

Darwin Initiative Main and Post Project Annual Report

To be completed with reference to the “Writing a Darwin Report” guidance: (<http://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/resources-for-projects/reporting-forms>). It is expected that this report will be a **maximum** of 20 pages in length, excluding annexes)

Submission Deadline: 30th April 2019

Darwin Project Information

Project reference	25-015
Project title	Why Eat Wild Meat?
Host country/ies	Cameroon
Lead organisation	IIED
Partner institution(s)	FCTV, Living Earth, University of Oxford
Darwin grant value	£365,826
Start/end dates of project	July 2018 – March 2021
Reporting period (e.g., Apr 2018 – Mar 2019) and number (e.g., Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	July 2018 – March 2019, Annual Report 1
Project Leader name	Dilys Roe
Project website/blog/Twitter	https://www.iied.org/why-eat-wild-meat
Report author(s) and date	Dilys Roe, Francesca Booker, EJ Milner Gulland, April 2019

1. Project rationale

Hunting of wildlife for meat is widely practiced in Africa - the scale of wild meat use in the Congo Basin alone is estimated at five million tonnes/year¹. Since the late 1990s, conservation and development organisations have been concerned about the scale of exploitation because of its implications both for conservation and for food security.

Many well-intentioned projects have been instituted to reduce bushmeat hunting; providing livelihood alternatives for hunters selling meat to urban consumers, reducing demand in urban centres, and providing alternative meat sources to rural consumers (through fish, livestock or captive-bred wild species). Available evidence suggests, however, that both livelihoods and bushmeat-alternative projects are failing to achieve their conservation and food security objectives. This is often because they fail to account for the underlying drivers behind the **choice** of wild meat as a food (including price, availability, taste and culture).

¹ <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2002.00275.x/full>



Our project focusses on the Dja Faunal Reserve (DFR) in Cameroon (Figure 1 reproduced from UNESCO) because a) there are high levels of wild meat hunting and consumption and b) because of the existing experience and partnerships of the project team.

While much wild meat is destined for urban consumers it is also routinely consumed as a key source of protein. In the DFR, threatened species such as central African chimpanzees, western lowland gorillas, and giant pangolins are regularly hunted for meat for local consumption. The establishment of community hunting zones (CHZ), such as under [Darwin project 20-007](#), have helped take pressure off the reserve but are insufficient to meet the protein needs of the growing local population. It is therefore critical that

additional protein supplies are available, acceptable and affordable.

This project is thus intended to help to improve the design of interventions that are put in place to reduce or stop hunting and consumption of wild meat, thus reducing current levels of exploitation that are threatening both species survival and long-term local food security and nutrition.

2. Project partnerships

The project builds on a well-established partnership between IIED's biodiversity team, led by Dilys Roe, and the University of Oxford Interdisciplinary Centre for Conservation Science (ICCS), led by EJ Milner-Gulland. IIED and ICCS have collaborated on a number of Darwin and IWT-Fund projects since 2012. IIED provides overall coordination of the project and brings specific expertise in conducting desk-based evidence reviews. IIED also supports a network of conservation and development organisations in Cameroon – the Cameroon Poverty and Conservation Learning Group – which will act as a key dissemination channel for this.

ICCS's role in the project is to bring its international reputation in conservation research excellence to bear and to design and implement the research components of the project. EJ Milner Gulland has supervised two recent PhD projects in the Dja ecosystem; Juliet Wright's analysis of the effectiveness of livelihood interventions, and project researcher **Stephanie Brittain's** investigation of the potential of local ecological monitoring of bushmeat species. Stephanie has worked closely with bushmeat hunters in two of the villages where the research component will be conducted.

Living Earth and FCTV are new partners to IIED but not to each other. **Living Earth** has worked in Cameroon since 1987 and since 1997 the Cameroon office has been registered as the independent NGO Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante (**FCTV**). LEL's role is to provide technical advice and assistance to the project with in-country discussions with local communities that live around the DFR, and liaise with senior government representatives to ensure that the project gains the support at the highest level within MINFOF and MINADER. LEL have undertaken similar roles in two Darwin Initiative funded projects (20-007, and currently 23-024) and been instrumental in producing Theory of Change models to support the change from unsustainable (often illegal) practices to sustainable ones, working closely with FCTV to ensure realistic, practically achievable activities are implemented and managed.

LEL and FCTV approached IIED with the concept for this project as a means to build on their existing work and inform new and existing interventions. IIED had previously conducted a systematic review of the effectiveness of alternative livelihoods projects and started to explore

food choice as a driver of wild-meat hunting and consumption as part of that, and so this joint project seemed a natural progression, especially with the addition of ICCS.

Over this first 9 months of the project, the partnership has progressed as planned:

- IIED has taken the lead on the desk based research and project coordination, including the survey of experts and end-users
- ICCS has visited the field sites to engage with in-country partners, including in the study area, and has started to design the research components, building on previous research and their experience of the case study sites.
- Living Earth has led on policy engagement within Cameroon
- ICCS and Living Earth have worked with FCTV to identify and recruit project assistants
- FCTV has led on in-country engagement with NGOs including translating project materials into French.

The partnership has been coordinated with in-person meetings in London and Yaounde, supplemented with skype calls and a project WhatsApp group.

3. Project progress

3.1 Progress in carrying out project Activities

This project did not officially start until July 2018 so this first annual report represents 9 months of activities only. The table below describes the activities planned for Year 1 and the progress against them.

Year 1 Activity	Year 1 Progress
Cross-cutting	
0.0 Agreement of ToRs and contracts for project partners (IIED)	Completed. In the first 6 months of the project we discussed and agreed ToRs for each partner. Contracts have now been agreed and signed by all and are available on request to Darwin Initiative on request from IIED
0.1 Inception meeting with project partners in Cameroon (All)	<p>Given three of the four project partners are UK-based, we held our first planning/inception meeting in London in August 2018. We reviewed the logframe, the activity plan and the budget and confirmed key tasks for each member of the project team. We also reviewed the project plans against IIED’s ethics review process and, because we will be including marginalised indigenous groups in our survey work, slightly modified our work plan to enable us to be able to interview them separately from the dominant Bantu groups. Based on this minor change we confirmed ethical clearance from IIED. The ethics submission form is available to Darwin Initiative on request from IIED</p> <p>We held a second informal project meeting in October 2018, capitalising on Mama Mouamfon being in the UK for the London Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade. We used the opportunity to discuss plans for an inception event in Cameroon hosted by the British High Commission in Yaounde. This was originally planned for February 2019 but which, for reasons beyond our control, ended up being postponed to April 2019 (covered here by BBC Pidgin news service: https://www.bbc.com/pidgin/tori-48034874).</p>

<p>0.2 Project webpage established and flyer developed (including translation of flyer into French) (IIED)</p>	<p>We produced a project website (https://www.iied.org/why-eat-wild-meat) which we will use to disseminate updates about the project as well as key project outputs.</p> <p>We produced a project flyer in English (http://pubs.iied.org/17485IIED/) and French (https://pubs.iied.org/17485FIIED/) to publicise the project both in the UK and in Cameroon (both attached in Annex 4). This was distributed in hard copy at the Dja Actors Forum – a key conservation network in Cameroon – in September 2018 and has also been sent electronically via the Cameroon PCLG and ICCS mailing lists.</p>
<p>0.3 Biannual skype-based progress review meetings (All)</p>	<p>We were able to have our first review meeting in person due to Mama Mouamforn being in London in October 2018. We have held ad-hoc skypes, in-person meetings and phone calls since then but anticipate more formal review meetings now that we are about to embark on the research component of the project.</p>
<p>Output 1</p> <p>Factors influencing use of wild meat as a food choice around Dja Biosphere Reserve and elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa understood and documented</p>	
<p>1.1 Desk-based evidence review of drivers of wild meat as a food choice in sub-Saharan Africa) (IIED)</p>	<p>Completed. The evidence review was conducted in Jan – Feb 2019. We captured 70 studies that are summarised in a draft report (see annex 4) and found that food choice as a driver of wild meat demand is not well addressed in the literature (especially in rural contexts). It also proved challenging to get responses from experts, meaning we had to extend the deadline for responses to our survey.</p>
<p>1.2 Fieldwork in Dja on local preferences, drivers and constraints, & role of wild meat in food security (focus groups, key informant interviews)</p>	<p>Ahead of schedule: Although this activity is not scheduled to start until Year 2, Stephanie Brittain (ICCS) visited Cameroon in February 2019 to start planning fieldwork and recruit local staff. The visit included some preliminary interviews with local communities in the Northern Buckle. A research plan and schedule for Year 2 were developed on the trip and are attached in Annex 4.</p>
<p>1.3 Synthesis and write up of evidence reviews (IIED)</p>	<p>This activity is slightly behind schedule but on track for completion by end of Year 2 Q1. Although research for the evidence review has been completed (activity 1.1) the synthesis and write up is still underway. The report will be circulated to the project advisors and the posted online once complete. We will also make available a spreadsheet detailing the sources of evidence on which the review is based.</p>
<p>Output 2</p> <p>Characteristics of existing bushmeat alternative projects in DFR and elsewhere, and the role of drivers of food choice in project success, analysed</p>	
<p>2.1 Desk-based evidence review of the factors affecting success of bushmeat-alternative projects in (sub-Saharan Africa) (IIED)</p>	<p>Slightly delayed. The evidence review was conducted in Jan-Feb 2019. We identified 30 papers (attached in Annex 4) for in detail review and this process is currently taking place and will be completed in Year 2 Q1. We are finding that not many papers detail factors affecting success and we will use the information from our baseline survey (0.2) to identify additional factors affecting success.</p>

2.2	Inventory of bushmeat-alternative initiatives (projects, implementers, funders) around DFR completed and placed in online database (IIED & all teams)	This activity is slightly behind schedule but on track for completion by end of Year 2 Q1. We had planned to use ICCS PhD work as the basis for the inventory and receipt of this was delayed as the PhD was being finished. However, we now have the basic inventory (attached in Annex 4) and plan to update and finalise it in next few months.
2.3	Cross checking of Dja projects with success factors from evidence review (IIED and Oxford)	This activity has been delayed but will be prioritised in Year 2 Q1 once the evidence review and inventory have been completed
2.4	Synthesis and write up of evidence review (IIED and Oxford)	This activity is behind schedule but will be completed in Year 2, Q1 along with the inventory and analysis of success factors.
Output 3		
Enhancements to existing bushmeat-alternative projects, at DFR, and a new proposal, agreed with villagers and implementers		
No Year 1 activities planned		
Output 4		
Capacity to design and implement improved bushmeat-alternative interventions improved elsewhere in Cameroon and internationally		
No Year 1 activities planned		

3.2 Progress towards project Outputs

Output 1: Factors influencing use of wild meat as a food choice around Dja Biosphere Reserve and elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa understood and documented

Output 1 is slightly behind schedule in that the desk-based evidence review (indicator 1.1) is not yet completed, but will be back on track by the end of Q1 in Year 2. Furthermore the research activities (indicator 1.2) are fully on track if not ahead of schedule. Evidence for progress has been discussed under Section 3.1 above and included in Annex 4. Interestingly, the lack of response to our surveys and the limited number of papers on the topic suggests that we were correct in identifying this topic as one which is comparatively neglected and in urgent need of the research we will be carrying out in our project.

Output 2: Characteristics of existing bushmeat alternative projects in DFR and elsewhere, and the role of drivers of food choice in project success, analysed

As discussed in section 3.1 Output 2 is also slightly behind schedule in that the desk-based evidence review (indicator 2.1), the inventory of projects (indicator 2.2) and the synthesis (Indicator 2.3) are not yet completed, but will be back on track by the end of Q1 in Year 2. As discussed above, the research component of this output is on track and evidence provided in Annex 4.

Progress toward Output 3 (Enhancements to existing bushmeat-alternative projects and a new proposal, agreed with villagers and implementers at DFR case study sites) and Output 4 (Capacity to design and implement improved “bushmeat alternative” interventions improved elsewhere in Cameroon and internationally) can not be measured at this stage since activities under these outputs have not yet started.

3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

The anticipated outcome of this project is “Strengthened capacity of policy-makers and practitioners in Cameroon and Africa-wide to design and implement effective “bushmeat-alternative” interventions that reflect drivers of food choice, conserve biodiversity and contribute to food security”. It is too early to measure progress towards this outcome as two of the

indicators (0.3 “Enhancements to two bushmeat alternative projects at DFR, and a proposal for another, by the end of the project, so that projects have the right conditions in place to a) improve food security and provide sustainable nutrition while also b) reducing exploitation of wild species” and 0.4 “Receipt, uptake and commitments to use project-generated evidence and tools by at least 50% of existing bushmeat-alternative project designers, funders and implementers in DFR (from inventory generated in output 2)” depend on the completion of the research and subsequent engagement with policy makers and practitioners. However we have initiated two baseline surveys against which we can measure progress towards indicators 0.1 (Improved understanding by conservation policy-makers in sub-Saharan Africa of different drivers of wild meat as a food choice of local people, compared to baseline at start of project) and 0.2 (Improved understanding by “bushmeat-alternative” project designers in sub-Saharan Africa of characteristics of effective bushmeat-alternative projects compared to baseline at start of project). The surveys were designed by the project team and distributed in Survey Monkey format via all the project partners list serves. The survey will be closed at the end of April 2019 and the results treated as the baseline against which to measure progress at the end of the project. The English and French versions of the survey are included in Annex 4.

3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

It is too early to tell whether many of our assumptions hold true as we are not yet at a stage where we can test them. Notes on our outcome-level assumptions (many of which are repeated at output level) are included below, however.

1. International NGOs and policy-makers (e.g. ECOFAC, CBD) are responsive to findings and change their processes accordingly [our strong international networks and involvement of key players in Advisory group will help here]

Comment: too early to test

2. Feasible and effective bushmeat alternatives exist, that can divert enough consumption from bushmeat to reduce hunting pressure [In the long run, food systems need to reflect changing environmental, social & economic realities. In the short-medium term there is potential for e.g. aquaculture, wild-caught fisheries, mini-livestock]

Comment: too early to test

3. Better-designed “bushmeat-alternative” projects will lead to reduced hunting and reduced threats to wildlife (because rural consumption is a major threat) [Our experience in DFR and elsewhere suggests rural consumption is a threat; detailed research by J Wright suggests design improvements are feasible and could be effective]

Comment: too early to test but no reason to not expect this to be true especially building on J Wright research

4. Local people are willing to take part in surveys and engage with research team [the team has very good relationships with local people in areas around the DFR and have worked with them for a number of years]

Comment: Fieldwork not yet started but preliminary visit in February did not highlight any concerns. Local staff recruited via FCTV will be involved in the research and build on good existing relationships with FTCV and project researcher S Brittain.

5. Creation of decision support tool is feasible based on information collected, and evidence from DFR will be generalisable [we expect the evidence internationally to be weak; our new evidence-base for DFR will be locally relevant and our expectation based on previous work is that broad general lessons will emerge]

Comment: Too early to test

6. Cameroon government remains supportive of the project and responsive to research findings

Comment: No reason to suspect this does not hold true. One govt official is on our advisory group and others have been consulted and kept informed about the project by Living Earth and FCTV

3.5 Impact: achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty alleviation

The anticipated impact of this project is that “Improved “bushmeat-alternative” projects in Cameroon and Africa-wide result in reduced exploitation of wild species and increased food security, contributing to achievement of SDGs while meeting CBD and CITES obligations.” It is too early to assess contributions to this impact since we have not yet conducted our research and sought to influence the design but we have no reason to expect that we won’t contribute to this impact over the next two years.

4. Contribution to the Global Goals for Sustainable Development (SDGs)

The SDGs to which this project are most relevant are:

- SDG 2 which includes Target 2.1 to end hunger by 2030 and ensure access by all people to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round.
- SDG 12 which includes Target 12.2 to achieve sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources.
- SDG 15 which includes Target 15.5 to take urgent and significant action to reduce degradation of natural habitat, halt the loss of biodiversity, and by 2020 protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species.

It is too early to claim any contribution to these SDGs in this financial year however over the course of the project we expect to contribute to 2.1 by improving the design of interventions designed to offer alternative or supplementary sources of protein so that they are more culturally acceptable and complement existing livelihood strategies; to 12.2 by helping to reduce unsustainable hunting pressure on forest-based wildlife; and 15.5 by specifically reducing pressure on a number of threatened species.

5. Project support to the Conventions, Treaties or Agreements

Again, while too early to assess a direct contribution at this stage, this project will contribute to both CITES and CBD, Specifically, for the CBD, the Secretariat established the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management (CPW) - of which IIED is a member - in 2013 and at the 2016 CoP passed a decision (XIII/8) requesting CPW to develop new guidance on bushmeat management. The guidance was adopted at the last CoP (2018) in Sharm El Sheikh and highlights the need for better identification of “opportunities and barriers for providing sustainably produced food and livelihood alternatives.” A lack of understanding of the drivers of wild meat as a food choice is one such barrier. The guidance further calls for the development of “culturally acceptable and economically feasible alternative food and income sources.”

In addition to the CBD, CITES Resolution Conf. 13.11 advises relevant Parties to improve domestic management of CITES-listed bushmeat species including identifying alternative foods. The CPW is planning a side event at the next CITES CoP which will have a focus on wild meat and which will feature a presentation from this project.

In terms of CBD focal points, Prudence Galega is the focal point for Cameroon and is a member of our project advisory group.

6. Project support to poverty alleviation

Our project is expected to support poverty alleviation by contributing to higher levels of food and nutrition security for rural populations (directly in DFR, and indirectly throughout sub-Saharan Africa), through access to sustainable, nutritious and locally acceptable protein sources. In DFR, our 3 sites have 200, 400 and 80 households respectively, totalling about 2500 people. The projects are village-wide, hence we expect direct benefits of improved bushmeat-alternative projects to benefit all the inhabitants.

There are no notable achievements this year since we have been conducting background research only and not yet contributed to improved design of wild meat projects.

7. Project support to gender equality issues

In the communities surrounding the DFR (as in sub-Saharan Africa generally), hunting is generally perceived as a predominantly male occupation. In contrast, meat preparation is perceived as a female role. This project's focus on understanding food preferences means that we can encourage an increase in the emphasis on the challenges faced by women in the design and implementation of future wild meat projects.

Our research plan – attached in Annex 4 – provides evidence of our intention to ensure that women have the opportunity to take part in the research, and express their views freely, through female-only focus groups, and key informant interviews. And in our analysis, we will explore differences between genders (as well as other socio-economic variables including age, wealth and ethnicity) in food choice and intervention type.

8. Monitoring and evaluation

To date our M&E strategy has been to track progress against our logframe activities, timeframe and indicators. The indicators set out in our logframe clearly set out the qualitative and quantitative aspects we are measuring and our means of verification – some of which are included as evidence of progress in this report where appropriate.

As discussed in Section 3, as part of measuring progress against outcome indicators we have initiated some baseline surveys against which we will monitor changes in policy maker and practitioner understanding of drivers of wild meat as a food choice and characteristics of successful bushmeat – alternative projects

As the research phase starts up, in Year 2 however, we will develop a Theory of Change setting out how we expect our research to influence project design and ultimately conservation and poverty impacts. We will use this as a supplementary mechanism alongside our logframe monitoring. We also plan to include assessment of ethical issues as a standing item in our regular meetings and in field reports.

9. Lessons learnt

We are only 9 months into the project and so have had little opportunity to reflect on lessons learned to date but plan to build a lessons learned review into our regular M&E going forward.

Things that have worked particularly well have included partnering with a UK based organisation (LEL) that has very strong presence in Cameroon and so is able to fulfil a key role as the link between the UK-based activities and UK-based team, and the Cameroonian activities and partners. Living Earth's regular presence in Cameroon has also acted as a form of subsidy and co-funding to this project in many ways as it has been possible to double up trips to meet multiple project objectives. Living Earth's strong in-country connections meant that we were easily able to bring our project to the attention of the British High Commission and have them offer to host an in-country launch event for us.

It has also been useful that the project researcher, Stephanie Brittain (Oxford), who is due to start her employment only in year 2, has still been able to contribute to the project this year, both in terms of planning and through visits to Cameroon. Her PhD which she is now completing, is based in the Dja, working with some of our study communities. That means that the field research element of the project is ahead of schedule and Stephanie has been able to work with FCTV and LEL to recruit research assistants and develop a field plan and budget, as well as attending meetings in Cameroon.

Our Cameroonian partner FCTV is also well connected and we are lucky that it is currently serving as secretariat to the Dja Actors Forum and so have been able to bring the project to the attention of a wide range of NGOs. This contribution has been despite FCTV also not receiving Darwin funding in year 1, so they have been particularly generous in working with us this year.

Things that have worked less well include the administrative side of the project which has been challenging this year. IIED is slowly coming to the end of a very complex and prolonged change over in all its in-house systems meaning delays to the issuance of contracts and payments; delays in being able to quickly check budget lines and make spending decisions and extra admin time being required to undertake routine project tasks. We expect this problem to now subside as the new systems bed in at IIED.

Another aspect which hasn't worked so well is that despite our extensive networks of each partner, we have struggled to get a high level of response to our baseline surveys. But as mentioned above, this does support our fundamental thesis that this topic is under-researched and under-appreciated as an issue within the conservation community.

We also haven't been able to make much use of our Project Advisory Group this year. We have asked for their inputs to our research design, survey instruments etc but partly due to everyone's busyness and partly due to a very limited budget for engagement with the group, we have not been able to yet make the most of the incredible experience our advisors have. We hope to rectify this with a face to face meeting in Year 2 – budget permitting.

10. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)

n/a

11. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

No major issues to comment on this year that hasn't already been covered

12. Sustainability and legacy

The project doesn't yet have a high profile in the country as we are not yet working on the ground. Nevertheless it has been highlighted at the Dja Actors Forum – a network of key conservation organisations – and at an event at the British High Commission which attracted BBC media coverage.

Our exit strategy remains as per our proposal. Ongoing sustainability is inherent in the project's design; our Outcome is supporting the ability of local people, NGOs and government actors to identify and implement projects leading to increased food security (through sustainable animal protein sources), while safeguarding species of conservation concern in protected areas from overexploitation. Meanwhile, the decision-support tool, databases and written materials that we produce will remain available to download from the IIED website beyond the life of the project, and our outputs will continue to be promoted regularly by all partners.

FCTV and LEL are committed to ongoing work in the Dja region and will help bring to reality the bushmeat-alternative project enhancements and proposals desired by local people e.g. through the established Dja Actors' Forum. All project partners will continue to engage with international bushmeat-related processes and actions, ensuring that both locally and internationally our findings will be taken on board, and built upon.

13. Darwin identity

We have used the Darwin logo and/or acknowledgment on our published outputs – specifically the flyers (attached in Annex 4), website (<https://www.iied.org/why-eat-wild-meat>) and presentations. We have also tagged the Darwin Initiative when tweeting about the project or promoting it via Facebook. Cameroon has a number of Darwin projects and the stakeholders we are engaging with a largely familiar with it. However at the recent launch event at the British High Commission we took the time to supply some slides (courtesy of LTS) on the initiative to the High Commissioner so that he could make direct reference to it in his opening speech.

14. Project expenditure

Table 1: Project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2018 – 31 March 2019)

	2018/19	2018/19	Var	Var	Comments
Project spend since last annual report	Grant (£)	Total Darwin Costs (£)	(£)	%	
Staff costs (see below)					
Dilys Roe Project Leader IIED					
Francesca Booker Researcher IIED					
Fiona Roberts Project Management IIED					
IIED communications staff					
EJ Milner-Gulland Technical expert Oxford					
Consultancy costs					
Overhead Costs					
Travel and subsistence					
Operating Costs					
Capital items (see below)					
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)					
Others (see below)					
Publication production, translation					
Bank charges on project payments					
TOTAL					

Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2018-2019

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2018 - March 2019	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Impact</p> <p>Improved “bushmeat-alternative” projects in Cameroon and Africa-wide result in reduced exploitation of wild species and increased food security, contributing to achievement of SDGs while meeting CBD and CITES obligations</p>		<p>Too early to assess contributions to this impact since we have not yet conducted our research and sought to influence the design but we have no reason to expect that we won’t contribute to this impact over the next two years.</p>	
<p>Outcome Strengthened capacity of policy-makers and practitioners in Cameroon and Africa-wide to design and implement effective “bushmeat-alternative” interventions that reflect drivers of food choice, conserve biodiversity and contribute to food security.</p>	<p>0.1 Improved understanding by conservation policy-makers in sub-Saharan Africa of different drivers of wild meat as a food choice of local people, compared to baseline at start of project</p> <p>0.2 Improved understanding by “bushmeat-alternative” project designers in sub-Saharan Africa of characteristics of effective bushmeat-alternative projects compared to baseline at start of project</p> <p>0.3 Enhancements to two bushmeat alternative projects at DFR, and a proposal for another, by the end of the project, so that projects have the right conditions in place to a) improve food security and provide sustainable nutrition while also b)</p>	<p>0.1 Baseline survey designed and data collected</p> <p>0.2 Baseline survey designed and data collected</p> <p>0.3 Not yet started</p> <p>0.4 Not yet started</p>	<p>0.1 Close of survey and analysis of baseline data</p> <p>0.2 Close of survey and analysis of baseline data</p> <p>0.3 Research to understand potential socially and culturally acceptable alternatives to be undertaken</p> <p>0.4 Work on this not due to start until year 3</p>

	<p>reducing exploitation of wild species.</p> <p>0.4 Receipt, uptake and commitments to use project-generated evidence and tools by at least 50% of existing bushmeat-alternative project designers, funders and implementers in DFR (from inventory generated in output 2).</p>		
Output 1. . Factors influencing use of wild meat as a food choice around Dja Biosphere Reserve and elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa understood and documented	<p>1.1 Evidence review of drivers of wild meat as a food choice across Africa completed by end of year 1</p> <p>1.2 Field work to gain local communities' perspectives on food choice at DFR completed and analysed by end of Y2Q2</p> <p>1.3 Findings of the evidence review and fieldwork are discussed with Cameroon and DFR policy makers and conservation practitioners by end of Y2.</p> <p>1.4 Findings reported to CBD at 2020 CoP in Y3</p>	<p>1.1 Review conducted although not yet finalised as detailed in Section 3.1 and 3.2. Draft report included in Annex 4</p> <p>1.2. Fieldwork not due to start until Year 2 but preliminary visit undertaken, local staff recruited and research plan developed – included in Annex 4</p> <p>1.3 Not yet started</p> <p>1.4 Not yet started</p>	
Activity 1.1 Desk-based evidence review of drivers of food choice (sub-Saharan Africa)		Evidence identified and review completed.)	Finalise draft report and make available online
Activity 1.2, Fieldwork in Dja on local preferences, drivers and constraints, & role of wild meat in food security (focus groups, key informant interviews) (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)		Preliminary visit conducted and research plan developed	Field work to run throughout Year 2
1.3 Synthesis and write up of food choice evidence review (IIED)		Preliminary write up completed	Finalise draft report and make available online
1.4 Synthesis and write up of first phase of fieldwork (Oxford)		Not yet started	Synthesis and write up planned for end of year 2

1.5 Meetings with DFR and national policy-makers, conservation actors and community representatives/associations to present findings and discuss uptake (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)	Not yet started - although national and local stakeholders have been kept informed about project through Dja Actors Forum	High level event in April 2019 to raise awareness at national level and periodic meetings (organised via FCTV) during year 2
1.6 Side event at CBD CoP (IIED)	Not yet started	CBD CoP will be held in Year 3
1.7 Dissemination of food choice evidence review report internationally (IIED)	Not yet started	For year 3
<p>Output 2. Characteristics of existing bushmeat alternative projects in DFR and elsewhere, and the role of drivers of food choice in project success, analysed</p>	<p>2.1 Evidence review of the factors affecting success of bushmeat-alternative projects in sub-Saharan Africa completed by end of year 1</p> <p>2.2 Inventory of existing bushmeat alternative projects in Dja region completed and placed in online database by end of Y1Q3</p> <p>2.3 Analyses of evidence review & inventory to discern success factors completed by end of year 1</p> <p>2.4 Fieldwork completed to explore bushmeat-alternative intervention preferences in three case study sites in DFR, and data analysed, by Y2Q4</p> <p>2.5 Findings discussed with Cameroon and DFR policy makers and conservation practitioners by end of Y2Q2.</p> <p>2.6 Findings reported to CBD at 2020 CoP in Y3</p> <p>2.7 Findings disseminated internationally by end of project</p>	<p>2.1 Review conducted but not yet finalised, as reported in Section 3. Draft report included in Annex 4</p> <p>2.2 Basic inventory developed based on prior PhD work - include in Annex 4 – but requires updating and expanding by FCTV and Living Earth based on local knowledge</p> <p>2.3 Behind schedule – analysis will be conducted by end of Year 2 Q 1 once evidence review and inventory finalised</p> <p>2.4 Fieldwork not due to start until Year 2 but preliminary visit undertaken, local staff recruited and research plan developed – included in Annex 4</p> <p>2.5 Not yet started</p> <p>2.6 Not yet started</p> <p>2.7 Not yet started</p>

2.1 Desk-based evidence review of bushmeat alternative projects (IIED)	Evidence identified and review completed.)	Finalise draft report and make available online	
2.2 Inventory of bushmeat-alternative initiatives around DFR completed and posted in online database (IIED & all teams)	Preliminary inventory completed	Finalise in inventory and make available online	
2.3 Cross checking of Dja projects with success factors from evidence review (IIED and Oxford)	Not yet started	Cross check Dja projects with success factors	
2.4 Synthesis and write up of evidence review on bushmeat alternative projects (IIED and Oxford)	Preliminary write up completed	Finalise draft report and make available online	
2.5 Fieldwork to explore preferences for bushmeat-alternative interventions with villagers in 3 case study sites (including survey design, training of FCTV staff in survey techniques, implementation of choice experiment and household surveys) (Oxford & FCTV/LEL)	Preliminary visit conducted and research plan developed	Field work to run throughout Year 2	
2.6 Data analysis and write up of overall research report & other outputs such as papers (Oxford with inputs from all)	Not yet started	Year 3	
2.7 Meetings with DFR and national policy-makers and conservation actors to present findings and discuss uptake (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)	Not yet started - although national and local stakeholders have been kept informed about project through Dja Actors Forum	High level event in April 2019 to raise awareness at national level and periodic meetings (organised via FCTV) during year 2	
2.8 Side event at CBD CoP (IIED)	Not yet started	CBD CoP will be held in Year 3	
2.9 Dissemination of report internationally	Not yet started	For year 3	
Output 3. Enhancements to existing bushmeat-alternative projects and a new proposal, agreed with villagers and implementers at DFR case study sites	3.1 Improved design of at least one new or existing bushmeat-alternative project in each of three sites around DFR agreed with local communities and implementers by end of project 3.2 At least 50% of project implementers acting within the DFR report improved understanding of	3.1 Not yet started 3.2 Not yet started 3.3 Not yet started	

	<p>the drivers and barriers to successful bushmeat-alternative projects, resulting in improved implementation effectiveness by end of project</p> <p>3.3 At least 50% of households in case study communities report increased engagement with bushmeat-alternative projects in their area by end of the project</p>	
3.1 Work with villagers and project implementers in 3 sites to improve existing projects based on findings (Mindourou, Northern buckle) or design new project for future fundraising (LEL/FTCV & Oxford)	Not yet started	Research in year 2 will inform interventions in year 3
3.2 Meetings with project designers/implementers (community organisations, NGOs, govt) in DFR to disseminate project findings and explore ways to improve project design & implementation (FCTV/LEL)	Not yet started	Activity planned for year 3
3.3 End of project survey of villagers in 3 case study sites to assess engagement with, and perceived effectiveness of, bushmeat-alternative projects or proposals (FCTV/LEL & Oxford)	Not yet started	Activity planned for year 3
<p>Output 4. Capacity to design and implement improved “bushmeat alternative” interventions improved elsewhere in Cameroon and internationally.</p>	<p>4.1. Policy recommendations developed discussed and agreed with Cameroonian government by end of project</p> <p>4.2 Decision support tool designed, and tested in DFR, by end of Y3Q2.</p> <p>4.3. Decision support tool disseminated to at least 100 conservation and/or development organisations, tested and validated for at least 20 projects, and refined accordingly, by end of Y3Q3.</p>	4.1 Not yet started

	4.4. Endorsement of guidance/ recommendations by at least one international conservation policy process or large-scale programme developing bushmeat-alternative interventions, by end of project.	
.1 Drafting and translation of policy recommendations (IIED & FCTV/LEL with inputs from Oxford)	Not yet started	Year 3 activity
4.2 Development of Decision Support Tool based on experience in case study sites & evidence reviews (LEL/FCTV with inputs from all)	Not yet started	Year 3 activity
4.3 Meetings with project designers/implementers (community organisations, NGOs, govt) in DFR to test & validate tool and refine/update its design (FCTV/LEL)	Not yet started	Year 3 activity
4.4 Presentation of tool (and experience from case study sites including new project designs) to other project implementers via the Dja Actors Forum & PCLG (FCTV/LEL)	Not yet started	Year 3 activity
4.5 Meetings with Cameroon policy makers to discuss recommendations & feasible changes in interventions (FCTV/LEL)	Not yet started	Year 3 activity
4.6 International dissemination of project findings and tool (IIED with inputs from all)	Not yet started	Year 3 activity
4.7 Validation exercise for tool in other projects (IIED & Oxford)	Not yet started	Year 3 activity
4.8 Feedback survey on project's impact on intervention design internationally (IIED with inputs from all)	Not yet started	Year 3 activity
4.9 Presentation at CBD CoP (IIED)	Not yet started	Year 3 activity

Annex 2: Project’s full current logframe as presented in the application form (unless changes have been agreed)

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Impact: Improved “bushmeat-alternative” projects in Cameroon and Africa-wide result in reduced exploitation of wild species and increased food security, contributing to achievement of SDGs while meeting CBD and CITES obligations</p>			
<p>Outcome: (Max 30 words)</p> <p>Strengthened capacity of policy-makers and practitioners in Cameroon and Africa-wide to design and implement effective “bushmeat-alternative” interventions that reflect drivers of food choice, conserve biodiversity and contribute to food security.</p>	<p>0.1 Improved understanding by conservation policy-makers in sub-Saharan Africa of different drivers of wild meat as a food choice of local people, compared to baseline at start of project</p> <p>0.2 Improved understanding by “bushmeat-alternative” project designers in sub-Saharan Africa of characteristics of effective bushmeat-alternative projects compared to baseline at start of project</p> <p>0.3 Enhancements to two bushmeat alternative projects at DFR, and a proposal for another, by the end of the project, so that projects have the right conditions in place to a) improve food security and provide sustainable nutrition while also b) reducing exploitation of wild species.</p>	<p>0.1 Survey of policy-makers to determine understanding before and after project implementation</p> <p>0.2 Survey of project designers/implementers (identified in evidence review) before and after dissemination of project findings/tool, to determine understanding and willingness to implement improved projects</p> <p>0.3 Reports from project designers/managers; feedback from villagers</p> <p>0.4 Reports on uptake of decision support tool and policy guidance materials; feedback from project funders and implementers</p>	<p>International NGOs and policy-makers (e.g. ECOFAC, CBD) are responsive to findings and change their processes accordingly [our strong international networks and involvement of key players in Advisory group will help here]</p> <p>Feasible and effective bushmeat alternatives exist, that can divert enough consumption from bushmeat to reduce hunting pressure [In the long run, food systems need to reflect changing environmental, social & economic realities. In the short-medium term there is potential for e.g. aquaculture, wild-caught fisheries, mini-livestock]</p> <p>Better-designed “bushmeat-alternative” projects will lead to reduced hunting and reduced threats to wildlife (because rural</p>

	<p>0.4 Receipt, uptake and commitments to use project-generated evidence and tools by at least 50% of existing bushmeat-alternative project designers, funders and implementers in DFR (from inventory generated in output 2).</p>		<p>consumption is a major threat) [Our experience in DFR and elsewhere suggests rural consumption is a threat; detailed research by J Wright suggests design improvements are feasible and could be effective]</p> <p>Local people are willing to take part in surveys and engage with research team [the team has very good relationships with local people in areas around the DFR and have worked with them for a number of years]</p> <p>Creation of decision support tool is feasible based on information collected, and evidence from DFR will be generalisable [we expect the evidence internationally to be weak; our new evidence-base for DFR will be locally relevant and our expectation based on previous work is that broad general lessons will emerge]</p> <p>Cameroon government remains supportive of the project and responsive to research findings</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. Factors influencing use of wild meat as a food choice around Dja Biosphere Reserve and elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa understood and documented</p>	<p>1.1 Evidence review of drivers of wild meat as a food choice across Africa completed by end of year 1</p> <p>1.2 Field work to gain local communities' perspectives on food choice at DFR completed and analysed by end of Y2Q2</p> <p>1.3 Findings of the evidence review and fieldwork are discussed with Cameroon and DFR policy makers and conservation practitioners by end of Y2.</p> <p>1.4 Findings reported to CBD at 2020 CoP in Y3</p> <p>1.5 Findings disseminated in Cameroon and internationally by end of project</p>	<p>1.1 Report and database of sources available online and disseminated via partner networks</p> <p>1.2 Biannual progress reports to Darwin, research findings report, research paper</p> <p>1.3 Meeting reports</p> <p>1.4 CBD reports</p> <p>1.5 PCLG meeting reports, dissemination records</p> <p>1.5 IIED and partner websites with materials available</p> <p>1.5 Research papers and conference presentations</p>	<p>Sufficient information is available at the international scale to draw conclusions</p> <p>Local people are willing to participate in surveys and interviews</p> <p>Policy makers and practitioners are sufficiently interested and engaged to attend meetings and provide feedback</p>
<p>2. Characteristics of existing bushmeat alternative projects in DFR and elsewhere, and the role of drivers of food choice in project success, analysed</p>	<p>2.1 Evidence review of the factors affecting success of bushmeat-alternative projects in sub-Saharan Africa completed by end of year 1</p>	<p>2.1 Project progress reports and publications</p> <p>2.2 Project report and database of projects published on website</p>	<p>Sufficient information is available [we already have a foundation from J Wright's work]</p>

	<p>2.2 Inventory of existing bushmeat alternative projects in Dja region completed and placed in online database by end of Y1Q3</p> <p>2.3 Analyses of evidence review & inventory to discern success factors completed by end of year 1</p> <p>2.4 Fieldwork completed to explore bushmeat-alternative intervention preferences in three case study sites in DFR, and data analysed, by Y2Q4</p> <p>2.4 Findings discussed with Cameroon and DFR policy makers and conservation practitioners by end of Y2Q2.</p> <p>2.5 Findings reported to CBD at 2020 CoP in Y3</p> <p>2.6 Findings disseminated internationally by end of project</p>	<p>2.3 Research paper and report</p> <p>2.4 Results of household surveys; write up of focus group discussions, data from choice experiments; project progress reports, research report/paper</p> <p>2.5 Meeting reports</p> <p>2.6 CBD reports</p> <p>2.7 Dissemination reports, web download stats, conference proceedings, journal article altmetrics</p>	<p>Local people prepared to respond to survey questions and engage with project design.</p> <p>Policy makers and practitioners are sufficiently interested and engaged to attend meetings and provide feedback</p>
<p>3. Enhancements to existing bushmeat-alternative projects and a new proposal, agreed with villagers and implementers at DFR case study sites</p>	<p>3.1 Improved design of at least one new or existing bushmeat-alternative project in each of three sites around DFR agreed with local communities and implementers by end of project</p>	<p>3.1 Inventory results, minutes of meetings held with implementers, project progress reports</p>	<p>Local people willing to participate in the project</p> <p>There is sufficient information generated from the research under outputs 1 and 2 that a locally</p>

	<p>3.2 At least 50% of project implementers acting within the DFR report improved understanding of the drivers and barriers to successful bushmeat-alternative projects, resulting in improved implementation effectiveness by end of project</p> <p>3.3 At least 50% of households in case study communities report increased engagement with bushmeat-alternative projects in their area by end of the project</p>	<p>3.2 Feedback from survey of project implementers;</p> <p>3.7 Community surveys at beginning and end of project</p>	<p>acceptable and effective project design improvement can be agreed</p> <p>Implementers of existing and planned projects are prepared to engage with us to improve their projects and monitor outcomes. [our strong relationships with these project implementers, and careful laying of the groundwork in year 1, makes this likely]</p>
<p>4. Capacity to design and implement improved “bushmeat alternative” interventions improved elsewhere in Cameroon and internationally.</p>	<p>4.1. Policy recommendations developed discussed and agreed with Cameroonian government by end of project</p> <p>4.2 Decision support tool designed, and tested in DFR, by end of Y3Q2.</p> <p>4.3. Decision support tool disseminated to at least 100 conservation and/or development organisations, tested and validated for at least 20 projects, and refined accordingly, by end of Y3Q3.</p>	<p>4.1 Policy recommendations available in French and English on project website; minutes of meetings</p> <p>4.2 Tool available on project website, web download stats, PCLG meeting reports; project design documents, project implementer feedback and reports</p> <p>4.3 Evidence of dissemination online and at CBD side-event. Report of validation testing.</p>	<p>Policy makers and practitioners are receptive to research findings and recommendations and willing to provide feedback</p> <p>Tool is useful and generalizable beyond case study sites.</p> <p>“Bushmeat-alternative” projects continue to be developed by other actors</p>

	4.4. Endorsement of guidance/ recommendations by at least one international conservation policy process or large-scale programme developing bushmeat-alternative interventions, by end of project.	4.4 Dissemination records, downloads from website, feedback surveys reporting on uptake and usefulness, letter of confirmation of use from at least one organisation.	
--	--	---	--

Activities (each activity is numbered according to the Output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1)

- 0.0 Agreement of ToRs and contracts for project partners (IIED)
- 0.1 Inception meeting with project partners in Cameroon (All)
- 0.2 Project webpage established and flyer developed (including translation of flyer into French) (IIED)
- 0.3 Biannual skype-based progress review meetings
- 0.4 Annual project meetings in Cameroon (1 day project partners and advisors, 1 day outreach via PCLG)
- 1.1 Desk-based evidence review of drivers of food choice (sub-Saharan Africa) (IIED)
- 1.2 Fieldwork in Dja on local preferences, drivers and constraints, & role of wild meat in food security (focus groups, key informant interviews) (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)
- 1.3 Synthesis and write up of food choice evidence review (IIED)
- 1.4 Synthesis and write up of first phase of fieldwork (Oxford)
- 1.5 Meetings with DFR and national policy-makers, conservation actors and community representatives/associations to present findings and discuss uptake (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)
- 1.6 Side event at CBD CoP (IIED)
- 1.7 Dissemination of food choice evidence review report internationally (IIED)
- 2.1 Desk-based evidence review of bushmeat alternative projects (IIED)
- 2.2 Inventory of bushmeat-alternative initiatives around DFR completed and posted in online database (IIED & all teams)
- 2.3 Cross checking of Dja projects with success factors from evidence review (IIED and Oxford)
- 2.4 Synthesis and write up of evidence review on bushmeat alternative projects (IIED and Oxford)
- 2.5 Fieldwork to explore preferences for bushmeat-alternative interventions with villagers in 3 case study sites (including survey design, training of FCTV staff in survey techniques, implementation of choice experiment and household surveys) (Oxford & FCTV/LEL)
- 2.6 Data analysis and write up of overall research report & other outputs such as papers (Oxford with inputs from all)
- 2.7 Meetings with DFR and national policy-makers and conservation actors to present findings and discuss uptake (Oxford, FCTV, LEL)

- 2.8 Side event at CBD CoP (IIED)
- 2.9 Dissemination of report internationally
- 3.1 Work with villagers and project implementers in 3 sites to improve existing projects based on findings (Mindourou, Northern buckle) or design new project for future fundraising (LEL/FCTV & Oxford)
- 3.2 Meetings with project designers/implementers (community organisations, NGOs, govt) in DFR to disseminate project findings and explore ways to improve project design & implementation (FCTV/LEL)
- 3.3 End of project survey of villagers in 3 case study sites to assess engagement with, and perceived effectiveness of, bushmeat-alternative projects or proposals (FCTV/LEL & Oxford)
- 4.1 Drafting and translation of policy recommendations (IIED & FCTV/LEL with inputs from Oxford)
- 4.2 Development of Decision Support Tool based on experience in case study sites & evidence reviews (LEL/FCTV with inputs from all)
- 4.3 Meetings with project designers/implementers (community organisations, NGOs, govt) in DFR to test & validate tool and refine/update its design (FCTV/LEL)
- 4.4 Presentation of tool (and experience from case study sites including new project designs) to other project implementers via the Dja Actors Forum & PCLG (FCTV/LEL)
- 4.5 Meetings with Cameroon policy makers to discuss recommendations & feasible changes in interventions (FCTV/LEL)
- 4.6 International dissemination of project findings and tool (IIED with inputs from all)
- 4.7 Validation exercise for tool in other projects (IIED & Oxford)
- 4.8 Feedback survey on project's impact on intervention design internationally (IIED with inputs from all)
- 4.9 Presentation at CBD CoP (IIED)

Annex 3: Standard Measures

Table 1 Project Standard Output Measures

Code No.	Description	Gender of people (if relevant)	Nationality of people (if relevant)	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
Established codes								
6A	Number of people to receive other forms of education/training (which does not fall into categories 1-5 above) *	M & F	Cameroonian	0	6		0	6

6B	Number of training weeks			0	3			3
7	Number of training materials					1		1
11B	No of journal articles submitted					2		2
14 A	Workshops etc organised			0	2	2	0	4
14B	Workshops etc attended			0	2	2	0	4

Table 2 Publications

Title	Type (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (authors, year)	Gender of Lead Author	Nationality of Lead Author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. weblink or publisher if not available online)
Why Eat Wild Meat	Flyer	IIED, 2018	F	GB	IIED	https://pubs.iied.org/17485IIED/
Pourquoi manger de la viande sauvage ?	Flyer	IIED, 2019	M	Cam	IIED	https://pubs.iied.org/17485FIIED/
Why Eat Wild Meat website		IIED, 2019	F	GB	IIED	https://www.iied.org/why-eat-wild-meat

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

Checklist for submission

	Check
Is the report less than 10MB? If so, please email to Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk putting the project number in the Subject line.	X
Is your report more than 10MB? If so, please discuss with Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	
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. However, we would expect that most material will now be electronic.	
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	X
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	X
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	