

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Global Wildlife Conservation and the Saola Working Group
Project Title:	Conservation Through Collaboration: The 3 rd Meeting of the Saola Working Group
Date of Report:	28 August 2013
Report Author and Contact Information	William Robichaud, PO Box 129, Austin, TX 78767 USA, saolawg@gmail.com

CEPF Region: Indo-Burma

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

Strategic Direction 3: "Engage key actors in reconciling biodiversity conservation and development objectives, with a particular emphasis on the Northern Limestone Highlands and Mekong River and its major tributaries".

Grant Amount: \$16,610

Project Dates: 1 June – 31 July 2013

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

The following organizations contributed both travel and staff time (salary) for their staff to attend the Saola Working Group meeting; three of these participants are members of the Cattle and Camelid Technical Advisory Group of the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria (EAZA):

Banham Zoo (UK)
Borneo Rhino Alliance (Malaysia)
Royal Zoological Society of Scotland/Highland Park Zoo
San Diego Zoo
Bronx Zoo/Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)
Zoological Society of London

The following organizations contributed staff time for their staff to attend the meeting:

Institute of Ecology and Biological Resources (Vietnam)
IUCN SSC Asian Species Action Partnership (ASAP)
Kunming Institute of Zoology
Lao Department of Forest Resources Management
Nam Theun Watershed Management & Protection Authority (and Lao Wildlife Conservation Association)
Rhino Foundation of Indonesia
Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute
Vinh University
WCS Lao Program
WWF Greater Mekong Programme

Conservation Impacts

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

First, the project contributed significantly to a collaborative strategy for conservation of one of 12 Critically Endangered mammals in the ecoregion, under the CEPF species outcomes focus and priority.

Second, the meeting will have significant influence on the ecosystem profile's new Strategic Direction 3, "Strengthen management effectiveness at protected areas as a tool to conserve priority key biodiversity areas".

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project against the expected results detailed in the approved proposal.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected:

Species Conserved:

Corridors Created:

We are pleased to report that each main objective listed in the Lol was reached during the meeting. Specifically:

- The SWG defined a saola protection goal for priority sites.
- The SWG reached a decision on saola captive management, and has drafted a statement on this decision, which is still under revision by the SWG, and will be released soon.
- The SWG developed a clear plan and survey protocols for intensive surveys in 2013/2014 to test various methods to detect saola.

In addition, we introduced several international technical partners, who have expertise in captive management, to Laos, and gave them their first looks at the Annamites, and their initial first-hand views of the opportunities and constraints to endangered species conservation in the ecoregion.

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

As usual, the main challenge was finding meeting dates that everyone could attend. We did not quite succeed, but we did well.

The main successes came from the power of assembling a group of dedicated and knowledgeable people, and facilitating them to spend several days together in complete focus on one topic - in this case, saola conservation. It's the match, or the spark, that ignited all the action that will follow.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

We did not see any negative impacts.

The most positive unexpected results were two national saola meetings, one in Laos and one in Vietnam, which Lao and Vietnamese members of the SWG, respectively, organized on their own initiative, with the purpose of preparing and collecting input for the SWG meeting (see more below). In Vietnam, the organizers even found their own funding for their national meeting (from the IUCN SCC ASAP). Without prior coordination, and by remarkable coincidence, the meetings

were held on the same day, 24 May 2013, about ten days before the SWG meeting; one in Dong Hoi, Vietnam, and one in Pakxan, Laos.

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)

At previous SWG meetings, just the SWG members met first for a few days of technical discussions. This would be followed by a couple of days of a much larger meeting, with a wider array of stakeholders, especially from the meeting's host country, variably Laos or Vietnam.

This year, we tried something different. An SWG member from Laos pointed out that Lao participants sometimes feel intimidated from expressing their views at large, multi-lingual meetings. She suggested convening instead an all-Lao national saola meeting, held in advance of the SWG meeting, where Lao stakeholders would feel freer to give their honest input.

An SWG member in Vietnam conceived of the same concept independently. As a result, instead of large, multi-stakeholder at the end of the SWG meeting, we helped Lao and Vietnamese SWG members convene national saola meetings in advance. The results of these meetings were then presented to and fed into the SWG meeting.

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

At our meetings, we need to get better at identifying someone suitable to record the main points of discussion and decisions reached as the meeting progresses. We didn't quite find the right formula at the two previous SWG meetings, and were still left searching for it at this one.

The model of holding separate national saola meetings before the SWG meeting (instead of tacking on a large, multi-stakeholder meeting onto the end) seemed to work well, and we may repeat it at future SWG meetings.

One of the most important outputs of the SWG meeting, the one that best insures that the meeting will translate into more conservation on the ground, is the 12-month SWG worklist we drafted at the end of the meeting, with participants assigned specific tasks and dates of completion and follow-up. This is the mechanism that translates the meeting's good ideas into action.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

We have learned that zoos make excellent supporters of single species conservation programs. There are at least four reasons for this:

1. The wish of zoos to show their zoo visitors that they are working to conserve animals in the wild, not just exhibit them at the zoo.

2. Zoos are run by 'animal people', who are already convinced of the need for species conservation.
3. Zoos understand well the need for consistent core operating support (they need it themselves to feed their animals every day).
4. Along with financial support, zoos can also provide technical support, on issues such as captive management.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
Copenhagen Zoo	A	\$2,000	
Fauna & Flora International	A	\$500	
Leipzig Zoo	A	\$3,908	
Natural History Museum of Denmark	A	\$1,000	
Natural History Museum of Denmark	B	\$4,000	
San Diego Zoo	A	\$2,000	
Wildlife Conservation Society	A	\$5,000	
ZGAP	A	\$3,901	
EAZA	C	\$40,000	Contributed in part due to our engagement with European zoos, which was deepened by three members of EAZA attending the meeting.

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

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF 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 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.

The main lesson-learned from past CEPF-funded SWG meetings is the paramount importance of ending the meeting by drafting a detailed, specific worklist to move the results and decisions of the meeting forward on the ground. It's a lesson we applied to this meeting, and implementation of the worklist is now under way.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

Some of the external participants that came from the United States and Europe, by attending the meeting, were visited Indochina for the first time and commented how much they learned from their visit. In particular about what is needed to support the SWG in its work in Laos and Vietnam. They left Laos with new perspectives and new awareness they didn't have before they arrived. This was a valuable and somewhat unexpected outcome of the meeting (especially the field trip at the end of the meeting).

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

No actions were required.

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, 2012 to June 30, 2013. (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.	Not immediately relevant			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?	n/a			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.	Likely, but not possible to know yet.			We set specific saola protection goals to be applied to Hue Saola Nature Reserve, Quang Nam Saola NR, Bach Mach National Park Extension, Pu Mat NP, Xe Sap National Protected Area, Nakai-Nam Theun NPA, and Phou Sithon Endangered Species Conservation Area.
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Likely, but not possible to measure yet.			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	n/a			

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

Additional Comments/Recommendations

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.ceph.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: William Robichaud

Organization name: Saola Working Group, and Global Wildlife Conservation

Mailing address: PO Box 129, Austin TX 78767-0129, USA

Tel: 512-537-8951

Fax:

E-mail: saolawg@gmail.com