Examples of tangible project learning and how this has been applied in other work within FFI

Prepared by FFI, July 2016

Projects	Things we learnt	Projects that benefited	Response	Mechanisms
Belize, Awacachi	The need for good in-country legal skills for land purchase	Madeira, Yasquel, ADEPT, Zarand	We ensured that full legal costs were written in up-front, and spent time securing and retaining good in-country legal advice from the start of the project	Same staff involved; staff-to-staff consultation and conversations; case studies captured learning
Awacachi	Challenges of multiple purchase where land is traditionally subdivided each generation	Madeira, Iberian lynx, ADEPT	We were much more aware of the challenges this causes, and this led to different solutions: in Madeira leaving the purchase to the partner (the government), in Portugal to focusing on land management rather than purchase, and in Romania to proceed with purchase but only where land ownership was fully established and blocks were big enough	Same staff involved; staff-to-staff consultation and conversations; institutionalised knowledge following Awacachi case study
Awacachi	Risks associated with partner selection	Iberian lynx, Gokova	Better assessment of partners and willingness to abandon proposed partner and find new one if risks too high	Documented history of Awacachi; staff-to-staff conversations; discussion and joint problem solving
Awacachi	Partner-related risks in land ownership	ADEPT, Romania	Learning/advice from Awacachi used to tailor the declaration of trust document for ADEPT to include clauses on addressing conflicts in the partnership, controls over the management of the	Direct consultation with staff involved in the different projects

			land, equitable allocation of costs and benefits should that become necessary, setting up of a land management committee.	
Flower Valley, Belize	The role of FFI in establishing in-country organisations and long term capacity building to independence; subtle behind-the-scenes capacity building allowing independent decision making	Many FFI projects including Nkuringo, ADEPT, Zarand, OI Pejeta, NRT, Scotland, etc.	An internalised FFI approach that is humble but supportive, and ensures local organisations are brought to the fore in these partnerships	Mentoring; role of cross-cutting teams to share experiences, especially the capacity team; part of the informal (rather than formal) induction process;
Walker Bay Conservancy	The opportunities to develop a tourism circuit and thus improve revenues all round	NRT, OI Pejeta	A similar tourism circuit design proposed	SMT awareness; same individuals involved; cross-cutting team shared of examples
NRT	The role of networks of communities in sharing resources and creating a political voice	Cardamom CCAs, Scotland coastal community project	Recognition that it's not enough to invest in individual site based CCAs, but creating networks builds resilience and economies of scale	Cross-fertilization via inter-regional team conversations and the role of the cross-cutting team in sharing examples
OI Pejeta, NRT	The role that significant anti-poaching investment can play, including the use of dogs	Borana, Chuilexi	Applying first-hand knowledge of the realities of making front-line wildlife protection work	Same staff involved; SMT awareness and aim to share experiences across projects
Niassa	Vast amounts of understanding of how conservation can operate in Niassa	Chuilexi	Well informed by the understanding drawn across from previous Niassa experience	Same staff involved and targeted recruitment of others from Niassa; SMT awareness;
Kerinci tiger project	The role of informants in reducing poaching	NRT, Chuilexi	Applying first-hand knowledge of the realities of making front-line wildlife	Internal lesson learning through reports and direct staff-

			protection work	to-staff interactions
Belize	The value of seconding staff within a partner	NRT, Chuilexi	Early recognition of the solution being a secondment despite high costs	Role of SMT level learning in informing how new initiatives are shaped; involvement of same staff in project design
NRT, Uganda	The role of ethnic community groups in promoting localised conservation	Tongwe, Philippines ancestral waters	Able to translate the experience directly to the Tongwe Trust and to the Philippines	Brought across FFI staff who'd been directly involved in other initiatives to input into these projects
South Africa Conservation Incentives	The opportunities for conservation easements established	Renosterveld	Applied the easement opportunity developed under the previous project	Staff-to-staff sharing; knowledge captured through previous reports
Chacocente	The value of strategic purchase of relatively small areas to influence wider conservation lands	Cristalino	Applied similar strategic purchase model having seen the success at Chacocente	Same staff involved; internal discussion of approach e.g. with HLS manager
South Kenya BMUs	How to ensure benefit sharing for wider community and model for receiving fees for landing sites	Pemba octopus project	Lessons learning on benefit sharing built in from the start; fees for landing site model has been proposed	Internal conversations; involvement of overlapping staff
South Kenya BMUs	Models for livelihoods development in marine ecosystems	Aceh Small Islands	Applications of some of the experiences in Kenya	Role of the CLG team in cross-pollination
Niassa	Recognition of approaches to governmental engagement and political buy in	South Sudan	Applied to the development of the S Sudan project to ensure effective governmental engagement	Same staff involved (strategic decision); SMT awareness
Business & Biodiversity Programme	Approaches to successful, non-threatening corporate engagement	Marine plastics programme	Similar approaches used initially to build trust with companies and to position us at a distance from campaigning NGOs	Direct staff mentoring; institutional knowledge of FFI's generalised

				approach
Indonesia programme	Successful engagement with campaigning NGO on logging	Marine plastics programme	Applied learning from the successful collaboration in Indonesia to give us confidence in our engagement in the microbead coalition	Staff-to-staff conversations; SMT awareness
Natural Value Initiative	Development of good understanding of how to work with and influence financial sector	Sustainable Seafood Finance	Application of history of work with the finance sector	Ongoing partnerships; staff-to-staff experience sharing
Gokova Bay	Gains from investing in renovation of co-operative facilities	Cape Verde	Replication of experience by investing in fisheries co-operative infrastructure	Same staff involved; staff to staff advice; marine working group to share experience
Flower Valley	Role of enterprise development in funding long term conservation projects	Aceh, NRT, Chacocente	Focus on local enterprise development as part of the project framework	Learning captured in case study; wider organisational recognition of potential formalised under one team who can advise others
Georgia Carnivore Project (non-Arcadia)	How to manage Human - Carnivore Conflict	Zarand	We used the experiences and lessons from the Human Wildlife Conflict approach delivered in Georgia (2009-2012) to shape the proposal and then activities delivered in Zarand (2013 – to date).	Awareness of what one project had delivered within same region, and more generally across the organisation and ease of contacting staff internally for advice
Aceh Small Islands	Socio-economic monitoring and evaluation using SOCMON (www.socmon.org) and How Is Your MPA Doing?	Cambodia, Myanmar and Belize	Aceh was the first project site where we trialled SOCMON, lessons learnt were subsequently applied when supporting other marine projects. This included a recognition of the need for better support on data management and	Several lessons learnt were documented and shared in a case study document (on MyFFI); also direct sharing of experience by Conservation Livelihoods and Governance

			<p>statistical analysis and learning also used to inform new project design and implementation e.g. Myeik Archipelago (such as tailoring community engagement approach for different socio-economic contexts of different island communities; engaging additional expertise in participatory approaches to LMMA development). Additionally learning from Aceh of the tendency of project teams to focus on household surveys rather than mixed methods/triangulation led to greater emphasis on the latter in Cambodia. This led, among other things, to greater participation of women in the MPA design process in Cambodia. In addition, since Aceh team sometimes struggled to understand how SOCMON data would be useful for MPA design and management, and the relationship between socio-economic, governance and biological monitoring, more emphasis was placed on integrating the 3 types of data in the work in Cambodia.</p>	<p>team; role of marine working group to share approach and learning</p>
<p>Conservation Livelihoods Team incl. work in</p>	<p>Need to adopt a Participatory Market Systems Development</p>	<p>Applied in same project and at other</p>	<p>Learning from numerous examples (FFI and others) of where 'livelihoods</p>	<p>Role of Conservation Livelihoods team in sharing</p>

Kepayang, Jambi	approach	sites in Indonesia	projects' have failed due to insufficient understanding of the market system has informed our work on economic aspects of livelihoods (i.e., adapting a PMSD approach).	good practice
Siawan-Belida, Indonesia	REDD+ Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment	West Kalimantan, Indonesia	Able to develop a theory of change with local stakeholders, including participatory design of an equitable benefit-sharing mechanism using experience from original site	Staff member participated in SBIA training relating to first site and then was able to transfer to site in West Kalimantan
OI Pejeta	Application of Social Assessment of Protected Areas manual	A number of other FFI sites	SAPA was initially piloted in OI Pejeta, which were then used to further refine the methodology for use in other FFI (and non-FFI) sites.	Direct application of a new methodology which has been actively shared across FFI teams
Ya'axché organisational support programme		Institutional strengthening to Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and Sustainable Development of Belize	Part of our strategic planning process includes a situation analysis, to contextualise their work and help selecting strategic priorities. Whilst going through this activity with Ya'axché Conservation Trust in November 2015, it became clear that this is not enough, as an increasing number of our partners has a livelihoods/social focus. From then on we have started to more explicitly link biodiversity targets to consequent ecosystem services, and human wellbeing. This has proven to be effective in ensuring all aspects of our partners' work are	Partner support programme transferring examples and experience between projects

			reflected in the diagram when identifying strategic objectives and has now been applied with several NGO partners.	
Cambodia University capacity building project; Tajikistan capacity Building project	Design of courses	Liberia capacity building project	Information was shared about how we had set things up in the Cambodia University project. We shared written resources from Cambodia and Tajikistan and all this influenced project design.	Information was sought directly from the Cambodia team and the Tajikistan team and individuals from both teams provided a lot of support in the development of the Liberia project; document sharing; direct discussions with the Cambodia team
Conservation Leadership Programme, other cross-cutting and regional projects	Training module development	Capacity building project, Tajikistan	The materials for this project were built using experience from previous/current projects elsewhere. Training modules were adapted from other projects and we used materials we had developed for things like the CLP project design workshops.	Ideas and examples requested from across the organisation – both from regional and cross-cutting teams
REDD Indonesia, REDD Vietnam		Norad-funded REDD+ project, Liberia	The design of the whole programme of work is based on lessons from our work in Indonesia and Vietnam. We have specifically set it up with staff working across those countries rather than silo-ing geographically. Specifically, learning from Indonesia on the legal and political side of REDD+ has	Role of the Conservation Finance and Enterprise team in providing expertise and sharing experience between different countries REDD projects. An FFI Global Learning Event some years ago brought

			<p>already enabled us, and helped us help the government learn about key issues. There are continued activities within that project to ensure that type of learning continues. In addition, more basic learning relating to implementation of standards, challenges of securing tenure, models for benefit sharing, good practice for FPIC has already been shared between these projects.</p>	<p>together teams from different countries (including from countries with less developed REDD+ work to share experiences and a set of learning papers were shared from thus.</p>
Rapid Response Facility	The important niche of responsive funding to conservation emergencies	Development of the Species Emergency Fund	Internal sharing of opinions influencing grant development	Regular consultation between grant managers; SMT awareness; one individual providing oversight of different funds and ensuring discussions and learning
Halcyon Land & Sea grant management processes	Recognising the value of legacy reporting, etc.	Arcadia marine programme, Segre Conservation Fund, Species Fund	Building on existing grant management structures but adding value by integrating technical staff time	Same individuals involved; group discussions between internal and external grant managers to share experiences