

## CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

### I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** World Wildlife Fund, Inc

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Safeguarding Globally Threatened and Lesser Known Species in the Eastern Himalayas: Small Grants for species conservation in Nepal and Bhutan

**Implementation Partners for this Project:**

The Small Grants Program was implemented in Bhutan and Nepal with assistance and guidance of several partner organizations comprising of both government and non-government organizations.

In Nepal the small grant advisory committee was not a formal body but a group of experts mainly members of the IUCN Species Specialist Group, academicians, experts and conservation practitioners as well as the WWF representative and a representative of the CEPF Regional Team:

In Bhutan, the small grants partners comprised of a formal group who helped in reviewing proposals, providing technical feedback and in selecting the grants to be funded. The National Advisory Committee for the CEPF large grants assisted and guided in implementing this initiative. The organizations included: Representatives from Ministry Of Agriculture, Department of Aid and Debt Management, Royal University of Bhutan, National Environment Commission, UNDP-GEF Small Grants Program, Bhutan, Royal Society for Protection of Nature and WWF Bhutan Program.

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** 1 September, 2007- 31 December, 2010

**Date of Report (month/year):** 4 March 2011

### II. OPENING REMARKS

*Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.*

WWF/CEPF small grant program was initiated in 2007 to provide grants to civil society organizations to work towards safeguarding globally threatened species of the Eastern Himalayas. These investments were primarily made to generate reliable scientific information on key floral and faunal species to improve their conservation status. The information generated was expected to fill critical data/information gaps particularly of lesser studied species which would contribute to updating their status in the global context (IUCN Red Data Book). The Small Grants Program expected to achieve this by enhancing the capacity and participation of a wider group of civil society organizations by involving them in the projects.

A total of 45 grants (Bhutan=17; 28=Nepal) were awarded to individuals and Non Government/Civil Society Organizations. Of these 14 were for research and survey of mammals, 8 on birds, 5 on plants and 6 (amphibians=3; reptiles=2; fishes=1) and 12 other action oriented research of Nepal ranging from key species focused researches to action oriented projects. In Nepal the grants included 4 Critically Endangered 6 Endangered species and 9 Vulnerable species. In Bhutan the grants included 4 Critically Endangered species, 6 Endangered species and 5 Vulnerable species.

### III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT IMPACTS

**Project Impacts:**

**Long Term:** To improve the status of key floral and faunal species and their habitat by management actions/regimes based on adequate and reliable scientific knowledge in prioritized sites and corridors of the Eastern Himalayas of Bhutan and Nepal.

**Short Term:** Aid civil society groups in Bhutan and Nepal to become actively engaged in the conservation of key species and their habitat through partnerships/leverage, research and well informed decision making mechanisms

**Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.**

With the 45 small grants that were implemented in Bhutan and Nepal a large number and diverse group of civil society groups in the region were able to participate in the conservation of threatened species and habitats in the region.

One of the key successes of CEPF small grant program was that it has been able to engage diverse civil society groups and individuals in conservation of key species and their habitat. This is not only because of the accessibility but also due flexible grant process that each grant were conscientiously allotted to the key species and sites needing prompt action and funding support. The small grant program has helped in replicating and up scaling number of successful projects both supported by CEPF and other funding agencies. In addition the small grant program has brought scientists, academics, policy makers and students under one platform to share information and lesson learned and helped policy maker to reassess the status of species and action needed for their conservation.

Some examples are:

- Scaling up and replication of successful projects (Gharial, vulture) -In Nepal the Vulture conservation project implemented through small grant support was upscaled to core grant project covering 10 Districts of Western Nepal

- Core grant of CEPF linked with the small grants (red panda)

- Community forest user group adopted anti poaching as one of the key activities in the operational plans

- Habitat of Amphibian in three key sites and vulture in 2 key areas improved

- Data base and account of critically endangered, endangered, vulnerable and lesser known species such as bat, amphibians, turtle, and small carnivores established and shared among the scientific and local communities and government partners so as to enhance informed decision making for policy formulation, implementation and feedback.

- Awareness on species and its status improved among the community

**Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?**

**No**

**IV. PROJECT COMPONENTS**

**Project Components:**

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: A systematic, effective and transparent mechanism for management of CEPF Small Grants program to conserve	

<p><b>key species and their habitats developed and in place in Bhutan and Nepal.</b></p>	
<p><i>Indicator 1.1: A national level advisory committee comprising of representatives from government, NGOs and academia with clear Terms of Reference put in place within 1 month of project implementation</i></p>	<p>-In Bhutan the existing National Advisory Committee comprising of members from the government departments, academia, non-government with clear Terms of Reference was used to serve as the key partner in implementing the Small Grants program in the country.</p> <p>-In Nepal due to the diversity of the project proposals and concepts and comparatively more active civil society involvement the requirement of specialists for review was diverse. Therefore members of the IUCN Species Specialist Groups, national and international level experts were directly contacted were proposal review and evaluation and these were used for selecting the projects. Therefore in Nepal an informal advisory body was used.</p>
<p><i>Indicator 1.2: A mechanism and guidelines for implementation of small grants program in Nepal and Bhutan developed within 1 month of project implementation</i></p>	<p>-The Regional Implementation Team developed a clear mechanism and guidelines for small grant implementation before the project inception. This included a document which outlined the background, objectives, outcomes, geographical extent, priorities for funding (complete list of species and sites), implementation modality, application procedure (template for proposals and budget), eligibility, amount of grant available and contacts. This was available online in the WWF/CEPF website for the potential grantees to access and the announcement for receiving grants was also made public.</p>
<p><i>Indicator 1.3: A section of the CEPF Eastern Himalaya website (<a href="http://www.panda.org/easternhimalayas/cepf">www.panda.org/easternhimalayas/cepf</a>) hosted in WWF website (<a href="http://www.pande.org">www.pande.org</a>) devoted to CEPF small grants to enhance transparency and information dissemination by Year 1 of the project.</i></p>	<p>-A separate website (<a href="http://www.panda.org/easternhimalayas/cepf">www.panda.org/easternhimalayas/cepf</a>) for small grant was developed and hosted WWF website (<a href="http://www.pande.org">www.pande.org</a>). The website comprises of a short description of the small grants and was regularly updated with new information on grants. Significant achievements by any of the grants were also featured in the quarterly newsletter of the CEPF program.</p>
<p><b>Output 2: 4 Critically Endangered and 14 Endangered species found in Nepal and Bhutan identified in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile receive small grants support aimed at stabilizing and or improving their conservation status.</b></p>	
<p><i>Indicator 2.1: 20 research grants for Critically Endangered and Endangered species identified by the CEPF profile in Bhutan and Nepal by the end of the project</i></p>	<p>-20 grants (8 for Critically Endangered and 12 for Endangered species) were implemented in Bhutan and Nepal.</p> <p>-This included projects on-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critically Endangered species - Pygmy hog <i>Porcula salvania</i>, White-rumped Vulture <i>Gyps bengalensis</i>, Slender-billed Vulture <i>Gyps tenuirostris</i>, White-bellied Heron <i>Ardea insignis</i>, Gharial <i>Gavialis gangeticus</i> and a plant species endemic to Bhutan <i>Bazzania bhutanica</i></li> <li>• Endangered species: Golden Langur</li> </ul>

	<p><i>Trachypithecus geei</i>, Snow leopard <i>Panthera uncia</i>, Tiger <i>Panthera tigris</i>, Hispid hare <i>Caprolagus hispidus</i> , South Asian River Dolphin <i>Platanista gangetica</i>,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vulnerable- Red Panda <i>Ailuris fulgens</i>, Greater One-horned rhino <i>Rhinoceros unicornis</i>, Takin <i>Budorcas taxicolor</i>, Black-necked Crane <i>Grus nigricollis</i>, Rufous Necked Hornbill <i>Aceros nipalensis</i> and a plant Agarwood <i>Aquilaria malaccensis</i></li> <li>• These included research and survey as well as action on the ground like awareness building and sensitization on the conservation of the species.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Indicator 2.2: 20 research grants on lesser known taxa in Bhutan and Nepal by the end of the project</i></p>	<p>12 projects that incorporated research and monitoring on lesser known -taxa bats, fishes, amphibians, small cats          -Species: Woolly Flying Squirrel          -Plants: Plants-<i>Rhododendron</i> spp.          17-grants included action projects like awareness development, training, developing community based antipoaching mechanisms and also some documentation work.</p>
<p><b>Output 3: The CEPF Small Grants portfolio maximizes synergy and complementarity between different investments in priority sites identified in the Ecosystem Profile for better achievement of species and site outcomes identified in the Ecosystem Profile</b></p>	
<p><i>Indicator 3.1: 4 small grants projects are implemented in complementarity with 4 larger projects supported by CEPF in Bhutan and Nepal by year 1</i></p>	<p>3 small grants were implemented complementarily with 3 larger projects supported by CEPF in Bhutan and Nepal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Nepal the Bird Conservation Nepal was given a small grant to replicate their earlier work on developing community based vulture safe feeding sites or what was once known as “Vulture Restaurant”. This was scaled up to a large grant by CEPF which included more integrated approaches like-policy advocacy, community sensitization, livelihoods support in the project.</li> <li>• The Royal Society for Conservation of Nature in Bhutan was the recipient of a grant on studying the conservation status of White-bellied Heron. This project was implemented in coordination with a large grant of the same organization which focused on the development of civil society groups at the grass roots. The civil society group formed at the Heron study sites were actively involved in conserving the species.</li> <li>• A small grants project on the Black-necked Crane implemented by an independent researcher in Bhutan was lined to a larger project on the conservation of the winter habitat of the</li> </ul>

	<p>species implemented by a community based organization. The small grant was able to train and build the capacity of the communities benefited by the larger project in the technical aspects of monitoring the crane population to assess whether their interventions were effective.</p>
<p><i>Indicator 3.2: 2 small grants projects are implemented in complementarity with 2 external agency projects in Bhutan and Nepal by year 2</i></p>	<p>3 Projects were implemented in complementarity with 2 external agencies in Bhutan and Nepal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Nepal the project on Gharial was an integral part of the initiatives that the government was undertaking to conserve the remaining population of gharials in Nepal. This included the captive breeding and release project. This initiative became closely linked with the project supported by Lacoste in Nepal for improving the captive breeding facilities in Chitwan National Par.</li> <li>• The vulture conservation project complemented the Vulture Conservation Program of Bird Conservation Nepal program and the organization was able to scale this up through projects received for the Darwin Initiative funded by the Department of DEFRA UK.</li> <li>• The small grant project on White Bellied Heron provided to RSPN became an integral part of the program supported by the Felburn Foundation, and International Crane Foundation, USA.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 4: Improved scientific knowledge base of priority species through extensive surveys, intensive studies, assessments, interactions, and databases to guide management and conservation of key species and sites</b></p>	
<p><i>Indicator 4.1: 20 different peer reviewed research reports on threatened and endemic species prepared by end of project</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 peer reviewed research reports on the studies conducted on Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable species were produced and submitted.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Indicator 4.2: 20 different peer reviewed research reports on lesser known taxa prepared and shared with relevant policy makers and experts by the end of the project.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 peer reviewed research report on bats, turtles, fish medicinal plants and amphibians and small carnivores were prepared and submitted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 5: CEPF supported small grant results are used as advocacy tools for wider scientific and conservation community as well as with key policy makers in Bhutan and Nepal through scientific publications as well as technical interactions.</b></p>	
<p><i>Indicator 5.1: 3 national level interactions organized to share the results/information generated by CEPF grants on threatened, endemic and lesser known species by the end of the project</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A two days national level workshop was organized in Nepal to share the results and information generated by the small grant projects. The participants included the grantees, government line agency members, experts from India and other relevant stakeholders.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A two day national level workshop was organized in Thimphu to share results of the ongoing small grant projects and share research results of completed projects with the grantees and relevant stakeholders.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Indicator 5.2: At least 4 of the findings/results of research supported by the CEPF small grants program published in peer reviewed scientific papers by the end of the project</i></p>	<p>Research results on fish, small carnivores, stork and vultures were peer reviewed and published in scientific journals such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fish: Nepal Journal of Science and Technology (NAST) vol;10 page 219-223</li> <li>• Small Carnivore: IUCN/SSC Cat Specialist Group - Cat News, Contents Cat News 51 - Autumn 2009</li> <li>• Stork: only abstract and awareness poster was published in Our Nature, an International Biological Journal Vol;6 No; 1 (2008) <a href="http://www.nepjol.info/index.php/ON/article/view/1661">http://www.nepjol.info/index.php/ON/article/view/1661</a></li> <li>• Results on Golden and Capped Langur research from Bhutan were peer reviewed and published in scientific journal - International Journal of Primatology.</li> </ul>

***Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.***

Key success in delivering intended outputs include, establishment of a mechanism for systematic and transparent management of CEPF Small Grants in Bhutan and Nepal. This mechanism helped the implementation team in assessing the technical value of the proposals and gave access to a wide range of individuals and civil society organizations to be able to be involved in species specific work in the region. With these 45 small grants on Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable and “Lesser Known taxa a large pool of information and database has been generated and which will be crucial in supporting the improvement of the conservation status of some of these species. With these grants there has been recognition of new emerging threats, changing status of these species and also gaps that still remain to be filled in the region. The small grants implemented in the key sites of Bhutan and Nepal were able to establish complementarity with other investments so as to maximize species and site outcomes identified in the Ecosystem Profile. The research grants provided to civil society and individuals have improved scientific knowledge base of priority species and set guideline and measures for their monitoring and conservation. In addition, the CEPF small grant results publication (fish, small carnivores, stork) were used as advocacy tools for scientific and conservation community and policy makers. Several other action researches has improved community understanding of the species and initiated action for its conservation at the respective key sites. Over all with the involvement of a whole range of civil society organizations and individuals the grant was successful in building the capacity of these stakeholders to be involved in biodiversity conservation.

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

All the intended outputs were achieved

**V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS**

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

NON

## VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

**Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.**

-The formation of team at the national level has not been feasible due to the diverse nature of research topics and lack of relevant experts. Therefore in Nepal various IUCN specialist groups were consulted for the evaluation of small grant project proposals.

-The small grant portfolio has been very effective in reaching the grassroots community particularly the action grants. This should be continued in the future to build on the success and their replication in other areas.

-For grants like CEPF having an action oriented aspect in each project is an effective way to get more and diverse range of civil society involved in the program. Even though the small grants program had a pure research and survey vision in the Ecosystem profile most of the projects especially in Nepal had an action oriented aspect.

-Civil society organizations in Bhutan were emerging and therefore the effective way of implementation was working with individuals working for the government or independent and this made generating research results and information simpler.

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

The project is designed in such a way that large number of civil society groups both at national and local level could have access to the grants. The priority sites and species outcome set in the ecosystem profile has been very helpful in streamlining research and action based projects. In addition the researches were prioritized on the basis of gap analysis conducted beforehand so as to reduce the possibility of duplication and focus on site and species where prompt actions were necessary.

### **Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)**

-One of the key learning of the CEPF small grant implementation was that the grant process has been easily accessible to various local civil society groups both at national and local level.

-In Nepal there were instances where the implementation team even encouraged proposals written in Nepali so that grassroots organizations could get access to these grants.

## VII. 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
Lacoste (Save your Logo)	B	USD 400,000	For Gharial conservation
GEF Small grant	B	USD 30,000	For Vulture conservation
Disney wildlife cobervation fund	B	USD 25,000	For Vulture conservation
Conservation		USD 10,000	For Vulture conservation

Leadership			
Rufford	B	Pound 5,000	For Vulture conservation
Darwin initiative	B	Pound 60,000	For Vulture conservation
Felburn Foundation		USD 23,100	For White Rumped Vulture project
Felburn Foundation	B	USD 60,000	For White Bellied Heron project

**\*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** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)*
- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

**Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.**

Several small grantees have been able to access grants for the continuation of projects. These include; Bird Conservation Nepal on vulture, Gharial, small carnivores. Other action grants provided at the grassroots level (such as community based vulture conservation, Amphibian conservation, Dolphin conservation and community based anti poaching activities) will continue to implement their activities incorporating it in annual operational plans.

### VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

-With effective implementation of the small grant in Eastern Himalaya, similar small grants program need to be continued in future. There is still more to be done and consolidation of work done by the small grants program needs to be done. Grant programs like these help grassroots level action and this is the only way for conservation initiatives to be effective for a long time.

### VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

**Please include your full contact details below:**

Name: Shubash Lohani

Organization name: WWF Inc.



Mailing address: 1250 24th St. NW Washington DC 20037  
Tel: 202 495 4796  
Fax: 202 495 4377  
E-mail:shubash.lohani@wwfus.org