



# Darwin Initiative 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Report 2006 - 2007



## Darwin Project Information

Project Ref. No.	14-024	
Project Title	Afro-Asian Elephant Community Conservation Network	
Country/ies	Thailand (with links to Kenya)	
UK Contract Holder Institution	Conservation Programme, Zoological Society of London (ZSL)	
UK Partner Institution/s	Friends of Conservation (FOC)	
Host Country Partner Institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elephant Conservation Network (ECN), Kanchanaburi</li> <li>Dept. National Parks &amp; Wildlife Conservation (DNP), Thailand</li> </ul>	
Darwin Grant Value	£188,188	
Start/End Dates of Project	July 2005 – March 2008	
Reporting Period / Report No.	April 2006 – March 2007	Annual Report No. 2
Project Leader Name	Belinda Stewart-Cox	
Project Website	<a href="http://www.zsl.org/field-conservation/deserts-and-rangelands/asian-elephant-conservation-in-Thailand">www.zsl.org/field-conservation/deserts-and-rangelands/asian-elephant-conservation-in-Thailand</a>	
Author/s, Date	Belinda Stewart-Cox (BSC) & Jittin Ritthirat (JR)	July 2007

### Acronyms

ADEQ	Association for the Development of Environmental Quality (a Thai NGO in Kanchanaburi)
DNP	Department of National Parks, Plant and Wildlife Conservation
ECN	Elephant Conservation Network
HEC	Human-Elephant Conflict
MONRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
PA	Protected Area (NP = National Park. WS = Wildlife Sanctuary)
SEECA	Salakpra Elephant Ecosystem Conservation Alliance
VC/VM	Village Coordinator (full-time) / Village Monitor (part-time)

## 1. Project Background

The Salakpra-Chalerm Rattanakosin protected area in west Thailand supports some 20% of the country's largest population of wild elephants (around 130 individuals), but it is now a forest peninsula and human-elephant conflicts are increasing in and around it. Due west, Salakpra is severed from the larger Western Forest Conservation Complex (the core of which is a natural world heritage site) by the Srinakarin Reservoir, due south by the Kwae Yai river, road and ribbon development, and due east, it is flanked by human settlement and agriculture.

The Elephant Conservation Network was founded in 1998 by Belinda Stewart-Cox and in 2001, it conducted semi-structured interviews, focus group surveys and site visits to find out from rangers and villagers what is known and felt about elephants and their conservation, and where HEC occurs. This survey identified the need for seasonal elephant surveys inside Salakpra to support a community-based human-elephant conflict monitoring and mitigation programme around the protected area. This project aims to address the problem of human-elephant conflict as a means to improve elephant conservation.



## 2. Partnerships

### Project partnerships

- **ECN & ZSL:** This was a timely pairing, for when ECN needed a UK partner because FOC could no longer manage a DI project, ZSL was seeking to support Asian elephant conservation *in situ*. So ZSL took over the DI project from FOC and Belinda Stewart-Cox, founding director of ECN with 20 years experience in Thailand, was contracted to manage it and other ECN projects, thereby forging a mutually advantageous, happily constructive partnership. But it differs from other ZSL partnerships in that its project manager 'belongs' to ECN more than ZSL, and the most constructive partnership of all, and the one that really makes ECN work, is the 10-year collaboration of Jittin Ritthirat and Belinda Stewart-Cox. The strength of the ZSL-ECN partnership is their connection through BSC and the fact that her priority is ECN and its achievements. In the last year, the capacity of ECN has developed considerably, in number and in capability, thanks partly to its new policy of recruiting from the project area when possible and arranging extra training to make up for any lack of skills.
- **ECN & DNP:** this partnership operates at 3-levels. The strongest is the one 'on the ground' between ECN and the PA staff at Salakpra and Chalerm Rattanakosin where contact is frequent, relations supportive and collaboration well established. The next level, also very supportive, is the partnership between ECN and its official counterpart, Dr Mattana Srikrajang, who is Thailand's wild elephant research specialist. ECN invited Dr Mattana to join the Nairobi HEC workshop and Kenya study trip, and she in turn arranged for ECN to take its associates to her project area in Kuiburi (see below). She also gave a presentation at the first feedback meeting and she gives advice or support when asked. At higher levels of DNP, the relationship changes when personnel change. Sometimes new directors are people BSC knows already, sometimes they are from other departments, but because she has worked there so long, it is not difficult to forge new connections. It just takes time.
- **ECN & FOC:** this is now a minor partnership, although FOC has honoured its original plan to provide at least one return airfare per year to ECN, but if/when the ECN ecotourism initiative gets off the ground, FOC can help with marketing & promotion among its member organisations. In the meantime, contact is regular, relations are good and FOC's bi-annual newsletter gives this project some useful publicity. It is good about giving due credit to other organisations and donors involved.

### Other collaborations

#### a) *Collaborations with similar projects in host country*

- **Wildlife Conservation Society:** WCS has an HEC research project in south-west Thailand that began a year or so before ours. In Year 1, ECN's Thai staff visited the WCS project area to learn about HEC monitoring methods. They have kept in touch ever since, by telephone and by meeting at gatherings such as local wildlife symposia. The relationship between ECN and WCS Thailand is strong because the senior staff of both organisations once worked together and continue to get on well. In addition, there is a collaborative agreement between WCS and ZSL and Dr Simon Hedges, the WCS Asian elephant coordinator, is generous with help and advice. In late 2007, he will visit ECN to review our HEC, crop-protection trial and forest survey protocols and findings. ECN & WCS will also work together to present our recommendations to government for HEC mitigation needs.
- **Kuiburi HEC Mitigation Project** of the Royal Household and the Department of National Parks, Plant and Wildlife Conservation led by ECN's official government counterpart Dr Mattana Srikrajang. In October, we arranged a study trip for 17 local community members from our target area (7 HEC affected villagers, 6 appointed community leaders, 6 elected district councillors and 2 PA officials) as well as 5 ECN field staff, two of whom are village-based. The aim was to meet the villagers and PA officials involved with the Kuiburi project, learn about their crop-protection and HEC mitigation measures, discuss lessons learned and forge collaborative links. This trip – with villagers learning from other villagers - proved to be such a worthwhile and effective exercise that we are encouraged to use this approach again in future with visits to other appropriately instructive sites. It raised awareness, built trust, inspired commitment, and prompted more active engagement. Several decisions made during this trip have been acted upon (see attached Kuiburi Study Trip Report)

- **Jumbo Travel:** ECN has an excellent working relationship with Ms Buranakarn Chatupornpaisan, owner of Jumbo Travel, the local tour operator who will be a key partner on any ecotourism initiative. Ms Buranakarn (known as Jumbo), gave an instructive presentation at the workshop organised by ECN as part of the ecotourism feasibility study and will continue to help the process of product planning with target communities.
- **North Andaman Tsunami Relief:** through personal friendships and practical help, ECN has helped NATR in many small ways since its inception. One of NATR's sustainable development initiatives is North Andaman Discoveries, a community-based ecotourism venture that is now operational and has shared many of its product-planning lessons and outputs (e.g. training guide, language manual, visioning procedure) with ECN. Moreover, the person who helped NATR develop its tourism product was recruited for them by BSC and later came to do ECN's ecotourism feasibility study. When NATR disbands, one of its most able and experienced local field managers will join ECN, helping us deal with our work overload. Though not a formal collaboration, it is a supportive one.
- **Forest Restoration Unit (FORRU), Chiang Mai.** BSC has been in touch with Dr Stephen Elliott, founder of FORRU and former recipient of a DI grant, about setting up a FORRU West Thailand with local communities that are keen to undertake similar forest restoration work in and around Salakpra. Plans are at a preliminary stage, mainly for want of time, but ECN is keen to pursue this idea with local communities as part of its SEECA development initiative.

*b) Collaborations with similar projects in other regions*

- **Transmara HEC mitigation project** (supported by WWF Kenya & the Durrell Institute of Conservation & Ecology, UK In 2006, Dr Noah Sitati helped organise the HEC workshop in Nairobi and the ECN study trip around Kenya, and in 2007, he came to Thailand to help ECN set-up its crop protection trials. In 2008, he will return for the HEC regional workshop being organised by ECN.
- **Fauna & Flora International HEC projects:** While still at DICE overseeing the Transmara HEC project with which BSC did her Conservation & Tourism MSc fieldwork, Dr Matt Walpole helped ECN formulate this DI project. Since he moved to FFI to manage its Biodiversity & Livelihoods programme, he has continued to help the project with advice and practical support, including organising the Nairobi HEC workshop on ECN/ZSL's behalf. As a result, two FFI participants at that workshop who work on its HEC projects in Cambodia and Sumatra, joined the first week of ECN's subsequent study trip and will be invited to give presentations at its regional HEC workshop in 2008.

**Note:** The MIKE programme in Thailand has all but died this year and there is now no coordinator for south-east Asia, so that partnership is on hold. It had, in any case, become inactive because relations between DNP and MIKE were increasingly fraught, in Bangkok and in Salakpra. As it is important for ECN to maintain good collaborative relations with DNP at every level, and as some of the discord with DNP was caused by the MIKE coordinator, we held back until the tensions eased.

*c) Link to local CBD focal point*

In the last year, we (ECN) have not had much direct contact with Thailand's CBD focal point, either in the Ministry of Environment or in the Department of Conservation, although they do get copies of our project reports. But BSC has been in touch with the MONRE focal point on ZSL's behalf about helping Thailand compile an Insect Red Data, List and about supporting surveys of the endemic Bumblebee Bat (*Craseonycteris thonglongyai*) under ZSL's recently launched EDGE programme for species that are Ecologically Distinct and Globally Rare.

## 3. Project Progress

### 3.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

The last six months have been extraordinarily busy, with new activities added to ongoing ones. Most activities were planned, but some were valuable extras. Although some activities were started later than scheduled (through no fault of ours) and one - the international HEC network - was vetoed at the Nairobi HEC workshop, we have now caught up with our work-plan such that every major activity is either finished or underway. This was achieved through unrelenting hard-work by the ECN team (especially Belinda and Jittin) and by recruiting more local staff from the project area.

#### Output 1 - Local capacity to monitor & mitigate HEC improved

**Activity 1.1 Survey training.** Five new ECN staff (two of them village-based) have been trained to record HEC data, and three of them have also been trained to undertake forest surveys. At the same time, five replacement forest rangers were trained. All of them have proved hard-working and reliable.

**Activity 1.2 Feedback meetings.** We held two lots of two feedback meetings this year, the first lot in June, the second in November. Each time, one meeting was held on the west side of Salakpra and the other on the south side, the areas of most intensive crop-raiding. The theme of the first meetings was 'The Importance of Data and Collaboration in Solving HEC'. The theme of the second meetings was 'HEC: Participation and Collaboration for finding HEC solutions'. At the second set of meetings, participants endorsed ECN's suggestion of establishing a network of community conservation groups and promptly formed one at district-level, electing key office holders. All four meetings were very productive in:

- letting people know about HEC elsewhere in Thailand, Asia and Africa
- raising awareness of ECN's data collection activities & findings
- generating respect and gratitude for ECN's aim & application
- prompting discussions based on fact rather than belief
- involving government representatives from key agencies
- sharing practical information from other HEC sites (Kenya & Kuiburi)
- facilitating networking and problem-solving discussion among key people

**Activity 1.3 Kenya study trip.** Six people went on this 2½ week trip instead of four; three members of ECN, Dr Mattana Srikrajang (our government counterpart), Ms Buranakarn Chatupornpaisan (our tourism partner) and Mr Joei Hutakom (documentary filmmaker for Thai ITV). The trip was organised by BSC. It began with a 2-day HEC workshop in Nairobi. The team then travelled to Transmara (2-nights), Outer Mara (1-night), Naivasha (2-nights), Laikipia (6-nights), Aberdares (1-night) and the coast (3-nights). It was exhausting but exhilarating, and we learned a lot about HEC mitigation and ecotourism options. On our return, Joei made nine half-hour programmes for Thai ITV as part of his popular Songloke ('Around the World') slot. This series was entitled 'People and Elephants in Kenya: from conflict to compromise'. Each programme went out twice a week, on Saturday morning and Tuesday evening. It promoted the project, its associates and lessons learned, but is not great viewing by UK documentary film standards.

**Activity 1.4 Kuiburi study trip.** This involved Kuiburi NP in south-west Thailand where HM The King supports an HEC mitigation project to reduce or offset the cost of elephants raiding pineapple plantations around the park. The plan for this trip arose from the first feedback meeting in June when participants expressed an interest in visiting other communities dealing with HEC (having not, until then, known that there were other communities in Thailand with the same problem). We thought this would be a good opportunity to start forging collaborative links between individuals, communities, PA officials and ECN. The trip was organised by Dr Mattana Srikrajang and Jittin Ritthirat. Participants included community members, local leaders, Salakpra officials, and ECN staff. Everyone stayed in park lodgings but spent much of the day visiting project sites with local people and much of the night talking to their hosts about what they had learned, while also sharing ideas and experiences. It was a really worthwhile trip which greatly strengthened ECN's relationship and regard among community members, elected leaders and government officials. It also produced some useful crop-protection ideas which are now being tested.

**Activity 1.5 Visit by Kenyan counterpart.** We visited Dr Noah Sitati in Transmara on our Kenya study trip to learn about his HEC work. He then came to our project site for 10-days in March to help us set-up our own crop-protection trials. We first took him on a site visit of the whole project area to show him our different activities and introduce him to associates in the villages and Salakpra. He and Jittin then designed the crop-trials and data collection forms before setting up two sites in time for a 1-day media visit (over-nighting in Salakpra) during which nine journalists and one TV crew were told about ECN, the HEC problem and the crop protection trials. Noah was a great ambassador for Africa among people who had never met an African before, and he was extremely helpful. All in all, it was a very productive trip.

**Activity 1.6. GIS training.** When Namfon left the project in July last year, we lost the GIS skills we need for this project. We addressed this by recruiting a GIS specialist doing an MSc, but that did not work out. He did not like our kind of field work. So we then recruited Krit, a local IT specialist, who was keen to acquire GIS and other computer skills. Using money budgeted for Namfon's MSc (agreed by DI), we provided three GIS training courses. The first two (4-days and 5-days) were basic introductions to GIS given in Thai to all ECN project staff by Dr Yongyut Trisurat of Kasetsart University's Conservation Department. The more advanced training in GIS data management and mapping was given by Dr Susan Canney of Oxford University's Zoology Department, an experienced GIS trainer for elephant conservation projects in Africa and Asia. We first took Susan on a 2-day site visit to show her project activities. She then worked with Belinda and Jittin as well as with Krit to review / modify ECN's data management / recording system and to identify the best ways of presenting survey data in GIS format (see report). She will continue to help ECN with mapping its survey data in year 3. She is an excellent trainer, well liked by the Thai team, and her quick grasp of ECN's aims and requirements makes her advice invaluable.

## ◇ **Output 2 - Monitoring & mitigation programme functioning**

**Activity 2.1 Monitor HEC / crop-raiding.** This monitoring programme began in March 2006 (during an unusually mild dry season) and has continued ever since. Unfortunately, from a comparative point of view (but challenging from a conservation point of view), the dry season this year was especially severe and crop raiding was so intense that some of ECN's village monitors were out several nights in a row, often more than once. As a result, we recruited two full-time village-based field staff to help record crop-raiding data and to help monitor the crop protection trials which started in March 2007. Competent and reliable, they have become valued members of the team. Jittin has drafted an HEC/crop-raiding report covering the first year of data which will be included in October's interim DI report.

**Activity 2.2 Socio-economic survey.** This was undertaken in December and January, a couple of months later than planned because the lead researcher was not free. It was managed by Jittin Ritthirat but was led by Dr Napat Sirisamphand, a recently retired researcher from CUSRI, the Chulalongkorn University Social Research Unit. The aim of the survey, the questionnaires and the semi-structured interviews, were formulated with Belinda and Jittin. One local staff member worked full-time with Dr Napat and the VMs in each village helped arrange interviews and questionnaire distribution / collection as requested. A workshop was held with community leaders at the end of the survey period. Data were then analysed and a report drafted from Feb-April. There was then a gap as Dr Napat's mother fell ill (and has since died), but ECN and Dr Napat will do some follow up work with community members and local leaders in the coming months to review findings and plan the next step. Happily Dr Napat – a long-time work acquaintance of Belinda - is keen to continue helping ECN because its work promises to develop new models for HEC mitigation, community-based natural resource management, collaborative protected area management and sustainable forest use in Thailand. With years of experience working with farming communities and the protected area authorities, she is a great asset and a much valued advisor.

**Activity 2.3 Crop-protection trials.** In March 2007, later than originally planned (noted in previous reports), Dr Noah Sitati visited ECN to help initiate crop protection trials (see above). Trials were set up at two sites with him here, and at other sites after he had left but following the agreed plan. One difficulty is that farmers we know all want crop protection, so it has been hard finding control plots. We have also found maintaining the fences quite expensive. So the cost effective equation will be an interesting result. We have asked Dr Simon Hedges, the Asian elephant coordinator of WCS, to evaluate our methods on one of his trips East in the coming months. In the meantime, our local monitors and village-based staff record day-to-day data and report to the ECN coordinator several times a week following the protocols set up with Dr Noah Sitati and modified with reference to our own experience and other NGO project reports.

**Activity 2.4 Forest surveys.** Three forest surveys were undertaken as planned in the dry, wet and cool seasons, covering the three selected zones in the centre, west and south of Salakpra. Preliminary findings suggest that elephants are using all accessible areas but visit the dry forests more during the wet season. Human activities were widespread and various in the two survey zones that border the main crop-raiding areas, and cattle or cattle tracks were encountered throughout those same areas. Only the core area is free of human impact, though man-made fires are prevalent there too.

Unfortunately, the coordinator of our forest surveys moved on in July 2006 immediately after the 2nd survey, which left BSC in charge while we sought a replacement. This is our biggest challenge. Ideally we would recruit someone for whom Kanchanaburi is home (the policy we have adopted for other recruits) but we are unlikely to find a local person with the qualifications required. Two new recruits got other jobs in Bangkok before they had even started with us. We have now teamed up with Dr George Gale, head of the newly established Department of Ecology at KMUTT (King Mongkut University of Technology in Thonburi) whose MSc students tend to favour working with NGOs. We hope we will find someone from the cohort that graduates in June 2007. We will also recruit a UK intern to work for 1-year with our local recruit to manage the forest surveys and relieve BSC of writing every report.

**Activity 2.5 Land-use mapping.** Some aerial mapping of three priority villages was done for us in June by Dr Pete Cutter, husband of Namfon, during an inter-job period. These would have been completed by our GIS recruit had he stayed, but we will now train Krit to do this work once he has mastered GIS. In the meantime, other project staff, with help from village monitors and community leaders, are ground-truthing aerial maps and collecting data on ownership and land use using a standard form designed by ECN.

### ◇ **Output 3 - Ecotourism project underway**

When it became clear at the pro-poor tourism workshop attended by BSC in April 2006 that this project needed more careful planning than had been envisaged, we dropped the original plan of launching straight into product development and opted instead to commission a feasibility study using some of the budget no longer needed for an MSc. This was approved by DI and noted in the 2<sup>nd</sup> interim report.

**Activity 3.1 Feasibility study.** A feasibility study was undertaken with ECN by Charlotte Johnston who had helped develop the tourism product for North Andaman Tsunami Relief (see 2.2 above). The study was conducted from Jan-April 2007 and involved:

- Site visits around the target area to see HEC villages, ECN activities, Salakpra
- Data collection on the existing tourism market in the local area
- Interviews with local tour operators, tourism officials, ecotourism organisations
- Visits to potential model ecotourism initiatives elsewhere in Thailand and Laos
- Community workshop with trips to community-based tourism / conservation ventures
- Producing a comprehensive feasibility report with options and recommendations

We must now seek funding to implement the step-by-step product development process with target communities as recommended by the feasibility study.

### ◇ **Output 4 – Network for elephant conservation & HEC mitigation established**

This was the main item scheduled for discussion in the final session of the Nairobi HEC workshop, and although everyone was keen for HEC mitigation practitioners to share their information and experience, the plan to set up a web-based network was vetoed after Leo Niskanen of the IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group warned how much it would cost in time and money to maintain and how little it would, in fact, be used. Elephant Care International had recently closed its HEC forum for those very reasons. So, for the time being, ECN will focus on developing its own network of people keen to find ways of mitigating HEC while also promoting elephant conservation

**Activity 4.1 Encourage the creation of community groups.** This was originally planned as a subsidiary activity under 2.1 to help mitigate HEC, but it has become clear to ECN after numerous discussions with local people that we need to create a collaborative conservation alliance within which community groups, local leaders, government representatives and NGOs can work together to achieve better protection of the Salakpra ecosystem and more sustainable and equitable use of forest resources.

We are working towards the formation of a Salakpra Elephant Ecosystem Conservation Alliance (SEECA) which means encouraging the creation of SEECA groups at village and district level with individuals who can work together within a community and across communities while also working with ECN (or other NGOs) and relevant government representatives. So far, two district organisations have been formed, at least nominally, but we do not expect any organisation to take root without having a locally significant project to serve as the propagation medium. So we need to help plan conservation projects that will mobilise enough people to form an effective community organisation. We have several ideas (including establishing a FORRU West Thailand with Dr Steven Elliot) and good connections, but so far we have been too busy with other commitments to plan this. We aim to focus on this in the coming months.

#### ◇ **Output 5 - Lessons learned & best practice disseminated**

Overall we have made good progress in publicising our work via presentations and the media, but we have focused on sharing information locally in order to root the project and make it more effective on the ground. However, we do now need to give presentations at higher levels of government and academia in order to reach key decision-makers at national level. We also need to develop an ECN web-site and produce seasonal newsletters (so far we have done two). These are planned for the coming year.

**Activity 5.1 Presentations given.** We have given many more presentations than originally planned, most of them powerpoint ones with pictures. The occasions were: 4 community feedback meetings (see under 1.2 above); 1 Salakpra managers' monthly meeting; 1 verbal presentation at ADEQ's seminar on HEC in Salakpra; 1 at the HEC regional workshop in Nairobi; 1 at ECN's workshop for local leaders as part of the socio-economic survey (see 1.2 above); 1 for visitors/hosts on ECN's Kuiburi study trip (see 1.4 above); and 1 at ECN's local community workshop for the ecotourism feasibility study. ECN also manned a stand with a 3-sheet poster & pamphlets in the Natural Resource Management section at the Mahidol University's Kanchanaburi Campus open day. BSC also gave a talk at ZSL's London office.

**Activity 5.2 Press coverage / articles:** one illustrated 3-page feature on BSC in her mother's local magazine Wiltshire View; good Thai media coverage about the project and starting crop-protection trials; one column in Nation Media about BSC's latest conservation involvement (harking back to her past involvement with the Huai Kha Khaeng world heritage site and the Seub Nakhasathien Foundation). All these promote ECN - ZSL and this project but could not share much in the way of lessons learned.

**Activity 5.3 TV / radio coverage:** from late October to the end of December 2009, ECN and its HEC work got many mentions during the 9-part Songloke ('Around the World') series about its Kenya study trip (see 1.3 above). The 2nd community feedback meeting was covered by local radio, the start of the crop-protection trials featured on Thai national news (ITV) on 22 Feb 07. On seeing that, another producer from Nation TV then made a 40-minute documentary about the project and the HEC problem around Salakpra, incorporating interviews with Jittin and Belinda. It went out on Channel 9 on 9 April 2007.

**Activity 5.4 Publications:** one summary paper about the Nairobi workshop has been published in Pachyderm 41, co-authored by BSC, and one paper by BSC and JR has been submitted for publication in the workshop proceedings being edited by Dr Matt Walpole (FFI) and Dr Matthew Linkie (DICE).

**Activity 5.5 Web-linked network:** the original plan was vetoed (see 4 above) but this year, ECN will develop a website and establish a system of seasonal newsletters for local and electronic distribution.

## **3.2 Progress towards Project Outputs**

Remarkably, given the delays and recruitment set-backs we have experienced, we are now on the way to achieving the revised project outputs and, slowly but surely, ECN is becoming a more competent, committed team of people with the skills necessary to collect basic data, do simple analyses, conduct feedback meetings and workshops and forge effective working relationships with local people, community leaders and provincial officials. However, with the exception of Jittin, the current team has come together in the last six months since we decided to recruit locally as much as possible after losing yet another non-local Thai researcher after one year. For local people, Kanchanaburi is home and this project is important as well as interesting for them. But most local people need more time and training to develop the skills necessary to work up data and draft reports or presentations, and even then they would mostly be in

Thai. At present, only Belinda and Jittin can draft reports or papers in English (with Belinda editing everything) and only Belinda has experience writing project funding proposals, though Jittin will help apply for Thai government funding next year. For the last 6-months of this project, we aim to recruit an appropriately qualified native English speaker to help with forest surveys, but that person must either speak some Thai or, better still, we manage to recruit a Thai biologist who speaks good English. We aim to recruit a student of Dr George Gale (KMUTT) and for him to work with us in a supervisory capacity.

The important assumptions for outputs one and two are still valid. Finding suitable candidates who want to stay with the project is key. Hence our new policy of recruiting, if possible, local-locals (from the project area) rather than local-nationals (from the project country). However, we are unlikely to find a local-local with the ecological training necessary to manage the forest surveys.

Another challenge next year is to facilitate the creation of at least three SEECA community groups, together with relevant projects for them to manage, while also working with target communities to develop an ecotourism plan. This is a challenge partly because achieving desired outcomes with communities is always a challenge, and partly because, at present, only Jittin has the skills, knowledge and experience to facilitate discussions and workshops effectively with local people. We will need to find, and train, at least two new people to help implement these activities, though it will take time for them to become as confident or skilful at this as Jittin. It also means that sustaining salaries will become more of an issue although, once established, the tourism venture will pay for itself.

Are we likely to achieve all our outputs by the end of this project period? Yes, nominally. But neither the monitoring of crop-raids and crop-protection measures nor the forest surveys will continue beyond the life of this project unless ECN continues to serve as the driver, providing leadership, guidance and a management framework. The PA authority is too weak and under-resourced to take over this role, and local villagers, even when they form a CBO, are more likely to undertake material projects rather than research ones, even though they acknowledge the value of getting good information. They would like ECN to keep going until we have found, and put in place, sustainable solutions to HEC and forest abuse.

### 3.3. Standard Output Measures

**Table 1a: Old Standard Output Measures**

Code No.	Description	Year 1 Plan	Year 1 Actual	Year 2 Plan	Year 2 Actual	Year 3 Plan
<b>Training</b>						
2	MSc attained by Thai graduate	-	-	1	0	-
4c	Thai graduates trained in forest & HEC surveys	2	3	-	3	-
4d	No. training weeks provided	4	6	-	5	-
5	Thai/Karen village monitors	14	28	-	3	-
6a	Rangers trained / supervised	10	12	-	6	-
6b	Ranger training weeks	5	6	-	30	-
7	Forest/elephant survey protocol	1	1	-	-	-
7	HEC monitoring protocol	1	1	-	-	-
7	Land-use mapping protocol	1	Delayed	-	1	-
7	Crop trial protocols	1	Delayed	-	1	-
7	Local awareness leaflet (Thai)	1	1	-	-	-
7	Guidelines for GPS/forest survey data collection	0	1	-	revised	-
<b>Research</b>						
8	Project leader	8	18	8	35	8
11a	Paper published (summary of Kenya HEC workshop)	-	-	1	1	-
11b	Manuscripts submitted	-	-	-	1	2



Code No.	Description	Year 1 Plan	Year 1 Actual	Year 2 Plan	Year 2 Actual	Year 3 Plan
<b>Dissemination</b>						
14a	Community briefing meetings	1	14	-	-	
14a	Community feedback / planning workshops	1	TBC June 06	1	6 inc. tourism & socio-econ	1
14a	Regional HEC workshop	-	-	-	-	1
14b	Workshops attended	0	1 UK 3 Thai	1 KU-DNP 1 AsESG	1 Kenya 3 Thailand	1 KU-DNP 1 AsESG?
15 / 18 / 19	Media coverage in Thailand & UK (project launch)	4	Awaiting Gov.permit	-	Official OK too tardy	-
15 / 18 / 19	Media coverage of Kenya study trip (in Kenya and Thailand)	2+	trip postponed	-	1 Kenya TV 9 Thai TV	-
15c/d	Local media coverage in UK	1	-	-	1 colour feature Wiltshire View	-
15 / 18 / 19	Thai media coverage of elephant forest surveys	-	-	1+	included in HEC coverage	-
15 / 18 / 19	Thai media coverage of HEC and crop protection trials	1+	trials postponed	-	3 Thai TV 6 Thai Press	-
15 / 18 / 19	Kenya media coverage of crop trial connection in Thailand	1+	trials postponed	-	0	-
15 / 18 / 19	Thai national / local press release (ecotourism product)	-	-	1	No longer applicable	-
15 / 18 / 19	Thai media coverage of results	-	-	-	-	1+
16 a+b	Project info pamphlet and newsletter/s (500)	-	-	1	Draft pamphlet 1 newsletter 50 hard copies	Pamphlet, Website, Newsletter
17a	Beginnings of a community network established	1	1	-	2 district orgs. set up	Establish SEECA
15 / 18 / 19	Thai media coverage of launch of HEC / SEECA network	-	-	-	-	1+
19c	Local radio coverage of community feedback meeting	-	-	1+	Nov. meeting on KB radio	

**Table 1b: New Project Specific Measures**

Code No.	Description	Year 1 Plan	Year 1 Actual	Year 2 Plan	Year 2 Actual	Year 3 Plan
<b>Training</b>						
5	English language	-	-	-	-	4 ECN staff
6 a/b	GIS training via 4-7 day courses, 2 for 2-6 people, 1 for 2 people	-	-	-	3 courses	2 courses

**Table 2: Publications**

Type (-)	Detail	Publisher	Available From	Cost
1. Journal (-)	Walpole M, Sitati N, Stewart-Cox B, Niskanen L. & Stephenson P.J. (2006) Mitigating human-elephant conflict in Africa: a lesson-learning and network development meeting	IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group, Gland & Nairobi	www.IUCN.org	\$20
2. DVD (in Thai)	Songloke 9-part series. 'People and Elephants in Kenya: from conflict to compromise'	Songloke Ltd. Independent TV, Bangkok	www.songloke.com	£40

### 3.4 Progress towards the project purpose and outcomes

We are definitely on the way to achieving our stated purpose, but it would be dishonest to claim that we have attained the second half of indicators (a) and (b). The new knowledge we are providing has raised awareness at local level and is beginning to prompt changes in attitude and talk of changes in practice, but we have not yet seen obvious signs of that information being used for the conservation of elephants or the sustainable use of Salakpra's natural resources. Nor can we claim to have reduced HEC (as in crop-raids) although we have eased farmers' anger towards elephants and PA officials by addressing the problem and by working with them and other villagers to find a sustainable solution. In that way we have reduced the threat to elephants, at least for the time being, but until we turn elephants into an asset (through tourism) and ameliorate the HEC equation (the impact of elephants on people and the impact of people on elephants), we will not have achieved our aim. However, we are heading in the right direction and we have a good route map, but our destination will take longer than 2½ years to reach. There are so many different people involved with different aspirations. Elephants are more easily accommodated.

### 3.5 Progress towards impact on biodiversity, sustainable use or equitable sharing of biodiversity benefits

If/when we achieve what we aim to achieve, we will have a notable impact on biodiversity conservation (in part by facilitating its restoration), on the sustainable use of natural resources in and around Salakpra, and on the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits derived directly and indirectly from Salakpra. But, as our Year 1 reviewer rightly observed, we cannot achieve that in this project's lifetime. We will need another 3-4 years to get the tourism initiative well underway and the SEECA projects and partnerships in place. When those milestones have made their mark, we will have acquired the reputation and the voice to lobby for changes to the policies and laws that undermine effective PA conservation.

## 4. Monitoring, evaluation and lessons

The question on demonstrating how the outcomes and outputs of this project are contributing to its overall purpose has been addressed in some detail in sections 3.1 to 3.4 above. In year 3, the analysis and sharing of project findings at local, provincial and national level will be an important step forward in:

- o revealing the diverse components of the human-elephant conflict equation of Salakpra
- o publicising the conservation realities of this poorly protected wildlife sanctuary
- o identifying critical deficiencies in its system of management and protection
- o promoting the need for more collaborative conservation approaches

### Monitoring

We often review the various components of project data collection to make sure that we are doing as good a job as we reasonably can. Those components include:

- a) **Data gathering opportunities:** most data gathering to date (forest surveys, socio-economic survey, ecotourism study, crop protection trials, land-use) has been proactive, but HEC data is reactive, so it is important to know that we are being told of every crop-raiding or other HEC event. For that reason, we have developed a system of monitoring that maximises the likelihood of us knowing within hours when elephants have left the forest.
- o we have trained part-time village monitors (VMs) in every village that has experienced crop raiding, and we have recruited and trained new VMs for villages where HEC is a recent development.
  - o In April 2007, we recruited and trained two full-time village coordinators based south and west of Salakpra where crop-raiding is heaviest. The VCs liaise with VMs in their patch every day or two, visit HEC affected families every two weeks, and help 'spread the word' about ECN's work.
  - o ECN's community feedback meetings are open to anyone but always include local leaders, farmers and PA representatives. In addition, ECN phone numbers (VMs, VCs, and other ECN staff) are widely known and villagers are asked to let ECN know as soon as incidents occur. As almost all reports are called in, we are now confident that we are hearing about 99.9% of HEC incidents.

- b) **Data collection:** the VCs work with the VMs to map, measure and record the crop-raiding data immediately after the incident, and the ECN coordinator, or one of three similarly trained field assistants, visits most sites (especially new sites) with the VC when collecting the data forms, usually once a week. Thus the quality of the data collected is checked by a team of people soon after it is recorded, and all of them were trained in the data collection method when first recruited.
- c) **Data logging:** the ECN coordinator, sometimes with the field assistant who helped her, logs in data within a day or two of collecting the forms. During their training, the need for accuracy was repeatedly explained, so data is logged, if possible, first thing in the morning for no more than an hour or two to reduce the chance of carelessness, and each entry line is checked before moving on to the next form.
- d) **Data analysis:** Jittin Ritthirat, the community coordinator, does a basic analysis of HEC findings every few months and this picks up the occasional error (mostly a faulty conversion of the affected area from *rai*, the local measure, to m<sup>2</sup>). It may not be possible to prevent every human error, but we believe our system excludes most of the serious ones.

## Evaluation

- o **Internal:** because ECN is a small operation, we do not have a formal system for evaluating team members although we do evaluate new recruits after 4-months of working. In practice, however, Belinda and Jittin regularly evaluate ECN's performance (and their own) during frequent discussions about work plans, project progress, future activities etc. And at monthly meetings, Jittin encourages team members to raise problems or suggestions they may have. If there appears to be a personnel issue, Jittin will talk to the individuals concerned one-by-one. Our policy is to be open, consultative and frank to remove, or better still avoid, any tensions. We aim to be a happy, committed team for whom work is a rewarding experience.
- o **External:** to date there have been three kinds of external evaluation, none of them formal. After each community feedback meeting, participants completed an evaluation questionnaire to let us know how to improve feedback in future. In March 2007, Dr Susan Canney, an elephant/GIS data specialist from Oxford University, reviewed ECN's data management system and suggested ways to improve it which have been adopted (see report). Then, in April 2007, Drs. Glyn Davies and Richard Kock from ZSL's Conservation Programme, spent a week with ECN to review the project, meet key collaborators (including the PA chief, the provincial governor, and the WCS Thailand director) and do some strategic planning. Dr Simon Hedges, the WCS Asian Elephant Coordinator, has also promised to evaluate survey methods (forest, HEC and crop-raiding protection trials) as soon as possible in year 3.

## Lessons learned

In addition to those mentioned in previous reports, three lessons have been learned:

- a) **Recruitment:** there are great advantages to hiring local-local people (e.g. lower salaries and higher commitment to the project/target area) but there are also disadvantages (e.g. lower educational attainment/capability and no ecological training). It is hard to find graduates with an ecology or conservation biology training who want to do this kind of work, especially for a lesser known NGO.
- b) **The HEC equation:** not surprisingly, findings to date reveal that the HEC equation – that is, elephant impacts on people and human impacts on elephants - is more complicated and less easily resolved than supposed, mainly because those affected by elephants are a minority of relatively well-to-do farmers whereas those affecting elephants are a majority of poor villagers who are landless or jobless.
- c) **The importance of strong leadership:** it is well known in development circles that the presence or absence of strong community leadership determines whether or not a project succeeds. In our target area, we too have learned that some communities are better than others at organising cooperative action (e.g. crop protection as a group). Likewise, some communities are keener to discuss self-help initiatives such as ecotourism, forest restoration or elephant buffer zones. The common factor is strong community leadership. These are the villages we will work with first to discuss alternative livelihood conservation projects. They can then serve as a model for less 'together' communities.

## 5. Actions taken in response to previous reviews

- a) **Review assumptions:** last year, the planned timing and nature of project outputs was disrupted by:
- o the tardiness of the government in issuing official permission which inhibited the planned PR at project launch, but did not inhibit any other activities for which unofficial permission was granted
  - o the delayed project start (caused by the switch from FOC to ZSL) meant that activities with timing constraints were also delayed, e.g. seasonal surveys could not start until the following season
  - o the inability of Salakpra to provide the trained staff expected to do the forest surveys because the PA has too few capable staff and other activities, inc. the MIKE programme, needed them too
  - o the sudden and unexpected removal of the national petrol subsidy meant that project running costs were higher than expected

Two of the three assumptions noted in the project plan – that government policies would continue to support conservation/collaboration and that partners and stakeholders would remain enthusiastic and committed during/after the lifetime of the project – take into account what might undermine a project so badly as to threaten its viability. Delays, staff transfers, competing duties, political shenanigans and even price increases (though not the sudden removal of a standard subsidy) are normal in Thailand and should not damage a project unduly provided project personnel maintain good relations with their collaborators and fellow stakeholders, and follow the unwritten way of doing things. Last year the ex-Prime Minister decided to dispense with foreign donor projects and researchers. It had no effect on this project. There was a coup. It had no effect on this project, although it did mean forging new relations with a replacement provincial governor and a new protected area chief (but changes of personnel in these positions also happen without a coup), and it would be sensible to wait for the new Minister of Environment before promoting project findings at higher levels of government and pushing for changes in PA policy or practice. Ironically, the most troubling threat came from Darwin itself – the decision not to allow projects to carry forward unspent money from last year to this. Had we not been able to secure advance payments against signed agreements, next year's achievements would have been less than planned.

- b) **Reviewing the ecotourism component:** the reviewer rightly pointed out that, given the process of community engagement, private sector involvement and process management required to make an ecotourism initiative successful, this component is a project in itself. The project leader was asked to rethink how ECN can contribute to this output, given the time and resources available. ECN opted to do a comprehensive feasibility study and got approval from the Darwin Secretariat to use some of the MSc funding that was no longer needed (see output 3 under 3.1 above). The last section of the study entitled 'Next Steps' is table of the short, medium and long-term activities that are needed to move this project forward effectively.

- c) **Getting sufficient buy-in and commitment from project partners:** during the week-long strategic planning visit in early April of Glyn Davies and Richard Kock from ZSL's Conservation Programme, this topic was discussed at length and has been many times since. More effective buy-in by Salakpra and the Conservation Department is at the top of our list of necessary achievements for year 3. Likewise, we aim to facilitate more active involvement of a few key villages around Salakpra.

- d) **Exit strategy for Year 3:** we have often talked about this, both within ECN and with our ZSL advisors. Government buy-in is certainly important, but so is community buy-in, and the latter is likely to take more time to achieve because it will require a series of planning meetings and workshops with key members of each community (e.g. as part of tourism product development) and it will be linked to ECN's ability to facilitate the development of alternative livelihood options for the forest users whose detrimental impact on Salakpra is degrading its ecosystem and thereby aggravating, if not actually causing, the crop-raiding by elephants. Therefore we must motivate local communities to help protect their watershed forest, we must help provide other livelihood options for the poorest forest users, we must find a way to make elephants and forest conservation a most valued asset, we must prompt the government to improve PA protection, etcetera. None of this is achievable in 2 years 7 months, but we should know before the end of the year, and in concrete terms, whether the government and local communities are sufficiently committed for ECN to continue bothering to seek an HEC solution for Salakpra and local people.

## 6. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

Even without being asked by donors or ZSL, we (Jittin and Belinda) often ask ourselves whether we are making a difference, could we be making more of a difference and if so, what should we be doing. We want to know because there's no point going on if we aren't getting anywhere. We want to leave a lasting impact in our target area for the sake of Salakpra and all its denizens, human and non-human, and for human-elephant areas elsewhere in Thailand. Two other comments worth noting which are only touched upon in 3.2 - 3.5 above, are:

- a) **Facilitating self-help and stakeholder collaboration:** the two community feedback meetings arranged by ECN, together with the Kuiburi study trip, seemed to provide useful opportunities for information sharing, group discussions and collaborative planning. So far, some crop protection methods learned from villagers in Kuiburi have been incorporated into ECN's crop-protection trials at the request of local farmers, and one of the elected sub-district leaders who joined every meeting is planning to request local government money to dig a 4km trench around the southern tip of Salakpra where elephants repeatedly raid sugarcane. In future, we hope to facilitate more collaborative self-help responses such as these.
- b) **Developing trust and respect:** although we are a small and (mostly) young team, we have earned the respect of villagers, PA staff and local leaders for our commitment to tackling the HEC problem, for being seen to work hard, for being thorough, for being open, and for creating opportunities for local people to learn lessons and work together to seek solutions. We are credited, for example, with the fact that senior Salakpra personnel now take this problem more seriously than they used to and, at our urging, have attend local meetings. We are also credited with the fact that the provincial governors are well briefed and acknowledge that there is a genuine problem. In our day to day work, we know we enjoy the good opinion of local people and PA personnel because we get such willing cooperation, and our activities have not been undermined, either actively or passively, by local resistance. Long may it last!

## 7. Sustainability

It will take several more years to persuade local people and the protected area to adopt the attitudinal and behavioural changes needed to reduce the human impact on Salakpra. The data being collected by ECN on crop-raiding, crop-protection, land-use, socio-economics, and seasonal forest use by elephants and people is an essential part of the process and, by being shared through feedback meetings, is making people aware of the true nature of the HEC problem and is beginning to change attitudes, especially among farmers and community leaders. Would this data continue to be collected by villagers or the protected area if ECN were to stop doing this work in March 2008? The answer is undoubtedly no. Would another NGO or research institution take over this work? Probably not, because there are too few researchers in Thailand doing this kind of work and those that exist are already working elsewhere. If the associated problems of HEC and PA degradation are to be alleviated, ECN must continue to serve as the driver for the time being for any research component simply because neither the PA nor local communities have the capacity, capability or inclination to do this work. They can do the practical work (e.g. implement an ecotourism initiative and associated conservation/livelihood projects) that should follow from a better understanding of the HEC situation and widespread recognition and acceptance of what needs to be done. Is ECN sustainable? Provided Belinda and/or Jittin and other key team members remain committed to the cause, and provided diverse sources of funding can be found to keep the operation going and allow it to develop necessary initiatives, then ECN is as sustainable as any small NGO. If/when we can raise the half million baht capital required by law, we aim to register ECN as an official NGO. That will enable it to raise funds independently, including from Thai government sources.

## 8. Dissemination

We have exceeded the planned outputs (see 3.3 above) from a numerical point of view, but from a project efficacy point of view, we think we have been quite effective at local level, but we have not yet done enough at the national or international levels. The TV programmes and press items that went out gave general information about ECN's work and the HEC problem (and were seen by villagers and officials as well as members of the public), but they did not provide much detail.



## Annex 1 Report of Progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year: 2006/07

Project Summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress & Achievements Apr 06 – Mar 07	Actions required / planned for next period
<p><b>Goal:</b> To draw on expertise relevant to biodiversity from within the United Kingdom to work with local partners in countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The conservation of biological diversity,</li> <li>o The sustainable use of its components, and</li> <li>o The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</li> </ul>		<p>We need time to make a measurable impact on the conservation of elephants &amp; their habitat in Salakpra but, through data collection and feedback, we have made good progress in raising local awareness about the HEC problem and its associated issues. We have also forged better links between key stakeholders, a fundamental prerequisite for making a positive impact</p>	
<p><b>Purpose:</b> Via Afro-Asian exchange and technical cooperation, enact a community-based elephant conservation and conflict resolution initiative in W.Thailand to serve as a model for participatory conservation/ sustainable development S.E.Asia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Monitoring/mitigation system functioning &amp; new knowledge being used for conservation &amp; sustainable use</li> <li>b) Increased capacity / cooperation, reduced conflict, improved local benefits, reduced threats to eles.</li> <li>c) Better communication &amp; lesson-sharing between sites</li> </ul>	<p>Overall, good progress towards the project purpose &amp; measurable indicators with HEC monitoring &amp; mitigation systems in place, new knowledge regularly shared/discussed; increased capacity within ECN &amp; partner communities; more collaborative relations between farmers, local leaders &amp; PA forged by ECN; exchanges between Thailand &amp; Kenya and between HEC sites in Thailand.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◇ Continue HEC, crop-trials, land-use forest surveys / monitoring</li> <li>◇ All survey data analysed &amp; written up for wider presentation</li> <li>◇ Foster creation of SEECA groups &amp; plans for conservation activities</li> <li>◇ Undertake ecotourism product planning process with communities</li> <li>◇ Share information locally at feedback meetings &amp; regionally at workshop</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 1</b> Local capacity to monitor and mitigate human-elephant conflict improved (via training, supervision, study trips/exchange, feedback)</p>	<p>➤ 25+ partners &amp; community members trained as relevant, and one MSc studied in UK</p>	<p><b>Progress:</b> The capacity of 8 project staff &amp; 31 collaborative community members to monitor and mitigate HEC has certainly improved and they are doing well, but because we now recruit truly local people, i.e. from the project area, their educational attainment is mostly slightly lower and it will take time before the team can be fully independent. The MSc was first postponed (noted in 1<sup>st</sup> interim &amp; 1<sup>st</sup> annual report) when project start-up was delayed, and then dropped (noted in 2<sup>nd</sup> interim report) when the intended recipient left. The budget was reallocated, with DI permission, to project staff GIS training and the tourism feasibility study, both using UK expertise &amp; skills transfer.</p> <p><b>Appropriateness of Indicators:</b> a distinction should be made between local-locals (from project area) and local-nationals (from project country) as recruitment from each can have different outcomes viz. commitment (to this project vs any project), efficacy (local PR vs report writing) and leadership. Recruiting true locals has real advantages but until we can find a local-local with the relevant higher education, or a qualified local-national with genuine commitment to the project, ECN will still want some leadership, fund-raising support &amp; in-service training until enough local staff have the skills, experience &amp; confidence to take over all aspects of managing this long-term project. It is unrealistic &amp; unfair to pretend that full independence can be achieved in 2.7 years.</p>	
<p>Activity 1.1 Survey training</p>		<p><b>Yr1</b> 3 ECN staff (two of whom then left), 16 village monitors &amp; assistants trained to record HEC data (31 still involved), 10 forest rangers re-trained for forest surveys;</p> <p><b>Yr2</b> 5 more ECN staff trained to record HEC data (4 still involved), 3 also trained to do basic forest surveys, 5 more forest rangers trained to help with forest surveys.</p>	

Project Summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress & Achievements Apr 06 – Mar 07	Actions required / planned for next period
Activity 1.2 Annual feedback meeting		<p>Yr1 None. Too soon to have any data or information to share</p> <p>Yr2 4 community feedback meetings: 2 x 1-day in June, 1 x 2-day &amp; 1x1-day in late Nov (see reports), 1 feedback meeting in Dec to local leaders as part of 1-day workshop for socio-economic survey. Most participants now actively on-side</p> <p>Yr3: 1-2 community feedback meetings; national dissemination workshop</p>	
Activity 1.3 Kenya HEC / ecotourism study trip		<p>Trip moved from June to Oct, study team had 3 ECN members (inc BSC), Dr Mattana Srikrajang (government counterpart), Ms Buranakarn Chatupornpaisan (owner Jumbo Travel, tourism partner) &amp; Mr Joei Hutakom (documentary film-maker for Thai ITV). The team visited 9 sites (see 3.1 above &amp; trip report). Lessons learned @ HEC mitigation (e.g. chilli ropes, fence designs) &amp; ecotourism ideas (e.g. starbeds, activities) adopted</p>	
Activity 1.4 Kuiburi study trip (not in original plan)		<p>From 7-9 Nov, ECN arranged for 17 community reps (inc. HEC-affected farmers, local leaders &amp; PA officials) to visit a Royal HEC mitigation project, Kuiburi NP, S.W. Thailand to learn from other villagers about HEC problems &amp; mitigation measures. This allowed sharing of info / experiences (inc. CD / white strips now being tested by ECN) &amp; network development. Very worthwhile trip which strengthened local regard for ECN (see report)</p>	
Activity 1.5 Visit by Kenyan counterpart to help set-up crop-trials		<p>From 8-18 Mar, Dr Noah Sitati visited ECN to learn about its different HEC challenges compared to his area in Transmara and to help ECN design and set-up its own crop-protection trials using local &amp; African methods (see report). Dr Sitati's help invaluable.</p>	
Activity 1.6 GIS training in lieu of MSc (change from original plan)		<p>With OK from DI, some MSc funds used to provide (i) 2 x 5-day training courses for ECN staff in basic GIS mapping from Dr Yongyut Trisurat of Kasetsart Univ's Dept. Conservation (ii) Dr Susan Canney, elephant GIS specialist at Oxford Univ. worked with team leaders &amp; IT specialist to provide specific data management &amp; mapping training (see reports). GIS maps now produced by ECN &amp; data managed more efficiently</p>	
<p><b>Output 2</b> Monitoring &amp; mitigation programme established / functioning, implemented by local communities and partner organisations</p>	<p>➤ Relevant data collected in 14 villages &amp; sanctuary from Yr1, mitigation measures implemented from Yr2, impact assessed Yr3</p>	<p><b>Progress:</b> crop-raiding monitored for 1-year using effective reporting system so e hear of every incident. ECN relations with affected farmers, local leaders &amp; other community members is excellent (they have voiced appreciation for ECN work &amp; feedback on TV, to PA officials, local politicians &amp; the provincial governor). Crop-protection trials are set up &amp; well supported with wealthier farmers paying set-up / repair costs themselves.</p> <p><b>Appropriateness of Indicators:</b> these are fine</p>	
Activity 2.1 Monitor HEC / crop-raiding		<p>Yr1 Protocols &amp; forms developed, before monitoring started in March 06 when all VMs had been trained. This was towards the end of an unusually wet (largely fire-free) dry season. Crop-raid monitoring has kept going ever since.</p> <p>Yr2 ECN staff recorded data with VMs until the latter were practiced enough to do so alone without compromising data quality. This year's dry season was very hot and forest fires were widespread and recurring. A first year report is now in draft.</p> <p>Yr3 This monitoring must keep going as a long-term activity as it provides baseline data for understanding any links between human impacts on the forest (e.g. fire, cattle, bamboo cutting) and crop-raiding, as well as for assessing the impact of HEC interventions.</p>	



Project Summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress & Achievements Apr 06 – Mar 07	Actions required / planned for next period
Activity 2.2 Carry out socio-economic survey		<p>Yr1 Originally planned as part of HEC/land-use monitoring with VMs, plan revised to be collaborative survey led by retired researcher of Chulalongkorn University Social Research Unit. Revision noted in 1<sup>st</sup> interim &amp; 1<sup>st</sup> annual reports.</p> <p>Yr2 Survey done by Dr Napat Sirisamphand with ECN field assistant Dec – Jan with semi-structured interviews of HEC affected villagers, questionnaires of non-HEC villagers &amp; workshop with community leaders (see report). Key finding: villagers impacting forest (many / poorer) are not HEC-affected families (few / richer).</p> <p>Yr3 Follow-up meeting with ECN team &amp; representative community members/leaders</p>	
Activity 2.3 Set up & monitor crop protection trials in 5 sites		<p>Yr1 Rescheduled to mid-March (reported in 2<sup>nd</sup> interim report) after Kenya study trip postponed by KWS. Dr Sitati visit also postponed as a result. This gave us a year of baseline crop-raiding data, although the two dry seasons were so different (one very wet, one very dry) that comparative analysis is more difficult</p> <p>Yr2 Set up crop-protection trials from mid-March in 7 major HEC sites and recruited 2 new village-based project staff to help monitor daily these and the crop-raiding.</p> <p>Yr3 Continue maintaining &amp; monitoring the crop-protection trials, analyse data to find out what measures work, for how long, and what is the cost-benefit</p>	
Activity 2.4 Conduct seasonal forest surveys		<p>Yr 1 Protocols / forms developed &amp; piloted in Dec 05, reviewed with Dr Tim Wachter (ZSL) in early Mar 06. 1st forest surveys of 3 selected areas done Mar/Apr 06.</p> <p>Yr2 2<sup>nd</sup> (Jul-Aug) and 3<sup>rd</sup> (Nov-Dec) forest surveys done. Draft report underway. In Mar, approach partially reviewed with Dr Simon Hedges, the Asian Elephant project coordinator of WCS in light of recruitment problems. Full review requested</p> <p>Yr3 Review approach of forest surveys &amp; implement next series. Recruit UK intern to work with a Thai graduate in leading surveys and processing data into reports.</p>	
Activity 2.5 Carry out land-use survey & mapping		<p>Yr1 Originally planned as part of HEC/socio-economic monitoring by VMs, delay noted in 1<sup>st</sup> interim report, targeted aerial mapping planned for May 06.</p> <p>Yr2 Aerial mapping of three villages done by helicopter with help from PA, Police and visiting specialist in May-June 06. Ground-truthing started in Sep-Oct but delayed by shortage of staff time. Training started with new recruits in April 07</p> <p>Yr3 Systematic land-use mapping to be done by VMs and new village-based project staff, overseen by new ECN staff HEC coordinator, starting with high HEC areas</p>	
<b>Output 3</b> Small scale ecotourism established linking local communities, protected area, elephant conservation	➤ Appropriate product developed & marketed by Yr2, visitors Yr3	<p><b>Progress:</b> After a planned delay (noted in 1<sup>st</sup> annual report) to await data on areas of high HEC impact, the plan was revised (noted in 2<sup>nd</sup> interim report) to undertake a feasibility study before developing an ecotourism product. This has now been done.</p> <p><b>Appropriateness of Indicators:</b> the proposed output was inappropriate within this time-frame, and the indicators provided would not themselves reveal whether the product was effectively linking local communities, the PA &amp; elephant conservation</p>	
Planned activity 3.1 Product development by operator & communities Yr1 Planned activity 3.2 Basic training and product marketing local/overseas Yr2 Planned activity 3.3 Trial tours with domestic/international pilot groups Yr3		Abandoned in favour of an appropriately designed feasibility study which was commissioned in November 2006 for implementation from 6 Jan – 6 Apr 2007.	

Project Summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress & Achievements Apr 06 – Mar 07	Actions required / planned for next period
Actual activity 3.1 Conduct an appropriately designed feasibility study		<p><b>Yr 2</b> it became clear at the pro-poor tourism workshop in UK in May 2006 that our concerns about this activity were valid i.e we could not develop an effective ecotourism product without first doing a full feasibility study. This was commissioned in Nov 06 for implementation from Jan-Apr 07. Activities included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Site visits around target area to HEC villages, ECN activities, Salakpra</li> <li>o Data collection on existing tourism market in local area</li> <li>o Interviews with local tour operators, tourism officials, ecotourism organisations</li> <li>o Visit potential model ecotourism elsewhere the region</li> <li>o Community workshop with trip to community-based tourism / conservation venture</li> <li>o Produce feasibility report with recommendations (see attached near-final draft)</li> </ul> <p><b>Yr3</b> Seek funding to implement the step-by-step product development process that is recommended in the feasibility study</p>	
<b>Output 4</b> International network for community-based ele-conservation and conflict mitigation established	➤ Study trip/meetings introduce members Yr2/3, web-based network operational by Yr3	This proposal was discussed during Nairobi HEC workshop in Sept 2006. Everyone is keen for HEC mitigation practitioners to share info/experiences, but the IUCN African Elephant Specialist Group manager warned how costly and time-consuming it is to maintain a web-based HEC forum and how few people use them (one such forum has folded for lack of support). It was decided that another web-based network would not work and HEC researchers must try to keep in touch informally, sharing papers etc.	
Planned activity 4.1 Concept discusses/network planned at workshops Planned activity 4.2 Plans finalised, website designed / tested Planned activity 4.3 Network established and functioning Yr3		No longer applicable (see above) but ECN will raise the issue again at its own regional HEC workshop in 2008. In the meantime, ECN will focus on developing an active HEC network in Kanchanaburi, facilitating the creation of CBOs and relevant collaborations.	
Actual activity 4.1 Facilitate the creation of community conservation groups		<p><b>Yr2</b> Planned as a subsidiary activity under 2.1 to help mitigate HEC, it is clear from numerous discussions locally that we need a collaborative conservation alliance with community groups, ECN, the PA &amp; other key parties to address the bigger picture of HEC: forest protection / sustainable use / alternative livelihoods / social justice etc. We are forging a Salakpra Elephant Ecosystem Conservation Alliance (SEECA) at village &amp; district levels. To date two districts have nominal groups</p> <p><b>Yr3</b> Continue encouraging the creation of SEECA community groups by helping to plan and source funds for appropriate community-based conservation activities</p>	
<b>Output 5</b> Lessons learned and best practice disseminated	➤ 3 presentations, 6 press releases 4 radio/TV broadcasts, 1 final report, 3 articles out by Yr3.	<p><b>Progress:</b> overall, more indicator outputs achieved than planned; very good progress in sharing info &amp; lessons learned at local levels (community, district &amp; provincial), good progress at general national level via Thai media, but more action needed with key decision-makers in Thai government &amp; academia. Progress as planned internationally via Nairobi HEC workshop, with some relevant progress sharing information in the UK</p> <p><b>Appropriateness of Indicators:</b> press releases indicate effort but not outcome. In Thailand, it works best to contact the desks/journalists in relevant media to invite them to newsworthy events or offer stories. At ECN, we are developing relevant contacts in the media to ensure useful coverage. All presentations promote the project and share info but some may not achieve this output. We have focused on sharing info at local level in order to 'tap-root' the project &amp; make it more effective on the ground, but we must now give targeted presentations to key decision-making people at national level.</p>	

Project Summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress & Achievements Apr 06 – Mar 07	Actions required / planned for next period
Activity 5.1 Presentations / illustrated powerpoint (PP) talk: 1 per year		<p><b>Yr1</b> 11 presentations @ project to villages affected by crop raiding, 1 to provincial governor, 2 to provincial &amp; district environment planning group meetings; 1 to Salakpra WS station managers, 1 to Senate Ele-Working Group Workshop on need for corridors &amp; improve Thai elephant laws, 1 x pro-poor tourism workshop in UK, 1 x elephant vet training course at ZSL, 1 x ZSL members/donors event; plus 250<sup>+</sup> b/w info pamphlets (in Thai) about project, distributed locally</p> <p><b>Yr2</b> 4 community feedback meetings (see under 1.2 above); 1 PP-talk at Salakpra managers' monthly meeting; 1 presentation at ADEQ meeting on HEC in Salakpra; 1 PP-talk to HEC regional workshop Nairobi; 1 PP-talk at 1-day local community leaders workshop (see 1.2 above); 1 PP-talk for visitors/hosts on Kuiburi study trip; 1 PP-talk at local community members workshop for the ecotourism feasibility study; manned a stand with 3-sheet poster &amp; pamphlets in Nat. Resource Management section of Mahidol Uni's Kanchanaburi Campus open day; 1 PP-talk to ZSL audience (zoos and conservation programme)</p> <p><b>Yr3</b> Plan: 1-2 community feedback meetings (scheduled for Sep/Oct and Mar/Apr); 1-2 presentations to MONRE / DNP target audiences at Minister &amp; Director level 1-2 presentations to DNP/Kasetsart University's Annual Wildlife Seminar; 2-3 presentations at regional HEC workshop to be organised by ECN; ECN web-site, Thai-English newsletter system (hard &amp; e-copies) functioning</p>	
Activity 5.2 Press coverage / articles: 2 press releases / articles per year		<p><b>Yr1</b> No coverage while we awaited much delayed official government permit</p> <p><b>Yr2</b> 1 illustrated 3-page feature article on project leader in UK local magazine Wiltshire View, 1 press release, 7 news items in Thai press on initiating crop-protection trials, 1 column piece on project leader in Nation Media papers</p> <p><b>Yr3</b> Generate press coverage of all project activities / findings at relevant times</p>	
Activity 5.3 TV / radio coverage: 4 radio / TV broadcasts		<p><b>Yr1</b> No coverage while we awaited much delayed official government permit</p> <p><b>Yr2</b> Local radio coverage of 2<sup>nd</sup> feedback meeting (Nov 06); 11 x Thai national TV items (1x 5-min on crop-protection trials, 1 x 40-min on project aim, activities, findings; 9 x 30-min series on Kenya study trip</p> <p><b>Yr3</b> Generate TV/radio coverage of project activities / findings at relevant times</p>	
Activity 5.4 Publications: 1 paper published / 2 submitted by end of Yr3		<p><b>Yr2</b> 1 x summary paper published in <i>Pachyderm</i> 41 (Jul-Dec 2006) on Nairobi HEC workshop; 1 paper submitted for proceedings of Nairobi HEC Workshop</p> <p><b>Yr3</b> 3 x papers prepared for regional HEC workshop, submitted to relevant journal/s</p>	
Activity 5.5 Web-links: 1 web-based network established		No longer applicable as plan dropped following discussion at Nairobi HEC meeting. However, we will raise the issue again at our own regional HEC workshop in 2008	
Activity 5.6 Final report: 1 final report printed (250 Thai, 250 English) Yr3		To be produced next year	

## Annex 2 Project's full current logframe

Project Summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p><b>Goal:</b> To draw on expertise relevant to biodiversity from within the United Kingdom to work with local partners in countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The conservation of biological diversity,</li> <li>o The sustainable use of its components, and</li> <li>o The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Purpose:</b> Via Afro-Asian exchange and technical cooperation, enact a community-based elephant conservation and conflict resolution initiative in W.Thailand to serve as a model for participatory conservation/sustainable development S.E.Asia</p>	<p>a) Monitoring/mitigation system functioning &amp; new knowledge being used for conservation &amp; sustainable use</p> <p>b) Increased capacity / cooperation, reduced conflict, improved local benefits, reduced threats to elephants</p> <p>c) Better communication and lesson-sharing between sites</p>	<p>a) Communications, reports, publications</p> <p>b) Training records/certificates</p> <p>c) Analyses of relevant monitoring / evaluation data (social, economic, ecological)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◇ Government policies continue to support conservation / collaboration</li> <li>◇ partners &amp; stakeholders remain enthusiastic &amp; committed during / after the lifetime of the project</li> <li>◇ Tourism remains a viable livelihood option</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 1</b> Local capacity to monitor and mitigate human-elephant conflict improved (via training, supervision, study trips/exchange, feedback)</p>	<p>➤ ECN project staff and 25+ partners, inc. community members trained as relevant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◇ Training / study trip attendance</li> <li>◇ Survey field experience / reports</li> <li>◇ Partners / associates feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◇ Suitable candidates can be recruited, they complete the training &amp; remain active and effective with the project</li> </ul>
Activity 1.1 Survey training		<p>Yr1 ECN staff &amp; VMs for HEC work, forest rangers for forest surveys</p> <p>Yr2 New staff trained for HEC work and to do forest surveys</p> <p>Yr3 Ditto, as necessary</p>	
Activity 1.2 Annual feedback meetings		<p>Yr1 None. Too soon to have any data or information to share</p> <p>Yr2 Minimum of two community feedback meetings, minimum</p> <p>Yr3: Two community feedback meetings; regional dissemination workshop</p>	
Activity 1.3 Kenya exchange		<p>Yr 2 ECN study trip to Kenya, Kenya counterpart to Thailand</p> <p>Yr 3 Kenya counterpart to regional dissemination workshop</p>	
Activity 1.4 Local study trips for community representatives		<p>Yr 2 Kuiburi NP royal HEC mitigation project, and local community-based conservation &amp; ecotourism initiatives as part of tourism workshop</p> <p>Yr3 Proposed trip to HKK to see healthy forest ecosystem; to community-based conservation / ecotourism initiatives to see potential value</p>	
Activity 1.6 Basic GIS training		<p>Yr2 Two 5-day courses for ECN local staff by Dr Yongyut Trisurat</p> <p>10-day training in data management &amp; GIS by Dr Susan Canney</p> <p>Yr3 Dr Susan Canney second visit to work on data analysis &amp; mapping</p>	

Project Summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<b>Output 2</b> Monitoring & mitigation programme established / functioning, implemented by ECN with local communities & partner organisations	➤ Relevant data collected in 14 villages & sanctuary from Yr1, mitigation measures implemented from Yr2, impact assessed Yr3	◇ Data collection protocols; data recording system; HEC, crop trial & forest survey data analysis & reports; meeting reports;	◇ As above, that suitable candidates can be recruited, they complete the training & remain active and effective with the project
Activity 2.1 monitor HEC / crop-raiding		Yr1 Protocols & forms developed, VMs trained. Yr2 Data recorded by ECN staff with VMs until the latter practiced enough to record alone without compromising data quality. Yr3 Analysis of all data while continuing to monitor, map & cost each raid	
Activity 2.2 Carry out socio economic survey		Yr2 Conduct survey using structured & semi-structured interview techniques Yr3 Follow-up planning within ECN & workshop with local leaders	
Activity 2.3 Carry out land-use mapping survey		Yr2 Start land-use mapping using aerial & ground-truthing techniques Yr3 Complete land-use mapping of key areas, monitor changes in land use, and analyse in relation to crop-raiding and forest surveys data.	
Activity 2.4 Set up & monitor crop protection trials		Yr 2 Dr Noah Sitati visit from Kenya to start crop protection trials Mar 07 Yr3 Maintain & monitor crop-protection trials, review mid-year, analyse data and assess cost of crop-raiding versus cost of crop protection after 1 year	
Activity 2.5 Conduct seasonal forest surveys		Yr 1 Protocols developed & piloted Dec 05, reviewed Mar 06. Yr2 Conduct 3 forest surveys in dry (April), wet (July) and cool (Dec) seasons Yr3 Analyse data, draft report, review methods/approach, modify as needed	
<b>Output 3</b> Small ecotourism initiative planned that links local communities, PA, and elephant conservation	➤ Appropriate start-up product planned & initiated with target communities	◇ Meeting & planning reports ◇ Product development action plan	◇ Communities opt to develop a tourism product, tourism partners stay keen, funds available
Activity 3.1 Conduct appropriately designed feasibility study		Yr 2 Conduct feasibility study	
Activity 3.2 Develop tourism product with target communities		Yr3 Conduct workshops & study trips with target communities and tourism partner to develop plan for collaborative tourism product	
<b>Output 4</b> Local SEECA network for community-based ele / ecosystem conservation & conflict mitigation established	➤ Study trips / meetings that establish local groups & conservation initiatives, website & newsletter operational	Study trip reports, meeting reports, CBO agreements, conservation project plans, newsletters	◇ Community members remain keen to form & motivate CBOs ◇ CBO members keen to implement ICDP initiatives ◇ Gov.authority / PA keen and able to be an active supporting member
Activity 4.1 Form local SEECA groups		Yr3 Meetings with community members / local leaders to form CBO groups	
Activity 4.2 Formulate local SEECA group ICDP activities		Yr3 ECN support planning & fund-raising for proposed SEECA group activities	
Activity 4.3 Implement local SEECA group ICDP activities		Yr3 With ECN support/facilitation, local SEECA groups begin ICDP activities	

Project Summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<b>Output 5</b> Lessons learned and best practice disseminated	➤ 3 presentations, 6 press releases 4 radio/TV broadcasts, 1 final report, 3 articles/papers out by Yr3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◇ Powerpoint presentations</li> <li>◇ Press packs, media coverage</li> <li>◇ Reports, papers, articles</li> </ul>	◇ ECN will retain current team members & recruit as planned
Activity 5.1 Presentations / illustrated powerpoint talks (PPT) 3+ per year		<p>Yr1 presentations HEC villages, PA &amp; provincial authorities, plus 250<sup>+</sup> b/w info pamphlets (in Thai) about project, distributed locally</p> <p>Yr2 4 community feedback meetings; 1 PPT at Salakpra meeting; 1 verbal presentation at ADEQ meeting on Salakpra HEC; 1 PPT to Nairobi HEC workshop; 1 PPT at local leaders workshop; 1 PPT for visitors/hosts on Kuiburi study trip; 1 PPT at ecotourism workshop; stand with 3-sheet poster &amp; pamphlets at Mahidol Uni open day; 1 PPT @ ZSL</p> <p>Yr3 2 feedback meetings (Sep/Oct &amp; Mar/Apr); 2<sup>+</sup> SEECA planning meetings; 1<sup>+</sup> PPT to MONRE / DNP directors; 1<sup>+</sup> PPT to DNP/KU Annual Wildlife Seminar; 2<sup>+</sup> PPT at regional HEC workshop of ECN; ECN web-site and Thai-English newsletter system operational</p>	
Activity 5.2 Press coverage / articles: 2 press releases / articles per year		<p>Yr1 No coverage while we awaited much delayed official government permit</p> <p>Yr2 1 illustrated 3-page feature in Wilts. mag; 1 press release @ crop-trials, 7 news items in Thai press crop-trials, 1 column piece in Nation papers;</p> <p>Yr3 news coverage of project activities / findings, emphasis on key outcomes, and recommendations for HEC mitigation in and around Salakpra</p>	
Activity 5.3 TV / radio coverage: 4 radio / TV broadcasts		<p>Yr1 No coverage while we awaited much delayed official government permit</p> <p>Yr2 Local radio 2<sup>nd</sup> feedback meeting; 11 x Thai national TV items (1x 5-min on crop-trials, 1 x 40-min on project aim / activities; 9 x 30-min series on Kenya study trip</p> <p>Yr3 3<sup>+</sup> TV/radio coverage of project activities / findings as per press coverage</p>	
Activity 5.3 Publications: 1 paper published / 2 submitted by end of Yr3		<p>Yr2 1 x summary paper in <i>Pachyderm</i> 41 (Jul-Dec 2006) on Nairobi HEC workshop; 1 paper submitted for proceedings of Nairobi HEC Workshop</p> <p>Yr3 3 papers at regional HEC workshop, submitted to relevant journal/s</p>	
Activity 5.4 Web-site / tri-annual newsletters / CBO network meetings		Yr3 Set up ECN web site, design newsletters; establish hard & electronic distribution system; establish regular meetings of SEECA CBO groups	
Activity 5.5 Final report: 1 final report printed (250 Thai, 250 English) Yr3		Yr3 final report for 2.7 month current project period: officially Jun 05 – Mar 08 but effective start delayed until Aug 05 by changeover from FOC to ZSL. Final report will be used as a tool for generating in-county support, esp. from Gov, for implementing ECN's recommendations on HEC mitigation.	

### **Annex 3: Supplementary Material for Annual Report 2006/7**

The following reports are provided in electronic format and on CD.

1. Community feedback meeting reports
  - a) June 2006
  - b) November 2006
2. Study trips:
  - a) Kenya study trip report (October 2006)
  - b) Kuiburi study trip report (November 2006)
3. Dr Noah Sitati report March 07: trip to Thailand to advise on crop protection trials
4. Socio-economic survey report
5. Ecotourism feasibility study
6. Training reports:
  - a) Basic course in GIS: Dr Yongyut Trisurat
  - b) Data management & GIS: Dr Susan Canney
7. Media coverage:
  - a) Article on BSC / ECN in Wiltshire View
  - b) Some press pieces (in Thai)
  - c) TV series on Kenya trip, 9-parts in Thai (available on request)
8. Photo illustration of ECN activities over the year

