

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Fauna and Flora International
Project Title:	Mitigating transboundary illegal wildlife trade in Central Vietnam to protect 16 CEPF Priority Species in Nakai Nam Theun National Protected Area, Lao P.D.R.
Date of Report:	December 2013
Report Author and Contact Information	Dr Stephen Browne Director of Operations, Asia-Pacific Fauna & Flora International Singapore 354 Tanglin Road, Tanglin International Centre #01-15, Tanglin Block Singapore 247672 Stephen.browne@fauna-flora.org

CEPF Region: Indo-Burma

Strategic Direction: 1. Safeguard priority globally threatened species in Indochina by mitigating major threats.

Grant Amount: US\$124,981

Project Dates: 1 April, 2011 to 31 July, 2013

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):

Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) provided international technical support on wildlife enforcement training and field coordination in Ha Tinh and Quang Binh Provinces.

PanNature organized a journalists workshops to increase accurate media coverage on the issue of illegal cross-border trade in this area.

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal):

Increased and stabilized populations of 16 CEPF listed species within Nakai Nam Theun National Protected Area, corridors and contiguous protected areas in Lao P.D.R. and Vietnam by effective mitigation of wildlife trade threats.

Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:

It is hoped that as a direct result of this project more people better informed about the problems associated with wildlife trade and that government agencies are better able to work collaboratively across the Vietnamese/Lao border to reduce wildlife crimes. As much of the benefits from this project are from increased knowledge and capacity only time will tell if this has resulted in better management, law

enforcement and reporting, and as a result improves the conservation status of species in the area in the longer-term.

Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal):

A solid understanding of the socio-economy of buffer zone indigenous communities in Vietnam immediately adjacent to Nakai Nam Theun National Protected Area

A strong understanding of the (illegal) entry points from Vietnam into Nakai Nam Theun NPA

Increased capacity of key enforcement agencies in Ha Tinh Province for effective wildlife trade mitigation

Greater awareness by journalists and the general public in Vietnam regarding the values of Nakai Nam Theun NPA and the threats from illegal transboundary wildlife trade

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

As a result of this project we now have improved understanding of overall land-use/land tenure an assessment of socio-economics of the buffer zone villages inside Vietnam and information from market surveys on wildlife for 16 communes within 15 km of the international border

We are now better informed about access routes into Nakai Nam Theun NPA and the enforcement presence within 15 km of the international boundary.

Sixteen commune conservation profiles have been developed with maps providing information on land-use and land tenure, population centres and market surveys for wildlife, location of wildlife threats, access routes into Nakai Nam Theun NPA and enforcement presence.

Intensive training workshop has hopefully built the capacity of various officials from a variety of relevant agencies. Additionally a range of meetings have shared ideas, built capacity and laid the foundations for collaboration. The training and discussions involved Anti-smuggling and the National Vietnam Wildlife Enforcement, the CITES Management Authority Vietnam -WEN (Wildlife Enforcement Network), the Vietnam Directorate of Forestry and WCS-Vietnam, plus numerous national, provincial and district agencies. Hopefully ideas were exchanged and lessons learnt from a field visit to illegal wildlife trade hot points in Ha Tinh Province, including Road No. 8 and the Cau Treo border-gate check-points.

The project supported the delivery of two journalist training workshops that were attended by over 80 people including around 50 journalists. This resulted in at least 31 articles in various local media.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected:

Species Conserved: Up to 16 species should be better conserved as a result of reduced wildlife trade.

Corridors Created:

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.

Key successes were:

- Collecting important information relevant to tackling wildlife trade over such a large area and in a transboundary context.
- Developing 16 commune conservation profiles
- Organizing and facilitating a training workshop that was so well attended by relevant stakeholders, and receiving positive feedback that the training was appropriate.
- Organizing a wide range of meetings involving such a diverse and highly relevant range of agencies.
- Facilitating transboundary cooperation.
- Organizing such well attended journalist workshops that result in significant media coverage.

Challenges included:

- Running a project that involved so many stakeholders, which were sometime difficult to coordinate.
- Encouraging agencies to become engaged, when direct payments to them were not available and funding to develop the work was limited or non-existent.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

No

Project Components

Project Components: *Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

Component 1 Planned:

An assessment conducted of land-use and land tenure, population centres and market surveys for wildlife, access routes into Nakai Nam Theun NPA and enforcement presence within 15 km of the international boundary

Component 1 Actual at Completion:

An assessment report of 12 project communes and other 4 additional communes was produced on the overall land-use/land tenure, a general socio-economic assessment of the buffer zone villages inside Vietnam, and a section on market surveys on wildlife, all within 15 km of the international border

A report that partly assessed access routes into Nakai Nam Theun NPA (roads, tracks and major access trails and paths; and enforcement presence (checkpoints, stations, barriers) within 15 km of the international boundary. Sixteen commune conservation profiles were also developed with maps of commune were edited which contain information of land-use and land tenure, population centres and market surveys for wildlife, location of wildlife threats, access routes into Nakai Nam Theun NPA and enforcement presence. These commune profiles are additional outputs/products of this project.

A report produced to review provincial law enforcement and trade records, as well as any provincial MoUs and directives. This reviewed the provincial level of Forest Protection Departments of Ha Tinh Province and Quang Binh Province in 2012, as well as providing updated information for 2013. Two separated reports in Vietnamese were compiled and a combined report in English language of these two reports was also developed.

A report produced on FFI Compliance with CEPF Social Safeguards Policies for CEPF

Component 2 Planned:

B.) A single multi-agency training program undertaken for Ha Tinh provincial law enforcement agencies in wildlife trade control.

This component will be undertaken through a subgrant to the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) Vietnam.

Component 2 Actual at Completion:

A four-day (15-18 May 2012) intensive training workshop was delivered to an inter-agency group in Vinh City for 37 participants from six key law enforcement agencies from Ha Tinh and Quang Binh Provinces. The participants included Ha Tinh Province Customs (5), the Border Army (7), Provincial and District Forest Protection Department (7), the Vu Quang National Park (7), Environmental Police (7), Market Control Officers (2) and Quang Binh Provincial Forest Protection Department (2). Many local and national newspapers provided positive reporting of this training workshop. A report was prepared by WCS in English and Vietnamese. The report is available from a number of NGOs in Vietnam, including WCS Vietnam, FFI Vietnam, Birdlife Vietnam, the Vu Quang National Park (and provincial agencies) and PanNature.

Component 3 Planned:

C) Two joint-meetings of Committee 127 on Anti-smuggling and the National Vietnam Wildlife Enforcement Network held in Ha Tinh Town.

This component will be undertaken through a subgrant to the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) Vietnam

Component 3 Actual at Completion:

On 24 August 2012, a joint meeting was hosted by the CITES Management Authority Vietnam -WEN (Wildlife Enforcement Network) with support from the Vietnam Directorate of Forestry and WCS-Vietnam. Thirty-two participants attended from central and provincial level WEN agencies and NGOs. There were two sessions, including an indoor session where participants presented and discussed various issues concerning wildlife crimes, as well as drafting a plan to address trans-national wildlife crime. The meeting also provided opportunity to identify mechanisms for interagency cooperation in order to improve the province's wildlife law enforcement effectiveness. The second session was a field visit to illegal wildlife trade hot points in Ha Tinh Province, including Road No. 8 and the Cau Treo border-gate check-points.

The issue of cross-border wildlife trade was the core topic in the meeting. One representative from the NNT2 WMPA (Nakai Nam Theun 2 Watershed Management Protection Authority) was invited to join this meeting; the presence of Laotian colleagues stressed how important transboundary cooperation is to resolving problems concerning illegal wildlife trade.

The second LE Strategy Development meeting was scheduled in February 2013, based on meetings and discussion between the project partners (FFI, WCS, PanNature and local partners) that it will be ideal that the second workshop is held in May 2013 once WCS will have more solid data on wildlife crimes status based on the on-going activity in Ha Tinh Province and this plan also fitted better the workplan of local partners. It was agreed by the project partners that FFI will take the lead to request for extending the project implementation duration which would have allowed this to be completed. However, despite these discussions and agreements, all sides could not come to a conclusion for an agreement for joint-action plan although many joint-activities were identified. It was agreed that the discussion will be resumed when there's clear signal of financial resources for the joint-activities.

Despite the best efforts of WCS, who worked hard to try and organise the 2nd Strategic LE workshop within the project's lifetime, the workshop was not implemented, despite CEPF granting two no-cost-extensions (4 months of extension). As the project needed to be closed down and as the donor was rightly unwilling to grant any further extensions, the final workshop was not held as planned.

Component 4 Planned:

D.) Three transboundary liaison meetings held each year between the provincial authorities in Quang Binh and Ha Tinh Provinces with the provincial authorities of Khammouane Province and the Watershed Management and Protection Authority (WMPA).

*This activity will not be carried out under the amended CEPF budget. However it is expected that the WMPA may finance this activity through providing matching funds

Component 4 Actual at Completion:

The project facilitated a meeting (4 days from 7th to 10th August 2012) between the authorities of the Nakai Nam Thuen WMPA, Khammouane Province and Districts of Khamkeut and Nakai in Ha Tinh Province for the purpose of strengthening transboundary cooperation on wildlife conservation between the two provinces/two nature reserves and districts. The agreed key objectives of the meeting/visit to meet the authorities of Vu Quang National Park and Ha Tinh Provincial institutions:

- To review and update the status wildlife conservation of the reserves and revisit the Cooperative Action Plan between Ha Tinh-Quang Binh (Vietnam) and Bolikhamxay-Khammouane (Lao PDR) to control illegal transboundary hunting, trading and transporting of wild fauna and flora (period: 2005-2010) and identify any lessons learnt.
- To share experiences on biodiversity conservation and promotion of the sustainable livelihoods.
- To discuss on challenges, obstacles and opportunities.
- To discuss and produce a written agreement on transboundary cooperation on wildlife conservation and action planning.

A MoU was signed by the two parties for the future transboundary cooperation and some key points that were discussed and agreed upon in the MoU where that:

- Both parties highlighted and acknowledged the shortcomings in the management of the two protected areas, in terms of illegal logging, poaching and wildlife trade and trafficking along the borders, which is still prevailing in the areas under the management of both sides, causing continued loss of biodiversity
- Both protected area management boards proposed to the two provincial authorities to include the issue of trans-boundary biodiversity conservation in the agenda of high-level annual meetings of the two provinces.
- Both parties will support each other in calling for the financial and technical support from international organizations and NGOs for the purposes of nature conservation and sustainable development of the two protected areas and its surrounding areas.
- Both parties will request better cooperation of the provincial institutional agencies in strengthening of control of trans-boundary wildlife trade and trafficking as well as enforce the prevention and control of illegal logging, poaching, trading and transporting of illegal timbers and wildlife in each provincial area and at the border gates.
- Both parties agreed to conduct a meeting in a near future to discuss in details for a joint-action plan with the technical and financial support of FFI.

The project has been successfully bridging the two PAs as well as institutional agencies of the two provinces and districts of Laos and Vietnam, which this is the first time of the such level of transboundary cooperation was reached between the two provinces and the two protected areas since the senior meeting back in 2004.

Although the cooperation of the two provinces and the two protected areas has just started with meetings and written agreement, no-actual work has happened on the ground yet, but this start has helped to establish good foundation for the future collaboration on biodiversity conservation. This is a new area of cooperation at the local level of the two countries (Laos and Vietnam) since the legislative framework for cross-border cooperation have been established at national level.

During the period there have been discussions between the FFI project team, the Vu Quang NP and the NNT WMPA for a joint-action agreement, but all sides could not come to a conclusion for an agreement for joint-action plan. This is despite a number of joint activities being identified, such as joint-biodiversity research, joint-threat assessments and monitoring, synchronisation of law enforcement reporting system, Joint-planning of law enforcement activities, cross-border liaison meetings of different levels, joint-training, trans- protocol for boundary cooperation on biodiversity conservation. Unfortunately, the Vietnamese parties did not appear with a secured financial plan for the joint-actions, but NNT WMPA has already budgeted US\$ 15,000/year for the cross-border activities (however the NNT WMPA's budget is limited to their own expenditures only). The parties agreed not to develop a joint-action plan for now since there's no clear signal of availability of financial resources, this decision was made to avoid producing a "paper-plan for paper-joint action" as experienced nine years ago with a joint agreement of four provinces for LE action plan, but with no financial resources allocated for the implementation of the plan. It was agreed that the discussion will be resumed when there's clear signal of financial resources for the joint-activities

Component 5 Planned:

E) Two journalist workshops organized for local Vietnamese journalists to increase accurate media coverage on the issue of illegal cross-border trade in this area.

This component will be undertaken through a subgrant to PanNature.

Component 5 Actual at Completion:

The first journalist workshop was held in Ha Tinh from the 29-30 August 2012. Sixty-nine participants attended the workshop, 35 of which were journalists, 23 were from government institutions and 11 were from NGOs. Dr. Chanthavy Vongkhamheng, a senior scientific researcher from Laos attended to present the findings of his work looking at illegal cross-border wildlife activities to the Vietnamese audiences. There have been at least 22 articles in various local media published on illegal wildlife trade since the workshop (published by many important news agencies, such as the People, Vietnam Plus... with millions of readers). A report was compiled by PanNature and disseminated.

A one-day meeting was held in Hanoi on 23rd July 2013, 22 participants and reporters from 15 organizations and media agencies attended the meeting. The key contents that were presented and discussed in the meeting were: (a) update about status of wildlife trade in Ha Tinh, (b) Challenges to journalist to invest and write about wildlife trade, (c) Wildlife trade online in Vietnam, (d) update on Consumption of Rhino horn in Vietnam. Nine articles about the meeting were published in the national newspapers and Investigation story about the field investigations was also published and re-published by many national and local newspapers. Reports were compiled by PanNature

Were any components unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

The 2nd Strategic LE workshop was not implemented within the project's lifetime although CEPF did grant two no-cost-extensions (4 months of extension). The impact of this is limited because despite there being extensive discussions and agreements, all sides could not come to a conclusion for an agreement for joint-action plan although many joint-activities were identified. It was agreed that the discussion will be resumed when there's clear signal of financial resources for the joint-activities. Achieving these clear signals and progress is beyond the scope of this project

Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

The first lesson learned was to obtain the participation of Government staff in the implementation of the project on a non-payment basis. Usually a non-allowance based implementation is very difficult to be implemented in areas where the Government officials have insufficient allocation of human resources and financial resources for their field operations. This is in spite of the project activities being not far from their official mandates, but they seem reluctant to undertake the additional work. Understanding their action plan and priorities as well as their strengths and weaknesses is key to achieve this shared partnership.

An operational plan developed in partnership with the local partner based upon an analysis will ensure the participation of the local partners in implementation. Additionally, by making them to participate in the project planning and implementation then it will help to establish "soft institution" in the governance of forest resource protection.

Two project activities were delayed throughout the project period. Arising from this was the first lesson which was that the uncompleted outputs can have knock on effects. In the case of the first strategic LE planning workshop, the project would have pushed for an official and approved LE strategy and action plan as this document could be the basis in enabling the implementation of actual activities. Vietnamese officials are very much used to having clear plans and play their roles within the margins of the legislative enabled framework. The 2nd lesson was the need of flexibility and adaptability to the actual situation within project progress. Once we were aware that the 2nd strategic LE planning workshop was not be going to happen in the planned period, then the team needed to adapt to the situation and should have not waited to combine two events together which could risk of failure of deliver project activity (ie the 2nd journalist meeting).

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

Quang Binh and Ha Tinh Province are the main provinces where forest products of Lao PDR enter Vietnam for its market and re-export to other countries, of which China is reported as the principal destination. Revenues from taxes, fees and other services are the key incomes of the provinces, furthermore Ha Tinh Province has very limited trans-boundary exchanges with Laos.

Additional Funding

Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of the CEPF investment in this project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

**Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:*

- A Project co-financing (Other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project.)*
- C Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Sustainability/Replicability

Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.

Based on the work undertaken and from the final assessments, the project team believes that to sustainably achieve the targets of mitigating transboundary illegal wildlife trade, as well as reducing threats on biodiversity in the project areas in the long-term, an integration of approaches is needed. Based on FFI's experiences gained from other projects in the region, which involve collaborative management approaches, community-based and joint-patrolling, biodiversity surveys and monitoring, livelihoods enhancement and the sharing of these approaches we believe we have made significant progress towards embedding some of these concepts within the relevant authorities and contributing towards sustainability of this project's activities. The concept of good governance were introduced to the project local partners as alternative approaches for the long-term and sustainable conservation in this areas

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

N/A

Safeguard Policy Assessment

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

N/A

Additional Comments/Recommendations

None

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Dr Stephen Browne

Organization name: Fauna & Flora International

Mailing address: Fauna & Flora International Singapore, 354 Tanglin Road, Tanglin International Centre, #01-15, Tanglin Block, Singapore 247672

Tel: +65 64736208

Fax:

E-mail: stephen.browne@fauna-flora.org

*****If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages*****

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets

(Enter Grant Term)

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.				Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?				Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.				

If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics							Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit												
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased Income due to:			Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance.	Other
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities									
Total																				

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit:

