



## *Darwin Initiative Annual Report*



**Important note:**

**To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders – it is expected that this report will be about 10 pages in length, excluding annexes**

**Submission deadline 30 April 2009**

Darwin Project Information

<b>Project Ref Number</b>	<b>16-014</b>
<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Co-management of Forests and Wildlife in the Bi Doup-Nui Ba (BD-NB) Nature Reserve, Vietnam</b>
<b>Country(ies)</b>	<b>Vietnam</b>
<b>UK Contract Holder Institution</b>	<b>International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)</b>
<b>Host country Partner Institution(s)</b>	<b>WWF Greater Mekong Programme – Vietnam Country Office</b>
<b>Other Partner Institution(s)</b>	<b>Bi-Doup Nui-Ba National Park Management Board</b>
<b>Darwin Grant Value</b>	<b>£179,712</b>
<b>Start/End dates of Project</b>	<b>July 2007 to October 2010</b>
<b>Reporting period (1 Apr 200x to 31 Mar 200y) and annual report number (1,2,3..)</b>	<b>1 April 2008 to 31 March 2009.  Annual Report #2</b>
<b>Project Leader Name</b>	<b>Ivan Bond</b>
<b>Project website</b>	<b><a href="http://www.iied.org/sustainable-markets/key-issues/environmental-economics/co-management-forests-and-wildlife-vietnam">http://www.iied.org/sustainable-markets/key-issues/environmental-economics/co-management-forests-and-wildlife-vietnam</a></b>
<b>Author(s) and main contributors, date</b>	<b>Ivan Bond (Thursday 30<sup>th</sup> April 2009)</b>

## **1. Project Background**

Bi Doup-Nui Ba (BD-NB) National Park was decreed in 1986. It is one of the larger protected areas in Vietnam, encompassing 72,573 ha. It is mountainous and forms a vital watershed to three distinct water catchments. It falls within a landscape which has been independently identified by leading national and international scientists as one of the highest conservation priorities within the Greater Annamites eco-region.

The human population in the buffer zone surrounding BD-NB is growing with concomitant pressure on land and natural resources both inside and adjacent to the protected area. In addition, the integrity and the bio-diversity of BD-NB is threatened by infra-structure and potentially uncontrolled tourism development (see DI Half year report, 31-10-08).

The Bi Doup-Nui Ba Management Board identified that encroachment into the Park was an important threat and was in part a failure of the collaboration between the Park Management Board and the ethnic communities in the buffer zone. Through IIED and WWF-GMS, the project is taking steps to develop and implement co-management approaches to working with such communities that succeed in providing incentives for sustainable land use both in the buffer zone and the protected area.

## **2. Project Partnerships**

The core partnership in this project is between the BD-NB Management Board, WWF-GMS and IIED in the UK. In future, it is anticipated that this relationship will extend to representatives of the communes in which the project is active.

WWF was one of the first iNGOs (International Non-Governmental Organisations) to work in Vietnam. After 20 years of operations, WWF continues to be highly respected and able to work closely with our counterparts in the Vietnamese Government. WWF is responsible for the in-country supervision of the project and the employment of the project staff who are based in Da Lat. Project supervision, guidance and support comes from two senior members of staff, both based in Hanoi.

Overall project management, guidance and liaison with the Darwin Initiative (DI) is provided by Ivan Bond and James Macgregor of IIED. Both are senior researchers with significant experience of co-management and community conservation in southern Africa and more recently in Cambodia (see 14-046).

No direct contacts have been made with the Ministry of Environment who serve as the contact point for the Convention on Bio-Diversity (CBD).

## **3. Project progress**

As reported in the First Annual Report, this project made good progress in its first year of implementation. The project was granted provincial approval, by the Lam Dong Provincial Authority in 'record' four weeks. In addition, the project made good progress by recruiting two very good Vietnamese Staff (Nguyen Huong Minh) and Pham Tron Nhan); an office was set-up and the project was officially launched by the Director of the BD-NB National Park and the Director of WWF(Vietnam).

The reports below will show that progress has been made in undertaking many of the planned activities; such as the 3D Modeling; the livelihoods survey; a survey of management practices etc. However the purpose of the project namely 'to conserve threatened bio-diversity in the BD-NB National park in Vietnam through the introduction of collaborative forest and wildlife stewardship models based on negotiated tenure and access rights' – appears to be a highly ambitious and in the remaining project period will be extremely challenging to effectively operationalise at meaningful scale.

There are two reasons for this, these are:

The legal and policy frame-work for co-management: The national frame-work for co-management between the selected communes and the management board of the BD-NB National park is extremely complicated. As we develop a greater understanding of the situation on the ground, it seems matched by a decline in the explicit opportunities for co-management.

Allocation of resources and staff time: Work in the second half of the reporting period was constrained by human resource issues both within WWF and IIED. At the start of FY09, a conscious decision was made to direct the bulk of the financial resources to WWF for the implementation of the project. During the reporting period, two key staff in Vietnam left the project. In the latter part of 2008 and early 2009, IIED has not been able to react to this change as effectively or efficiently as would have been expected. Guidance and support to the project's activities during this period have been inadequate. The project is now entering a critical phase and will need considerable support in fulfilling some of the technical challenges and plotting the way ahead for the next 12 months.

### 3.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

**Output 1. Appropriate legal frameworks for co-management in place:** Two initial reports commissioned by the project highlighted

- The complexity of the legal and policy framework for co-management, and
- The preference for the term collaborative management, which is considered less threatening by government officials.

During the reporting period the project has continued to build and develop our understanding of the opportunities for collaborative management as well as those of the selected communities. We continue to pursue options for collaborative management through tourism. For this reason the project staff organized a visit to two other tourism projects; Bach Ma National Park and Suoi Voi Waterfall Eco-tourism Project.

Towards the end of 2008, a study commissioned to consider the options for collaborative management from the perspective of the BD-NB Management Board also highlighted the many (and some new) challenges of collaborative management in the Vietnamese Context. The Report highlighted the extent of the pressure on the BD-NB Board of Management as a result of the increase in collaborative and co-management initiatives in and around the national park.

**Output 2. Communities in the buffer zone have capacity to negotiate and benefit from co-management:** The development of effective collaborative management often focuses on the communities living in buffer zones adjacent to protected area, with too little attention focussed on the activities and constraints of staff within the protected area. For this reason a consultant with considerable experience in Vietnam was hired to consider the opportunities for collaborative management from the perspective of the BD-NB Board of Management. The report highlighted:

The organisation and the management of the Board of Management around nine objectives that are in the Park Plan

1. Proposed five potential interventions for the WWF/IIED Project:
2. Financial support of the 'protection contracts' via the joint patrols
3. Financial support for 'protection contracts' via the 'blue-book patrols'
4. Support to develop monitoring systems for human-wildlife conflict in the buffer zones
5. Support for a system of passes for mushroom collectors
6. Support for education and propaganda about the importance of the BD-NB

As noted above the report also highlighted the increasing interest and number of activities in and around BD-NB with a collaborative management focus. In particular the report highlighted the scale and lack of transparency of the JAICA initiative.

The report by the consultant was used as the basis for a workshop that was held in DB\_NB on the opportunities and challenges for collaborative management as planned (see DI Annual Report #1). It should be noted that the first two recommendations by the consultant, namely the financial support for joint patrols and 'blue-book' patrols are beyond the financial capacity of this project. In addition, such support would be temporary and largely palliative.

The project remains committed to developing a collaborative management model that is based around community based tourism model. During the review, the consultant identified a suitable location for such an enterprise – although the K'Long K'Lanh Area has been planned as an Agri-Tech Zone (see Sobey

pp #8). The loss of the current wetlands to agro-industry would be a major set back due to their proximity to known gibbon habitat.

In addition, as part of the investigation into the development of tourism, the project facilitated the first ever international birding party to visit BD-NB National Park. This was a joint initiative between two companies (Sunbird) in the UK and a Vietnamese Birding Company.

**Output 3. Core protection zone established:** 3D Modeling has become a standard tool to assist with challenging issues around that involve contested boundaries and landuse planning. The methodology has been used to great effect by IIED and WWF in the Mondulkiri Wilderness Area in Cambodia.

During the reporting period, a full scale 3D model of the BD-NB National Park was developed. The process was facilitated by a consultant and involved the participation of staff from the Board of Management and representatives from the selected communes.

The process of building the model was used to identify areas of conflict and between the BD-NB National Park and the communes. Generally these were areas of coffee plantation that had encroached into the protected area. The results of the discussion were that there was much greater understanding of the problem of contested boundaries and between the communes and the protected area. Although this process (i.e. 3D mapping) has led to greater agreement over the boundary between the commune and the National Park this is often only temporary. As a result, in the next year, the project will assist the communes and the National Park to demarcate their common boundary.

A second 3D- model for the Das-Chais Commune is being developed. We anticipate that this model will assist with some of the tricky landuse planning issues that are facing the commune – such as the conversion of a prime wetlands site to agriculture.

**Output 4. Socio-economic status established:** A preliminary rapid assessment of the six communes surrounding BD-NB was carried out in November and December 2007. This survey indicated that

The residents of the communes adjacent to BD-NB are mostly members of ethnic minority groups

The residents are mostly poor and dependent on small scale agriculture and the collection of non-timber forest products

A high proportion of the residents in the Da Sar, Da Nhim, Da Chais and d'kno have forest protection contracts while in Lat and Lac Duong there is much lower participation in this form of collaborative management

During the current reporting period a second and much more detailed livelihoods survey was conducted. The purpose of the survey was to generate more understanding and quantify livelihoods in two communes and to initiate a dialogue on the potential of an eco-tourism venture to address livelihoods and in doing so reduce the pressure on the land and resources of BD-NB National Park.

The survey established that:

Household incomes are low falling into a range between VN6 million and VN36 million per annum (£240 - £1,440 per annum assuming an exchange rate of £1 = VND25,000).

There was considerable internal differentiation in livelihoods between households within each commune as well as between the two communes. The average household income being higher in Da Lat than in Da Chais. This was attributed to their greater access to land, natural resources and education.

Wage labour and government revenue from forest protection contracts (collaborative management agreements) are essential forms of cash income to the households.

There was some potential for eco-tourism, but that the direct contribution of tourism to household income would be entirely dependent on the scale of the operation and the net revenues that it generated. However the report also predicted that developing tourism in the area would be extremely 'challenging'.

The livelihoods analysis under-taken by the project has shown very clearly the twin challenges of poverty and resource scarcity that face the residents of the Da Lat and Da Chais Communes. Under these conditions, the individual and collective decisions to extend their cultivation of coffee (their major cash

crop) is entirely rationale despite the loss in bio-diversity and the encroachment in to BD-NB National Park.

**Output 5. Communities monitoring natural resources:** During our work with the Management Board of BD-NB, we have identified three major categories of threats to its integrity and bio-diversity status. These are:

Infra-structure: There is a major threat of ribbon development along the DaLat - Nga Trang Rod (Road 723). In order to monitor development along the road, the project has established key points for photo-transects. The project has set up photo-transects along the road and these have been updated twice during the reporting period. Associated with the road is the construction and development of inappropriate agro-industrial activities such as the salmon fish farm.

Tourism infra-structure: There is immense pressure on the Management Board of BD-NB to develop tourism infra-structure within the protected area.

Encroachment and bio-diversity loss by communities: The encroachment into the protected area by farmers from the adjacent communities constitutes the third threat to BD-NB.

In the current reporting period, a consultant was recruited to examine the opportunities for collaborative management from the perspective of the Management Board (see references above).

**Output 6. Project success (lessons) communicated: In the current reporting period, two main activities have been undertaken, these are:**

English courses for staff: There have been ongoing English lessons for selected members of staff. These are considered important both as a contribution from the project to the BD-NB Reserve and to allow the project staff to communicate more effectively with the international conservation / development community.

Communication materials designed and delivered: A range of communication materials such as t-shirts, pens, caps and power-point presentations have been designed and delivered in the reporting period.

### **3.2 Progress towards Project Outputs: This project is expected to produce 6 outputs. These are:**

- Appropriate legal frameworks [from the village, commune, district and provincial level] for community-management are in place
- Communities in the buffer zone have the institutional capacity to negotiate, benefit from and monitor co-management agreements
- Core protection zone and surrounding land use boundaries established; community enforcement groups established
- Socio-economic status established; economic feasibility study completed; community sustainable financing plan developed and implemented
- Communities monitor their natural resource use and use increases in their knowledge to manage access to the resources and core area
- Project successes communicated nationally and internationally; lessons for wider replication and policy change across national and regional levels

Our initial Annual Report (April 2008) noted that some of the Project Outputs might have to be re-considered in the light of our growing understanding and experience in and around BD-NB National Park, in particular notice was given that some of the elements of #3 were unlikely to be fulfilled although activities that were being conducted under Output 3, such as the 3D Modelling were to continue.

In the current reporting period, we feel that the project has made good progress in terms of developing a robust understanding of the socio-economic status of the selected communes (Output #4). The project and our partners are now much better informed about the multiple forms of collaborative management arrangements that have been developed by the Vietnamese Government (Output#1). These frameworks are considered non-negotiable in many respects by the BD-NB Management Board. It is therefore very unlikely that in the remainder of this project that we will substantially alter or change these frameworks. We maybe able to develop ways of working within these frameworks, that have not previously been considered. This maybe an equally important finding and is the thrust of our current work with an eco-tourism model.

### 3.3 Standard Measures

Code No.	Description	Year 1 (Total)	Year 2 (Total)	Year 3 (Total)	Total to date	Total planned
21	Organisations established		Tourism learning groups in Da Chais and Da Lat being developed			3 planned
20	Physical assets	Fully equipped office with 2 lap-tops	No further physical assets purchased		Fully equipped office with 2 lap-tops	Lap-top, phone and other office equipment
7	Training materials on forest allocation, rights and responsibilities	No training delivered	No training delivered		Depending on the outcome of the tourism feasibility study, the project will consider training in a tourism related activities	
6A	Training in each commune	No training delivered in communes  English language training arranged for selected	English language training maintained for selected BD-NB senior staff but conditional upon attendance and passing		As above	

Code No.	Description	Year 1 (Total)	Year 2 (Total)	Year 3 (Total)	Total to date	Total planned
		BD-NB staff	exams			
8	UK Project Staff	Bond 15 days  Macgregor 18 days				55 weeks over 3 years
14A/B	Workshops, seminars (organized and attended)	Project launch held  Tourism workshop held  Collaborative management workshop held	Visit to potential similar tourism sites in Vietnam.  3D Modeling workshop held  Workshop on management options for BD-NB			
15A/B	National Press releases	Press release on project launch  TV coverage on project launch	No press releases			
17B	Dry Forest Coalition meeting	No meeting held	No meeting held		Potential of a visit from BD-NB to WWF/IIED project in Cambodia in FY10	
9	Land Allocation Plans  Business portfolio				Will need to consider the appropriateness of the this activity	

Code No.	Description	Year 1 (Total)	Year 2 (Total)	Year 3 (Total)	Total to date	Total planned
	Species management plan					
?	Wildlife monitoring reports	Terms of reference being developed for assessment of BD-NB Management			Will need to consider the appropriateness of the this activity	
10	Land allocation guide  Wildlife field guide				Will need to consider the appropriateness of the this activity	
11B	Peer reviewed journal articles (year 3)		none	XX		
18C/19	2 TV features on project activities (year 3)		none	XX		

**Table 1 Publications**

Type (eg journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (eg contact address, website)	Cost £



### **3.4 Progress towards the project purpose and outcomes**

As noted and alluded to several times already in the project narrative, the progress towards the project purpose has been limited in the current reporting period. Two reasons have been offered for this limited progress, staff changes at project level and the limit capacity / flexibility within IIED to react to these changes. The project continues to learn about the range of collaborative management arrangements that exist within the project site. These contracts or collaborative management agreements are threatened by reduced government expenditure. This has multiple implications;

Joint patrolling and management activities between the BD-NB management Board and the communes is unlikely to continue

There are many households in the communes around BD-NB that rely on the revenue from these contracts. If they are ended this has severe implications for communities that are already very poor.

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

To date there are no measurable impacts on the bio-diversity of the area that can be attributed to the actions of the project. In the next reporting period, the 3 sets of time series of the photo-transects will be examined / analysed to assess the impact of DaLat to Nga Trang Road through the BD-NB National Park.

In the next reporting period, the project will be working to develop a vision and complete a financial feasibility study for a community based tourism enterprise. One option is for this to be based in the K'Long K'Lanh Area has been planned as a Agri-Tech Zone. If this feasibility study is broadly positive, the project will actively lobby against the current conversion of this intact wetland for intensive agriculture. If this were to be successful then it would represent a small bio-diversity 'gain' for the project.

## **4. Monitoring, evaluation and lessons**

An emerging issue for this project and in particular the Board of Management of the BD-NB National Park is the number of 'collaborative management' initiatives that are now being developed in and around the BD-NB National Park. These multiple initiatives have the potential to replicate each others activities; dilute the efforts of the Management Board and confuse the representatives of the affected communes. This project (WWF/IIED) has offered to facilitate a meeting to map out the different initiatives and ensure that there is a greater degree of coordination between the stakeholders (see LogFrame)

## **5. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)**

In response to the First Annual Report by this Project, four technical queries were raised. Responses to these were made in the Second Half Yearly Report (HYR2). These responses have been pasted below with an update.

**5.1 Reduced emphasis on the Output #3 'Core protection zone and surrounding landuse boundaries established':** The Independent Review correctly queries why the project has downgraded this output. In many respects this is due to the complexities that the project has been discovering in terms of landuse and the relationship between the Bi Doup – Nui Ba (BD-NB) National Park and the surrounding communities. The initial assumption of the project was that communities and farmers had very weak land rights and that landuse change, was in part, due to the uncertainty about these rights. Our initial proposal was also unaware of the Government's efforts to develop collaborative management approaches with the communities in the area through the payment of forest contracts.

Our work to date has shown that rights to land are much stronger than initially expected. In Lat commune about 70% of the households have been issued with 'Red-Books' that secure their access and ownership to land. In the other, and significantly poorer commune (Da Chais) it has not been possible to confirm the proportion of households with secure tenure, although it is lower than in Lat. Secondly there

is an ongoing programme by the government in which small amounts of money are paid to households as collaborative management contracts. However the farmers see this largely as a government 'hand-out' on the basis of ethnicity and do not really understand the implications of the contracts.

The lack of clarity over the forest contracts will be addressed in the next six months of the project where we will seek to foster greater communication between state forestry departments and the households in the two selected communes. This may well lead to the development of a more formal training course on obligations and rights under the contracts and will undoubtedly raise the issue of boundaries. Although it must be emphasised that the BD-NB Board of Management (i.e. the Park Authority) have made it clear that the current boundary of the park is immutable and there can be no negotiation on its current location. However, further exploration of this issue may lead to a better all round understanding of allowable land use and resource harvesting on the boundaries.

**Update April 2009:** The situation and our understanding of it remains unchanged. In the forthcoming year, we have made provision for a process to demarcate the boundary between the communes and the National park (using and based on the agreements in the 3D modeling). We hope that this is one very practical way in which some of the uncertainty between the communes and the Board of Management of BD-NB can be resolved.

**5.2 Working together with other stakeholders in the area:** The project's aim is to work with and complement some of the other much larger stakeholder who are active in and around the BD- NB National Park. The project personnel are communicating directly with representatives of the Asian Development bank and the JAICA Tourism Project.

**Update April 2009:** The number and the cost of the collaborative management initiatives in and around BD-NB National Park is an urgent issue. Our understanding of the situation is that the Darwin Funded WWF/IIED project is the smallest of these, but possibly the project with the strongest links to the Board of Management. We plan to facilitate a meeting of all the projects to ensure a higher degree of coordination, identify the areas of over-lap and gaps.

**5.3 The development of collaborative management arrangements within the existing frame-work:** This has already been alluded to above. In the next quarter, the project will commission a focused review of the collaborative management activities from the perspective of the BD-NB Board of Management. This work will complement our understanding that from the farmers perspective, they really do not understand the implications of the forest protection contracts. Our ambition is to understand how these operate in reality rather than the theoretical perspective that we are given. Once this is understood, we hope to provide a suite of options to both sets of stakeholders that will improve the effectiveness of the collaboration. One option that we are considering is adapting the MOMs (management orientated management) systems developed in Namibia. MOMs will provide both sets of stakeholders with reliable trend information on agreed indicators that can feed into and possibly improve the current collaboration.

**Update April 2009:** The review of the collaborative management actions by the BD-NB Board of Management suggested that the WWF/IIED project financially support both the '661' and 'blue – book' patrols that constitute collaborative activities. Our project is not in a position to do this. But in the next reporting period will explore the options to make these efforts more effective.

**5.4 Technical support by IIED:** The query about IIED's support to this project preceded the changes in personnel in Vietnam. As a result of these changes, IIED technical staff, principally Ivan Bond and James MacGregor will play a more active role in the project. We hope that this will minimize the impact on the project's performance.

There will be a project meeting in January 2009, at which the activities for the planning period April 08 to March 09 will be discussed and evaluated. A new work-plan, schedules and a calendar of technical support will be developed. This will be shared with the colleagues from the Darwin Initiative

**Update April 2009:** IIED's nominated project leader, Ivan Bond has not been able to support the project to the desired level in the last three months. As a result, several activities have lost momentum. An urgently required project visit will be conducted in May 2009. A field report will be submitted to DI following this visit.

## **6. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere**

## **7. Sustainability**

The issue of sustainability of the project and the potential long-term impacts on bio-diversity have not been discussed or considered in any meaningful way as yet. However, the project, the Board of Management of BD-NB and the other agencies developing collaborative management approaches need to consider the opportunities that may arise out of the current REDD (Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation) debate. This is likely to be the most sustainable long-term and large scale source of funding for forest and woodland conservation.

A careful consideration of REDD issues in the context of the BD-NB is important because:

Vietnam is one of the focus countries that has been identified by UN-REDD as a priority for the development of REDD activities

Vietnam is one of the countries that is eligible for support from the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership (FCP) Facility

Because of these levels of support it is highly likely that in the near term there will be opportunities to add value to standing forests and these are opportunities that the project should be investigating for the communes adjacent to the BD-NB National Park.

Initial steps have been made in contacting the Plan Vivo who support forest-carbon projects funded by the voluntary carbon market in Mexico, Mozambique and Uganda (see <http://www.planvivo.org/>.) and looking for potential linkages with the IIED/WWF project.

## **8. Dissemination**

## 9. Project Expenditure

Table 2 Project expenditure during the reporting period (Defra Financial Year 1 April 2008 to 31 March 2009)

Item	Budget (please indicate which document you refer to if other than your project application or annual grant offer letter)	Expenditure	Variance
Rent, rates, heating, overheads etc			
Office costs (eg postage, telephone, stationery)			
Travel and subsistence			
Printing			
Conferences, seminars, etc			
Capital items/equipment (specify)			
Others (specify)			
Salaries (specify by individual)			
R. McNally (WWF)			
Mr. Nhan (WWF)			
Ms. Huong (WWF)			
I. Bond (IIED)			
F. Reynolds (IIED)			
James Macgregor (IIED)			
<b>TOTAL</b>			

### Notes on project expenditure:

- The project's expenditure in GBP is very dependent on the exchange rate that is applied. Current expenditure is given at an exchange rate of GBP1.7 to US\$1.00
- Expenditure and allocation figures should be considered provisional until final P&Ls from IIED.
- Expenditure and allocation figures should be considered provisional until clear and unequivocal responses have been received from WWF (Vn).

**OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements of your project during the reporting period (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes**

I agree for LTS and the Darwin Secretariat to publish the content of this section

## Annex 1 Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year: 2008/09

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2008 - March 2009	Actions required/planned for next period
<p><i>Goal: 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</i></p> <p><i>The conservation of biological diversity,</i></p> <p><i>The sustainable use of its components, and</i></p> <p><i>The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</i></p>			(do not fill not applicable)
<p><b>Purpose</b></p>	<p>To conserve threatened biodiversity in the Bi Doup-Nui Ba (BDNB) National Park in Vietnam through the introduction of collaborative forest and wildlife stewardship models based on negotiated tenure and access rights</p>		
<p><b>Output 1: Undertake legal and policy review</b></p>			
<p><b>1.1 Meetings with selected communes and villages to discuss the legal options for co-management.</b></p>		<p><b>Ongoing meetings held with groups in selected villages</b></p>	

1.2 Study tour for selected participants to an appropriate site in Vietnam.	Study tour to Bach ma national park and Suoi Voi Water Falls Eco-tourism Project
1.3 Develop project working group or learning group.	
Output 2: Communities have the capacity to negotiate, benefit and monitor the co-management agreement	
2.1 Agreement with Chairman of DPC that selected communes are appropriate.	Agreement reached
2.2 Develop a set of communications material to introduce project at village.	Materials in place and being used
2.3 Develop MOU with villages.	An MOU with villages on the development of collaborative management agreed
2.4 Identify an appropriate institutional group once co-management intervention has been identified.	The work over the year has revealed the complexity and limits of collaborative management agreements. Our aim is where possible to make existing collaboration more efficient.
2.5 Training needs assessment on negotiation skills and tangible co-management intervention.	No action
2.6 Identify relevant trainers and resource persons and develop training schedules.	No action
Output 3: Core Protection zone and surrounding land-use boundaries	

established		
3.1 Look at options for developing 3-D models for BD-NB National Park and one commune.		Terms of reference for a facilitator developed and agreed. Materials purchased
3.2 Facilitate 3D model for BD-NB National Park		3D Model for BD-NB successfully constructed. Workshops / meetings held in areas where boundary disputes were identified
3.3 Facilitate 3D models for one commune.		Preparations are being made to repeat the model development for one commune
3.4 Draft a plan for village forest protection teams (VFPT) using experience from other regions.		No progress made
3.5 Start discussions with villages and BD-NB management to set up village forest protection teams (VFPT) especially where these already exist.		No progress made
Output 4: Socio-economic status established; economic feasibility study completed; community sustainable financing plan developed and implemented		
4.1 Draft terms of reference for sustainable livelihoods survey		Terms of reference drafted and several consultants contacted.
4.2 Finalize methodology and timing of survey with consultants.		Approach and timing of survey agreed with consultants
4.3 Ensure that communes are aware and understand the purpose of the livelihoods survey.		Done and survey undertaken.

<b>4.4 Synthesize results and discuss with communes to identify alternative livelihoods.</b>		To be done in the next FY10 reporting period
<b>4.4 Develop simple financial models for alternative livelihoods.</b>		No models developed, but in FY10 will consider the financial viability of community owned tourism enterprises
<b>4.5 Re-visit communes with models and opportunities.</b>		No progress
<b>4.6 Draft terms of reference and budget for an eco-tourism workshop.</b>		No progress
<b>4.7 Hold a multi-stakeholder workshop on eco-tourism in BD-NB</b>		Workshop held
<b>Output 5:</b> Communities monitor their natural resource use and increase their knowledge to manage access to the resources and the core area		
<b>5.1 Draft terms of reference for an assessment of current monitoring within BD-NB National Park</b>		Terms of reference drafted and consultant selected
<b>5.2 Facilitate assessment of current monitoring</b>		Project facilitated access to BD-NB Board of management. Survey undertaken and report produced.
<b>5.3 Assess options for photo-transects as a monitoring tool along road.</b>		Time series of photos continue. Now conducted for 18 months. Need to consider the utility of approach.
<b>5.4 Liaise with WINROCK and other organizations to monitor land use change in BD-NB National Park and buffer zone.</b>		IIED and WWF trying to organize a round table meeting of agencies that are promoting collaborative management around BD-NB.



<b>Output 6: Project successes communicated nationally and internationally; lessons for wider replication and policy change across national and regional levels</b>		
<b>6.1 Develop local communications strategy for project.</b>		
<b>6.2 Participate in appropriate fairs</b>		
<b>6.3 Investigate the options to develop short local film about BD-NB and communities.</b>		<b>Options investigated bit no funding. Activity postponed</b>
<b>6.4 Purchase still and video camera for project.</b>		<b>No further purchases made</b>
<b>6.5 Project progress shared with key stakeholders.</b>		<b>This has been limited and could be done more effectively</b>
<b>6.6 Maintain a library and bibliography of relevant documents</b>		<b>Status uncertain</b>
<b>6.7 Maintain database of relevant consultants</b>		<b>Status uncertain</b>
<b>6.8 English courses for selected BD-NB staff</b>		<b>Courses for selected staff maintained, but with conditions in terms of attendance and pass marks on tests</b>

## **Annex 2**

## Annex 3 Project's full current logframe

### Work plan for 2009-10

Project summary	Measurable Indicators
<p><i>Goal: 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</i></p> <p><i>The conservation of biological diversity,</i></p> <p><i>The sustainable use of its components, and</i></p> <p><i>The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</i></p>	
<p><b>Purpose</b></p>	<p>To conserve threatened biodiversity in the Bi Doup-Nui Ba (BDNB) National Park in Vietnam through the introduction of collaborative forest and wildlife stewardship models based on negotiated tenure and access rights</p>
<p>Output 1: Undertake legal and policy review</p>	
<p><b>1.1.1 Meeting with community in 4 villages in 2 selected communes</b></p>	
<p><b>1.1.2 Facilitate the meetings monthly</b></p>	
<p><b>1.2.1 Facilitate to set up a thematic group</b></p>	
<p><b>1.2.2 Facilitate the discussion and activities of this group</b></p>	
<p><b>1.3.1 Letter to make the statement of the necessity of meeting</b></p>	
<p><b>1.3.2 Organise the meeting &amp; venue hire</b></p>	
<p><b>1.3.3 Act as Secretariat of the group</b></p>	
<p>Output 2: Communities have the capacity to negotiate, benefit and monitor the co-management agreement</p>	

<b>2.1 Training needs assessment on eco-tourism skills and MOM</b>	
<b>2.2 Conduct proposed training activities from TNA</b>	
<b>2.3 Develop an Management-oriented Monitoring System (MOM) for selected community patrol groups</b>	
<b>2.4 Training course on MOM</b>	
<b>2.5 Support joint patrol</b>	
<b>2.6 Discuss option of MOM</b>	
<b>2.7 Pilot MOM and integrated into the patrolling activities of the Park</b>	
Output 3: Core Protection zone and surrounding land-use boundaries established	
<b>3.1 Facilitate 3D models for Da Chais</b>	
<b>3.2 Synthesise results and discuss from survey of livelihoods</b>	
<b>3.3 Boundary marker in Da Chais</b>	
Output 4: Socio-economic status established; economic feasibility study completed; community sustainable financing plan developed and implemented	
<b>4.1 Survey on biodiversity of birds and gibbon in Da chais commune and possibility to develop a simple tours in this area/ Report on the status of gibbon and likely impact of tourism</b>	
<b>4.2 Survey on demand for a tourism product with home stay and gibbon option.</b>	
<b>4.3 Develop a short proposal for how tourism would work</b>	
<b>4.4 Study tour for ecotourism selected group</b>	
<b>4.5 Agreement (MOU) with the Park on piloting these tours</b>	
<b>4.6 Agreement with the selected villages on participating in piloting these activities</b>	
<b>4.7 Training on ecotourism and related tourism skills for BDNB staff and local people</b>	

<b>4.8 On - job training bird/gibbon watching skill for BDNB staff and local people</b>	
Output 5: Communities monitor their natural resource use and increase their knowledge to manage access to the resources and the core area	
<b>5.1 Set up model for patrolling and wild monitoring group (Da Chais and Lat Communes)</b>	
<b>5.2 Assess options for photo-transects as a monitoring tool along road.</b>	
<b>5.3 Investigate the options for piloting REDD in BDNB</b>	
Output 6: Project successes communicated nationally and internationally; lessons for wider replication and policy change across national and regional levels	
<b>6.1 Complete 6 monthly Darwin Reports.</b>	
<b>6.2 Develop a film about BD-NB and communities</b>	
<b>6.3 Purchase a GPS for project.</b>	
<b>6.4 Environment Education Program</b>	
<b>6.5 Poster and T-shirt printing</b>	
<b>6.6 English courses for selected BD-NB staff</b>	

## **Annex 4 Onwards – supplementary material (optional but encouraged as evidence of project achievement)**

**This may include outputs of the project, but need not necessarily include all project documentation. For example, the abstract of a conference would be adequate, as would be a summary of a thesis rather than the full document. If we feel that reviewing the full document would be useful, we will contact you again to ask for it to be submitted.**

### *Checklist for submission*

	Check
Is the report less than 5MB? If so, please email to <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> putting the project number in the Subject line.	x
Is your report more than 5MB? If so, please advise <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> that the report will be send by post on CD, putting the project number in the Subject line.	x
Have you included means of verification? You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	x
Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report? If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number.	x
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	limited
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	x
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	