

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

| | |
|--|---|
| Organization Legal Name: | Center for Environmental and Rural Development (CERD) |
| Project Title: | Moving from planning to action to save the Saola: The second meeting of the Saola Working Group. |
| Date of Report: | 30th May 2011 |
| Report Author and Contact Information | Dr Cao Tien Trung - Vice dean of Biology Faculty, Vinh University 182 Le Duan street, Vinh city, Nghe An province, Vietnam Email: trungctbio@yahoo.com; Tel: 0383.855697/0383.592409 Mobil: 0903446646. Fax: 0383.520570 |

CEPF Region: IndoBurman Hotspot (Indochina Region)

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

Grant Amount: \$16,956.8

Project Dates: For meetings held April 21-27, 2011.

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner): IUCN/SSC Saola Working Group - principal organizer of the agenda and reporter of outputs. WWF-Vietnam Programme: Organizer of 2nd half of meeting in Hue. Thua -Thien Hue Province (DARD): co-host for 2nd half of meeting in Hue.

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile. Saola is probably the most globally endangered mammal in the ecosystem. This second meeting of the SWG was another major spur forward for concrete actions to conserve the species.

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

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: n/a

Species Conserved: don't know yet

Corridors Created: n/a

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

There was some difficulty finding a meeting date workable for all key participants. Not all SWG members were able to attend.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Yes! The European Association of Zoos and Aquaria (EAZA) sent an observer to the Hue portion of the meeting (Dr. Carl Traeholt). In his draft report to EAZA, he has recommended that EAZA

immediately put a substantial amount of funding into Saola, particularly for priority research (several hundred thousand US\$), and maintain significant funding for at least five years.

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.

The most significant lessons were learned in the course of the first SWG meeting in 2009. Those lessons were successfully applied in many cases to this meeting (mainly, about including a wider range of stakeholders).

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

The SWG meetings seemed destined to have two foci (which are not always compatible): focused technical discussion and problem-solving, and the building of stakeholder support for proposed solutions. The best way forward seems to be to continue to hold the meeting in two halves, with different compositions of participants.

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

Nothing major to report.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

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 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| EAZA | A | \$4000 | |
| Copenhagen Zoo | A | EUR 2000 | |
| Leipzig Zoo | A | \$2000 | |
| Zool. Soc. London | A | \$1000 | |
| Wildlife Conservation Network | A | \$1000 | |
| Friends of Banham Zoo | A | GBP 500 | |
| Givskud Zoo | A | EUR 995 | |
| Vinh University | A | \$5000 | |
| WWF Greater Mekong | A | approx \$2000 | |

****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.

It is too early to know if the achievements of the meeting will be sustained or not. But we believe that the meeting will go a long way to improving the chances of sustainability of Saola conservation.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

The interest at least expressed by the EAZA observer in providing substantial funding is great hope for sustainability.

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

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, 2010 to June 30, 2011. (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. | Don't know | | | 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? | Don't know yet | | | 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. | Perhaps. | | | |
| 4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares. | no | | | |
| 5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below. | no | | | |

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: | | | | Improved 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 | Payment for environmental services | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Dr Cao Tien Trung

Organization name: Center for Environmental and Rural Development (CERD)

Mailing address: trungctbio@yahoo.com

Tel: 0383.855697/0383592409

Fax:0383.520570

E-mail: trungctbio@yahoo.com