

Darwin Initiative Main: Annual Report

To be completed with reference to the “Project Reporting Information Note”:

(<https://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/resources/information-notes/>)

It is expected that this report will be a **maximum of 20 pages** in length, excluding annexes)

Submission Deadline: 30th April 2024

Submit to: BCF-Reports@niras.com including your project ref in the subject line

Darwin Initiative Project Information

Project reference	30-003
Project title	Developing a sustainable model for human-elephant coexistence in Thailand
Country/ies	Thailand
Lead Partner	Zoological Society of London (ZSL)
Project partner(s)	Human Elephant Voices Network (HEVN)
Darwin Initiative grant value	£ 533,655
Start/end dates of project	April 2023 – March 2026
Reporting period (e.g. Apr 2023 – Mar 2024) and number (e.g. Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	Apr 2023 – Mar 2024 Annual Report 1
Project Leader name	Susie Offord-Woolley
Project website/blog/social media	
Report author(s) and date	Juliana Masseloux; Panjadach Singtho; Sudarat Sangkum; Bhichet Noonto; Riawphai Chantarachit

1. Project summary

Thailand has the largest population of Asian Elephants in mainland Southeast Asia and shares with Myanmar the largest remaining blocks of elephant habitat (Annex 4. Table 1). The future of Southeast Asia’s elephants thus depends disproportionately on the success of elephant conservation efforts in Thailand. Unfortunately, elephant conservation in Thailand is undermined by human–elephant conflict (HEC), which threatens human livelihoods and well-being and undermines tolerance of elephants and protected areas (PAs) [1]. There have been and continue to be many HEC mitigation projects throughout Thailand (e.g., 1-5) but these methods have met with mixed success and there are no best practice guidelines on what has worked and what has not. Furthermore, many local organizations lack sufficient capacity and expertise for establishing sustainable mechanisms to support projects beyond seed funding. As a result, some projects are trying methods already shown to be ineffective elsewhere in Thailand while effective approaches are not being replicated at scale.

Despite its middle-income country status, Thailand has one of the highest income inequality rates in the East Asia and Pacific region [6], largely split between urban and rural populations. Indigenous peoples, such as the Karen and Mon in rural western Thailand, are among the poorest of Thailand’s populations. Many lack legal recognition and thus access to land rights and basic social services including education, health care, information, and justice [7].

Impoverished rural communities living near protected areas do not have financial mechanisms to offset elephant damage or knowledge and capacity to trial and scale-up viable elephant friendly livelihood options. Economic monocrops such as cassava and sugarcane, most-prone to elephant damage, are widely promoted by government programs but no corporate social responsibility (CSR) or government insurance program currently exists, and existing compensation programs are widely considered insufficient by HEC-affected communities. Lower-income farming households in the landscape have expressed less supportive attitudes towards conservation and coexistence due in large part to the socio-economic and wellbeing costs of living near elephants [8]. The consequence is that HEC remains a serious problem in Thailand leading to retaliatory killing of elephants [9], reduced support for conservation, and substantial socio-economic costs typically affecting the poorest members of society.

This project will address these problems by: 1) reviewing and co-developing national best-practice guidelines for supporting effective HEC mitigation methods; 2) assessing the feasibility of HEC insurance schemes at the national scale to alleviate the financial burden of HEC; 3) identifying and mapping suitable resilient agroforestry livelihood options for the southern Western Forest Complex (sWEFCOM); and 4) scaling-up existing elephant-resistant livelihood initiatives (coffee agroforestry) in sWEFCOM. See Annex 4 for a map of project sites.

2. Project stakeholders/ partners

The strength of this project lies in multistakeholder engagement and participatory implementation. This is foremost a collaborative project between CSOs, government agencies, local communities, and private sector. ZSL has leveraged the organization's significant international knowledge and capacity as well as 16 years of expertise in elephant conservation in Thailand to lead on planning and implementation of key activities and outputs, particularly the systematic review of mitigation methods and assessments of insurance and resilient livelihoods. Building on existing relationships and partnerships with CSOs and organizations across elephant range regions in Thailand, HEVN is leading on planning and logistics for multi-stakeholder regional meetings and community engagement activities in the sWEFCOM. The strong collaborative working relationship and capacity sharing between these two organizations has ensured the successful delivery of Year 1 deliverables.

Public Sector: Support from the DNP has been key in ensuring national-level support for key activities including the best-practice guide and human-elephant conflict insurance. High-level representatives from the DNP Wildlife Conservation Division have been regularly engaged in project activities, securing access to valuable national datasets on human-elephant conflict. ZSL and HEVN have additionally been invited to sit on and support the sWEFCOM Elephant Center, which will be a hub for collating, analysing, and monitoring elephant conservation and conflict data. Decentralization of elephant management – shifting regulatory and financial management from central government to the provincial or district level – was identified as a key priority in 60% of forest complexes and has been gaining momentum across the country. While this management strategy has been cleared by the national government, local subdistrict government officials were invited to attend and speak at the regional meetings to identify capacity and knowledge gaps for implementation.

Private Sector: The insurance and diversified livelihoods components of this project has spurred engagement of the private sector, particularly companies involved in cash crop agriculture, which have previously not been engaged or educated around the human-elephant conflict situation. ZSL has engaged the British Chamber of Commerce, and additional engagement of agriculture and insurance companies is scheduled for Year 2 to support development of the insurance scheme.

Civil Society Organizations: International NGOs, local NGOs, and community-based CSOs in five forest complex regions have been invaluable for supporting logistics and implementation of regional meetings, sharing HEC data for the situation assessment, and organizing communities.

Research Institutions: We have engaged with expert faculty in mechanical and software engineering and programming from Suranaree University of Technology (SUT) to support piloting of innovative solutions to human-elephant conflict, which was also identified as a

priority by 60% of forest complexes as well as by the DNP. This includes planned testing of an AI-integrated early warning system and HEC monitoring application in Year 2.

Local Communities: Local farmers and community members, including community Elephant Rapid Response Units (ERRUs), are being engaged in activities contributing to all outputs to ensure development of the human-elephant coexistence model is participatory, bottom-up, and sustainable.

3. Project progress

3.1 Progress in carrying out project Activities

Output 1.

1.1 Baseline and endline HEC mitigation capacity assessment of all project partners within HEVN network (23) and annual assessment of communities in 5 HEC regions.

Capacity surveys tailored to different stakeholders (Elephant Rapid Response Units (ERRUs), farmers, NGOs/public sector) were disbursed to regional meeting attendees in five forest complexes over the course of Year 1. Organizational capacity surveys (OCA) were collected from 26 unique organizations in 3 HEC-afflicted forest complex regions – Eastern, Kui Buri, and Southern – during regional meetings. In the other 2 forest complex meetings, attendance was dominated by communities and ERRUs (with separate surveys) or organizations refused to complete the survey (e.g. local DNP due to concerns over data sharing). We are planning a follow-up targeted dissemination of the OCA surveys in Y2 which will collect more detailed information about specific mitigation tool studies after receiving permission from central DNP. Through the regional meetings, six priority strategies were identified for managing elephants, which varied by region according to local context, capacity, and needs. Follow-up regional meetings will dive deeper into priority capacity needs and strategies, as well as participatory co-development of mitigation best-practice guidelines to bridge the capacity gap.

1.2 Systematic review (synthesis/analysis) of data on HEC mitigation measures and monitoring methods collated from all partners in Thailand since 2002.

The OCA surveys disseminated during regional meetings included questions about HEC mitigation measures and monitoring methods. However, because regional meetings were delayed through to February 2024 and due to delays obtaining HEC data from DNP and other CSOs, we have opted to push the systematic review to Year 2. A master's student from University College London with experience in human-elephant conflict work in Thailand will be leading on the systematic map/review from May-August 2024 with direct oversight from ZSL staff. ZSL has also recently obtained permission from DNP to access and utilize the existing national HEC database which will inform the systematic review and HEC situational assessment (Output 2).

1.3 Co-development of best-practice guidelines for HEC mitigation and M&E with DNP and all partners by end of Y1. Report and paper published by end of Y2.

Best-practice recommendations following up on Y1 discussions will be co-developed during regional meetings in Y2 and disseminated to all partners and stakeholders for feedback in Y3.

1.4 National capacity-building workshops (Bangkok) introduce the project and assess existing capacity of elephant conservation partners in Y1 and disseminate project results in Y3.

A national meeting was held in Bangkok on March 16, 2024 for Thai Elephant Day, titled "Conservation and Coexistence: Hope for Sustainable Living in a Changing World." The event was co-hosted with support from the Thai Public Broadcasting Service (Thai PBS). The full-day event was held at the Thai PBS building in Bangkok and livestreamed for broad dissemination. Fifty-one people attended, including representatives from communities (5), government (16) CSO and private sector (30) from five HEC forest complexes.

1.5 Community-level workshops introduce project and assess capacity(Y1), disseminate best-practice mitigation, HWC insurance feasibility and livelihood framework(Y2), and elephant-friendly business models(Y3) to 5 HEC regions.

Regional meetings conducted in five forest complexes introduced the Darwin project, assessed existing organizational capacity and community ERRU practices and challenges (Annexes 5 and 6), and facilitated discussions for identifying and implementing regional elephant management priorities (Annex 8). The meetings engaged a total of 333 participants (59% community members, 28% government representatives, and 13% CSO/NGO; 20% women).

1.6 Public Community of Practice webinar shares lessons learned and best-practice guidelines to other elephant range countries (Kenya, Nepal, Sri Lanka).

This activity is on track for Year 3.

Output 2

2.1 Collation and analysis of data on financial impact of HEC. Situation analysis of HEC and role for insurance published by end of Y1.

The national situation analysis of HEC, as with the systematic review, has been delayed to Y2 to allow for collation and integration of additional data from DNP, key NGOs, and regional focus groups. This will ensure the assessment is thorough and accurate. We also have planned follow-up engagement with key public and private sector actors in the insurance sector including the Office of Insurance Commission (OIC) and Thai General Insurance Association (TGIA) which will help narrow down key data needs to develop a feasible insurance scheme.

2.2 Focus groups in 5 forest complexes with farming communities assess WTP premiums, insurance eligibility, existing financial support mechanisms, feasibility of crop protection compliance, etc.

Under the most recent change request, this was rescheduled for Year 2. Key implementation partners in each forest complex region were informed of this upcoming activity at the national meeting and will be engaged in April-May to support scheduling and planning of the focus groups per regional availability.

Activities 2.3-2.7 are on track for Years 2 and 3.

Output 3

3.1 Soil and farm mapping surveys to ground truth spatial maps and inform biogeographical variables of feasibility assessment, conducted in Y1

The soil and farm mapping surveys conducted by the agronomist in Year 1 yielded significant insights into the spatial distribution of soil properties, land use patterns, and biogeographical variables within the study area. These findings hold substantive implications for agricultural practices, land management, and feasibility assessments, thereby contributing to more informed decision-making processes. Moreover, a comprehensive soil nutrient assessment coupled with agroclimatic mapping delineated three distinct clusters based on landscapes and altitudes: Low-Altitude regions encompassing Chong Sadao and Tha Manao near Kanchanaburi city, Mid-Altitude zones in Sapan Lao, and High-Altitude areas including Huai Suea and Phu Toei in Thong Pha Phum District.

3.2 Viable Elephant-friendly alternative agroforestry/livelihood system(s) determined for model farms using biogeographical (soil mapping, climate) and HEC data (from partners) for 16 HEC zones in sWEFCOM

The process of identifying viable elephant-friendly alternative agroforestry and livelihood systems for model farms across 16 Human-Elephant Conflict (HEC) zones within the sWEFCOM region is meticulously tailored through the integration of biogeographical data, soil assessment, and farm surveys with HEC information. Five model farms were selected as potential alternative

systems, each with a distinct planting design tailored to its specific site characteristics. Selection of plant species was carefully curated to maximize both ecological benefits and economic returns. The list comprises 15 species of Emergent Trees (e.g., Dipterocarpus spp., Teak, Sal Tree), 11 species of high canopy trees (e.g., Neem, Moringa), 12 species of medium canopy trees (e.g., Pomelo, Coffee, Cashew Nut), 19 species of annual or herbaceous plants (e.g., Ginger, Black Pepper) and fencing plants (e.g., Rough Lemon, Industrial Hemp).

3.3 Market analysis identifies agroforestry/livelihood product buyers and collective action structures (e.g., CBO and associated microfinance, training and input supply services) across 16 HEC zones

The development of a financial model and implementation guidelines, including market structures, for key agroforestry models is slated for development and refinement in Year 2.

3.4 Interactive map of agroforestry/livelihood options for sWEFCOM landscape co-developed with Suranaree University and DLD and integrated into HEVN website

HEVN is currently partnering with a Thai tech company to store and manage the resiliency map and data (including crop suitability and soil maps from Activities 3.1-3.3 and HEC data from HEVN and ZSL for sWEFCOM). We are additionally exploring avenues for integrating the map with a new HEC monitoring application developed by Suranaree University and proposed for adoption by DNP and community ERRUs. A beta draft of the site is expected to be up and running by end of Y2.

3.5 Community-led focus groups in 16 HEC zones assess receptiveness to identified alternative elephant-friendly agroforestry/livelihoods systems

Community-led Focus Group Discussions (FGD) on agroforestry have been conducted in 10 out of 16 communities in Thong Pha Phum District and High-Altitude areas of Kanchanaburi. These FGD trips engaged 198 farmers (117 male, 81 female, at least 10% indigenous). The group discussions provided valuable insights into the receptiveness level of local communities towards identified alternative elephant-friendly agroforestry and livelihood systems, addressing community perceptions, concerns, and preferences. Basic analysis of the FGD data revealed that, in addition to agroclimatic conditions, farmers face barriers such as a lack of knowledge and clear mindset due to the absence of demonstration models on sustainable agroforestry systems. They also lack access to soft loans and information on how to access high-value markets. Further FGDs will be conducted in the remaining 6 HEC affected communities in early May 2024.

Output 4

4.1 Establishment of a governance structure, development of responsibilities and/or articles of incorporation and monthly CBO meetings, leading to incorporation (if determined by the community).

The leader of 3 Community-Based Organizations (CBO) and the Agricultural Occupation Promotion and Development Center established a steering committee for the project. Regular online meetings were held to guide the process. The CBO leader decided to formalize the organization by incorporating it as a legal entity focused on elephant-friendly coffee farming and production, aiming to receive government support and secure funding. This incorporation process is expected to be completed before the 2024/2025 coffee harvest season.

4.2 Business operations and management workshops support existing Chang Baa coffee CBO in TPP (60 members)

Workshops on business operations and management were organized to support the existing coffee CBO in the TPP area, which has 60 members. The workshops aim to bridge the gap between agricultural and business sectors, encouraging sustainable partnerships. At the provincial level, the working groups address human-elephant conflicts, promoting a transition from monoculture to agroforestry systems. Additionally, these sessions guide farmers through

the supply chain, helping them increase the value of their products. The existing coffee CBO is also in the process of registering as a community enterprise, with support from the HEVN team, which is assisting in business planning and brainstorming.

4.3 All CBO members trained to monitor/report HEC incidents and coached in safe, effective, non-violent deterrence methods. Data collected by HEVN at monthly steering committee meetings.

Throughout year 1, CBO members were trained to monitor and report Human-Elephant Conflict (HEC) incidents. Incident data was collected through the LINE app and satellite imagery maps, with incidents marked using elephant stickers. These reports were discussed during monthly steering committee meetings. Safe and non-violent deterrence methods were taught in a separate training session following a regional workshop. Given the expansion of elephant herds due to drought and wildfire in 2023-2024, the HEVN team extended its study area to cover more affected villages. In year 2, the method for recording HEC incidents will transition to an online platform using a new template co-designed by the DNP and the provincial agriculture department to facilitate data sharing among organizations.

4.4 Agroforestry/livelihoods training workshops and annual product testing to meet national and buyer standards

We organized coffee cupping events for farmers and stakeholders, providing an opportunity to sample contest-winning coffees and compare them with local brews. We also supported Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) in submitting coffee samples for quality assessment. Specialized training sessions focused on selecting and roasting coffee samples for competitions. Participating in two notable competitions provided valuable feedback:

1. ICP-Thailand Evaluation 2023 (National Competition): Our coffee samples scored 79.42 and 79.17, failing to meet the Fine Robusta standard due to coffee bean defects and high moisture levels. These issues were linked to post-harvest storage problems.
2. KAN COFFEE Fest 2023 (Regional Competition): Scores of 81.08 and 80.08 indicated improvement but still fell short of the international Fine Robusta standard (82 points).

Following these results, we began working with stakeholders, including a Robusta Grader, to develop robust quality improvement guidelines. This process involves assessing coffee quality at the individual plot level, identifying defects in cultivation and processing, and crafting quality enhancement strategies for each plantation. The quality assessment process is scheduled to take place from November 2024 to February 2025, aligning with the coffee harvest season in Thong Pha Phum District, Kanchanaburi Province.

4.5 Business operations and management workshops conducted in two additional HEC zones (Thamano and Mae Plaso)

This activity will be implemented in year 3.

4.6 Capacity assessment surveys conducted annually to assess progress and needs for CBOs (60 HH) through the project

Capacity assessment surveys will be conducted in year two for new members who have registered with the community enterprise.

4.7 Baseline and endline household income assessments adapted with appropriate indicators for Thailand context developed, conducted, and analysed for community business members (60 HH)

Baseline household income assessments will be conducted in year two for the newly registered community enterprise members. These assessments will use indicators tailored to the Thai

context to analyze the income changes among 60 households involved in the community business.

3.2 Progress towards project Outputs

Output 1: A country-wide systematic review of all human-elephant conflict mitigation projects in Thailand identifies effectiveness of mitigation tools trialed, and informs best practice and M&E guidelines that are promoted across 5 HEC regions of Thai

Indicator 1.1 Data on mitigation methods and assessment collated from partners across Thailand, systematically reviewed and analysed in Y1. Report written with participatory input from all partners including DNP at end of Y1 and a paper submitted for publication in a relevant peer-reviewed journal by the end of Y2.

- **Baseline condition:** No existing national systematic review or assessment of HEC mitigation methods and monitoring and evaluation methods.
- **Change recorded to date:** From data collated from communities and organizations during regional meetings, expertise with implementation and monitoring and evaluation of most mitigation tools was low across forest complex and organization type (Annex 5. Table 2 and 3). Though respondents generally found mitigation tools to be effective (Annex 5. Table 5), the average perceived mitigation tool effectiveness was also low across all sites. Night guarding, habitat management, and ERRUs had the highest mean perceived effectiveness, while fencing methods had the lowest mean perceived effectiveness (Annex 5. Figure 7 and 8). Surveys tailored for community ERRUs also identified current practices and key challenges for this specific mitigation tool (Annex 6). Additional mitigation data and best-practice recommendations will be collected during Y2 regional meetings and insurance focus groups, quantitative HEC data from DNP mapped and analyzed, and Thai and English literature (grey and published) on in-country mitigation tool trials collated for the systematic review in Y2. Capacity for implementation and monitoring of key mitigation tools will be re-assessed in Y3 after co-development and dissemination of best-practice guidelines.
- **Source of evidence for this change:** Annex 5 and 6

Indicator 1.2 Best practice guidelines for HEC mitigation tools, including suitability, requirements, risks, and cost-analyses co-developed by end of Y1.

This has been delayed to Y2.

Indicator 1.3 Best practice guidelines for locally appropriate, systematic and adaptive monitoring and evaluation of HEC mitigation methods co-developed by end of Y1.

This has been delayed to Y2.

Indicator 1.4 Best practice guidelines for HEC mitigation, monitoring and evaluation framework, and lessons learned disseminated to [...]

This is on course for delivery in Year 3.

Output 2. Assessment of the feasibility of human-elephant conflict insurance schemes (including commercial, corporate CSR and community-based) for supporting long-term human-elephant coexistence across Thailand.

Indicator 2.1 Data on financial impact of HEC (crop damage including damage to plantation crops; damage to infrastructure) collated from partners and analysed, and additional data collected as needed from representative areas across Thailand and analysed, by end of Q4Y1.

- **Baseline condition:** Data on financial impact of HEC from sWEFCOM collected by ZSL and HEVN (10 years).
- **Change recorded to date:** Collection of human elephant conflict data is ongoing. Qualitative data of elephant locations and conflict areas has been obtained for all five forest complex regions via participatory mapping. Data has been collated from Freeland in Khao Yai (4 years), and WWF in Kui Buri (4 years) during regional meetings. As expected, the quality and thoroughness of data collection varies. ZSL was obligated to obtain high-level permission from central DNP to access and collate HEC data collected by DNP, which has

resulted in delays obtaining this data. However, we have secured support and permission from the Head of the Wildlife Conservation Division and we are currently negotiating the scope and quantity of data to be shared. Data collected from DNP and other NGOs to date indicates that much important information is missing, including details on crop species and age which is necessary for accurate calculation of financial impact. Capacity surveys conducted as part of Output 1 indicates that there is a gap in capacity to collect this information, and no standardized protocol currently exists. This is important for development of standardized best-practice guidelines and for developing an accurate claims and verification system for insurance and/or compensation. Focus groups scheduled for Year 2 in five forest complex regions will enable ZSL and HEVN to collect more detailed information about socioeconomic impact from HEC and contribute to this indicator.

- **Source of evidence:** HEC database compiled by ZSL, heatmaps disseminated during national meeting.

Indicators 2.2-2.7 are still on track for delivery in project Years 2 and 3 per scheduled activities.

Output 3. Identification of alternative and/or enhanced livelihoods (e.g., agroforestry, elephant-resilient crops) that promote human-elephant coexistence in sWEFCOM informs future forward climate and HEC resilient livelihoods that promotes HECx.

Indicator 3.1 *Agroforestry/livelihood systems (based on existing coffee agroforestry model) builds scalable elephant and crop resiliency mapping framework, embedded within national HEVN network, to assess crop suitability across the sWEFCOM landscape (ca. 2,000 km²), identifying climate and HEC resilient options, and modelling areas prone to HEC by end of Y1.*

- **Baseline condition:** No mapping framework of elephant-resilient livelihoods for Thailand developed.
- **Change recorded to date:** Data from soil surveys, farm mapping activities, and focus groups have contributed to the development of agroclimatic and suitability maps which will be integrated with human-elephant conflict data collected by ZSL and HEVN into a resiliency map on the HEVN website. HEVN is currently partnering with a Thai tech company to develop the website.
- **Source of evidence:** Annex 7 for agroforestry suitability assessments and reports to be integrated into the resiliency framework.

Indicator 3.2 *Market analysis identifies and prioritizes suitable 'elephant friendly' products, cost-to-convert ratios, and sustainable financial mechanisms (e.g. community-based microfinance, CBO, CSR, insurance) for economically viable and inclusive livelihood enhancement promoting HECx across 16 HEC zones (~8,000 HH) in the sWEFCOM landscape by end of Y1.*

- **Baseline condition:** No market analysis of suitable elephant-resistant livelihoods and financial model for sWEFCOM.
- **Change recorded to date:** Soil assessments, farm surveys, farmer consultations (via consultation meetings and FGDs), topographical features, and land suitability criteria have informed identification of suitable species and development of a guidebook of agroforestry model planting plans in sWEFCOM. The species selection list was devised to maximize ecological benefits and economic returns. It includes emergent trees, high canopy trees, economically viable species such as citrus, pomelo, para rubber, coffee, and cashew nut, as well as herbaceous and fencing plants. The next step will be to develop a Financial Model and Implementation Guidelines. These tools will establish a structured framework for implementing alternative agroforestry and livelihood systems, ensuring their long-term effectiveness and sustainability.
- **Source of evidence:** Annex 7 reports

Indicator 3.3 *Community-led focus groups in 16 HEC conflict zones across the sWEFCOM (ca. 160 HH) assesses farmer receptiveness to viable elephant friendly alternative and/or enhanced livelihoods (e.g., agroforestry, organic products, CSR) by Q2Y2; barriers to adoption farther adoption pathways identified e.g., microfinance by Q4 Y2.*

- **Baseline condition:** No assessment of community receptiveness and barriers to adoption of elephant resilient alternative livelihoods.
- **Change recorded to date:** FGDs conducted in 10 out of 16 communities in the Thong Pha Phum District and high-altitude areas of Kanchanaburi have provided valuable insights into current agricultural practices and receptiveness of local communities towards alternative agroforestry and livelihood systems. Barriers to adoption identified so far include accessibility of water, land rights, local markets, and debt, which will need to be considered in development of sustainable agroforestry models. FGDs for the remaining 6 communities in low-altitude southeastern Kanchanaburi are planned for early May with all data analyzed and summarized by end of Y2Q1
- **Source of evidence:** Report (in development), photos and workshop notes (Annex 7)

Indicator 3.4 *HEC livelihood resiliency framework incorporates market and insurance cost-benefit ratios and serves as dynamic resource, housed within the HEVN network platform to inform and strengthen elephant-friendly livelihoods.*

This is on track for delivery in Y2 and Y3.

Output 4. Elephant-friendly livelihood and community cooperatives/ business organizations strengthened and scaled to support long-term human-elephant coexistence and provide financial and social resilience for HEC-afflicted communities in sWEFCOM.

Indicator 4.1 *An established community cooperative/business organization (CBO) piloting elephant-friendly livelihoods in Thong Pha Phum (TPP) zone (10 HH in 2 communities) in sWEFCOM is reinforced with support in business operations and management for 'Chang Baa' coffee production from source to market by end of Y1, with membership scaled to include 50 new members (20 HH in production and 30 additional HH along chain of production - processing, packaging, transport and marketing), with 30% membership of women and indigenous groups (Hmong and Karen) by end of Y2.*

- **Baseline condition:** Among coffee farmers, 40% are not formally organized or registered with the government, limiting their ability to receive support or access financial resources.
- **Change recorded to date:** Initial steps have improved communication among farmers, government agencies, coffee processors, roasters, and buyers. This has resulted in a more coordinated effort to organize coffee growers into a formal association. Community leaders in 10 villages have been informed about the project, and feedback sessions have been conducted to gather information on issues and obstacles. A workshop was organized to discuss the topic of human-elephant coexistence, with participation from various stakeholders, leading to an enhanced understanding of the challenges and potential solutions in the coffee production chain.
- **Source of evidence:** Data has been collected through surveys and workshops, with 20 survey sets distributed to farmers and other stakeholders involved in the coffee production chain. A Line application group was established to facilitate quick and efficient communication among stakeholders. A stakeholder analysis in the coffee production chain has helped identify key players and their roles in the project.

Indicator 4.2 *Seed funding supports CBO with assets, inputs, skills and finance to ensure product quality and quantity of coffee production (by end Y1), establishing a scalable M&E framework that meets both national 'elephant friendly' and health and safety standards by end of Y2, where 100% of participating CBO members (60 HH) meet standards by end of Y3.*

- **Baseline condition:** Most farmers had limited knowledge of coffee quality standards and did not have access to equipment or resources to evaluate the quality of their coffee.
- **Change recorded to date:** Farmers are now involved in testing and evaluating their coffee using the cupping method and have gained exposure to high-quality coffee from national competitions. Workshops have provided training on coffee quality assessment, and essential equipment for evaluation has been made available.
- **Source of evidence:** Workshops have focused on coffee tasting and quality evaluation, with farmers participating in local and national competitions to assess their coffee quality.

Necessary equipment for coffee quality evaluation has been provided, including sample roasters and moisture meters. See summary reports and photos in Annex 7.

Indicators 4.3-4.7 are still on track for delivery in project Years 2 and 3 per scheduled activities.

3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

Outcome: An evidence-based model for human-elephant coexistence in Thailand increases country-wide capacity for HWC mitigation, including insurance and elephant-friendly livelihoods, improving human wellbeing and attitudes toward elephants and protected areas.

0.1 Improved capacity and capability of 23 organizations and communities in 5 regions (~1,000 people, 30% women and indigenous, benefitting ca. 30,000 HEC-afflicted HH) working in elephant conservation in Thailand (including DNP, NGOs, and universities) to assess, implement, and monitor suitable, sustainable, cost-effective HEC mitigation measures by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, with midline surveys conducted in Y2.

- **Baseline condition:** No capacity assessment of organizations and communities
- **Change recorded to date:** Baseline capacity and capability of 26 organizations (65 respondents) and local community members from five regions (147 respondents) was successfully assessed during Y1. Baseline organizational and individual capacity to plan, implement, and monitor elephant mitigation strategies was low across all organization types and forest complexes (Annex 5. Table 1). Year 2 regional meetings will focus on building capacity needs, developing best-practice guidelines, and supporting regional priorities. Final guidelines disseminated and capacity re-assessed in Year 3.
- **Source of evidence:** Annexes 5 and 6

0.2 HEC mitigation best practice and standardized M&E co-developed and adopted into DNP elephant NAP and implemented by 70% (n = 16) of partner organizations by project end

- **Baseline condition:** No existing national HEC mitigation best-practice and standardized M&E guidelines
- **Change recorded to date:** Co-development and drafting of the best-practice guidelines are still on track for Year 2 following activities 1.1-1.3 and 2.1-2.2. Upcoming Y2 workshops will co-develop best-practice guidelines for regional priority strategies. Capacity building workshops in Y3 will support dissemination and implementation of final guidelines.
- **Source of evidence:** Annexes 5 and 6

0.3 National HEC insurance feasibility assessment, including costs and benefits, informs government and community-level options to offset elephant damages by the end of Y2 and, where appropriate, pilot schemes are in place by end of Y3.

- **Baseline condition:** No existing national HEC insurance feasibility assessment
- **Change recorded to date:** The HEC feasibility assessment is likely to be delayed to Year 3 given early delays and bureaucratic complexities in designing developing a comprehensive and feasible insurance scheme. However, this project will still aim to identify key players and collate necessary data for designing an insurance scheme, including developing HEC risk maps, calculating premiums, assessing community willingness-to-pay, and identifying barriers to adoption.
- **Source of evidence:** NA

Baseline capacity, wellbeing, and attitude surveys for **Outcome Indicators 0.4-0.6** delayed to early Year 2.

3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

Output 1:

Assumption 1: *The proposed HECx model (mitigation and monitoring best practice, feasible insurance schemes and alternative livelihoods) is able to prove its value to the Department of*

National Parks, Wildlife, and Plants and other stakeholders across the landscape, including elephant conservation NGOs/CBOs, through improved outcomes and post-project sustainability. As a result, the model is adopted by relevant stakeholders across the country: Despite initial skepticism especially in relation to the insurance scheme, increased buy-in has been demonstrated by project stakeholders, including communities and DNP, through continued engagement throughout the project. This is largely due to the participatory nature of the project as well as support provided by ZSL and HEVN for advancing regional priorities (e.g. decentralization and ERRU training).

Assumption 2: *Communities are interested in and willing to shift away from current livelihoods and mitigation methods:* Initial surveys (FGDs) have indicated some resistance to shifting away from current livelihoods due to concerns over the water and labor requirements of agroforestry and lack of knowledge around market and infrastructure. In addition, many farmers rent land or do not have formal land tenure documentation, which poses additional challenges to adoption of slow-growing crops.

Assumption 3: *Improved income and wellbeing of local communities, resulting from declining HEC and enhanced livelihoods, reflects reduced costs of living with wildlife and coupled with regular outreach that reinforces that these benefits are dependent on supporting wildlife conservation:* Community FGDs in sWEFCOM and 5 forest complex regions will assess the costs of living with wildlife for long-term impact assessment.

Assumption 4: *Sufficient data made available from partners for a meaningful review of the effectiveness of mitigation and monitoring strategies:* We have had some delays obtaining data from government partners such as DNP due high-level bureaucratic clearance needed to access the central HEC database. We are currently collaborating closely to obtain this data.

Assumption 5: *Willingness of all partners including DNP to co-develop Guidelines and to attend capacity-building workshops:* DNP and other partners have demonstrated willingness to attend and participate in regional meetings. Data sharing agreements, shared platforms and interoperable systems will be utilized to facilitate co-development of guidelines.

Assumption 6: *DNP and national partners see value in implementing evidence-based best practice mitigation measures and monitoring framework for evolving lessons learned the long-term:* The existing policies or priorities of the DNP or its partners might not align with the proposed best practices – for example, the DNP has focused on fencing in many areas to resolve HEC. ZSL is working closely with DNP and other stakeholders to co-develop best practices and carefully consider the pros and cons of all methods to ensure partners are willing to implement the practices.

Assumption 7: *Partners in other elephant range countries (e.g., range country government agencies, other NGOs/CSOs, Elephant Conservation Group, IUCN Asian Elephant Specialist Group) see value in resulting national assessment and monitoring and evaluation framework:* We have reached out to other elephant range states to learn about the development of other similar guidelines (e.g. Save the Elephants Coexistence Toolbox), insurance schemes (Seratu Aatai, Malaysia) and agroforestry initiatives (ZSL Nepal). By integrating methods and lessons learned from other range countries, we hope that other elephant range countries will see value and learn from the project outputs.

Assumption 8: *Insurance companies are willing to partner on the project and suitable compromises are developed so that insurance companies are willing and able to insure high-risk HEC-afflicted farmers at reasonable premiums:* After initial engagement with insurance companies and insurance brokers, we realized that we first needed to engage with the government insurance regulatory body, the Office of Insurance Commission (OIC) about development of this scheme. Once we have received support and clearance from the OIC and boosted private sector engagement in Year 2, we anticipate greater interest and support from insurance companies in co-developing a viable scheme.

Assumption 9: *Proposed insurance schemes meet IIED's requirements for successful and sustainable implementation (cost effective insurance administration, timely and fair insurance payments, incentives for damage prevention, financial sustainability of premium payments) based on successful models and lessons learned in Kenya and Sri Lanka (DI 25-004). IIED will be a consulting partner for Output 2 and ensure best-practice delivery:* Ongoing involvement of IIED will ensure IIED's requirements are met as the insurance scheme is developed. The last change request ensured that IIED will consult on all 3 years of the project.

Assumption 10: *Partners in other elephant range countries (e.g., range country government agencies, other NGOs/CSOs, Elephant Conservation Group, IUCN Asian Elephant Specialist Group) see value insurance assessment and pilot scheme results, adapting them for their own purposes:* This assumption will hold true if we are able to successfully co-develop a feasible insurance scheme.

Assumption 11: *University partners acquire adequate information from existing data sources to build resiliency framework:* HEVN is now leading on the resilience framework and will build on several years of HEC data from the sWEFCOM from ZSL and HEVN, as well as maps and data provided by the agronomist consultant. Ongoing conversations with DNP and university partners seek to integrate additional data and live HEC monitoring.

Assumption 12: *Elephant-friendly products identified by the project represent a sustainable investment, with market prices remaining relatively stable and competitive:* With potential suitable crops and financial models now identified by the agronomist (Annex 7), the project will continue to support progress towards investment readiness including development of a financial model and implementation guidelines to ensure the project represents a sustainable investment.

Assumption 13: *Proposed elephant-friendly business models and livelihood plans are considered sufficiently viable and attractive by communities. Financial mechanisms are suitable in scope and scale to support initial investment into proposed elephant friendly business models:* Ongoing FGDs and the upcoming financial model will ensure this assumption remains true.

Assumption 14: *Elephant and crop resiliency framework is built in way that can be scaled and replicated in both national and international site-based contexts for broad scale application and partners see value in resulting model:* This assumption holds true by integrating context-specific data but open-source methods and close collaboration with DNP for sustainable adoption in other regions.

Assumption 15: *No significant annual differences in environmental variables that could alter elephant movement behavior and patterns or significantly affect business members' financial situations:* The realities posed by climate change and increasing wildlife populations threaten farmers livelihoods in sWEFCOM. Adopting agroforestry livelihoods which are resilient to climate change and elephant damage should dampen financial impacts, enhancing resilience and reducing conflict.

Assumption 16: *Elephants do not shift to consuming the alternative crop or raiding households:* By selecting elephant unpalatable crops, training communities in ethical elephant deterrence, and continuously monitoring HEC, the shifting of elephants to consuming alternative crops can be monitored and mitigated.

Assumption 17: *Communities are interested in and willing to consider alternative livelihood scenarios, engage in surveys and livelihood pilots, and invest in financial support schemes:* Communities have demonstrated some reluctance to shifting livelihoods, but continued participatory development of the agroforestry model and knowledge-sharing among communities has increased interest and willingness to consider alternative livelihoods.

Assumption 18: *Community members understand that alternative livelihoods and CBO activities are directly linked to their engagement in conservation and human-elephant*

coexistence. This includes community members who are not direct beneficiaries, through word of mouth from community leaders and fellow community neighbours: Communities engaged in FGDs and workshops relating to alternative livelihoods are made aware of the benefits in relation to human-elephant coexistence, especially as high-conflict areas have been prioritized for engagement.

Assumption 19: *Successful livelihoods existing and developed under the community business represent a viable business case for investment by the financial schemes, as seen in previous ZSL work in Kenya (DI 26-006) and the Philippines (DI 21-020 & 24-016):* Close collaboration with WWF's Nature-based Solutions team and ZSL's sustainable business team is ensuring the alternative livelihood model is ready for financial investment by project end.

Assumption 20: *Aimed-for levels of female and indigenous participation are achieved based on pre-project understanding of community socioeconomics and demographics and results from previous/ongoing CBO implementation in the area:* Project activities with communities in sWEFCOM have made a concerted effort to ensure sufficient female and indigenous participation and engagement (at least 30%). Verifying indigenous participation is challenged by lack of self-identification, but knowledge of current ethnic make-up of the communities being engaged has ensured aimed-for levels of engagement of indigenous communities.

Assumption 21: *The CBO network engages necessary and sufficient community buy-in, social cohesion, and access to financial services (savings and loans) to be sustainable, competitive, and profitable:* Ongoing business trainings, capacity building workshops, and development of a financial model should ensure this assumption is met.

Assumption 22: *A supplementary widespread and reliable revenue stream, unimpacted by human-elephant conflict, will partially decouple community wellbeing from HEC, providing a basis for coexistence, with enough knowledge and modelling predicted about HEC incidents (i.e. activities elsewhere do not create new drivers of HEC):* This assumption will be monitored through wellbeing assessments in Y2 and Y3.

Assumption 23: *Access to enhanced and diversified livelihoods (in conjunction with financial schemes and mitigation interventions if appropriate) will reduce the need to engage in illegal, environmentally-damaging activities for income supplementation:* This assumption is being monitored through assessments of current practices (e.g., crop burning, NTFP gathering) in the FGDs. Current environmentally damaging practices outside of plot and residue burning and standard pesticide use have not been identified yet.

Assumption 24: *Coffee production knowledge, skills and assets developed by the project are sufficient in the event of any repeated extreme weather conditions over the life of the project:* Ongoing CBO training should ensure this assumption is met.

Assumption 25: *Economies of scale gained through establishing/supporting/strengthening the CBO gain sufficient market share to lead to profit for producers despite externalities in the market during the life of the project:* This assumption should hold true with ongoing market assessment and capacity building activities.

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

Impact: *A sustainable model for human-elephant coexistence based on effective HEC mitigation strategies that enhance human wellbeing and reduce threats to elephants has been adopted across Thailand benefitting all elephant populations*

The activities and outputs of this project are designed to develop a holistic model for human-elephant coexistence. This includes national participatory co-development of best-practice guidelines that facilitate prioritization and effective implementation of mitigation tools that reduce human-elephant conflict. Regional meetings helped identify and focus regionally appropriate priority strategies for HEC mitigation, such as decentralization of elephant

management, alternative livelihoods, and support for ERRUs. ZSL and HEVN have collaborated with DNP and other regional partners to support tailored workshops and trainings (e.g. ERRU training in sWEFCOM, decentralization meeting in Eastern forest complex) to advance these priority strategies. Lessons learned and local experts will contribute to development of the guidelines for scaling of these strategies to other areas with less knowledge and capacity.

Prior to the project, there was very little knowledge or interest in HEC insurance mostly due to scepticism around the feasibility. However, following outreach during regional meetings and a presentation from another IIED pilot site in Malaysia during the national meeting, interest in and support for the concept from project partners has increased including from the agricultural private sector. The co-development of a sustainable and fair insurance mechanism has significant potential for poverty alleviation for HEC afflicted farmers and promote greater support for conservation.

Finally, shifting agriculture is a slow and difficult process, especially as it entails consideration of many factors including climate, water availability, land rights, and farmer socioeconomics (e.g. indebtedness). This project is taking a participatory and measured approach utilizing expertise from ZSL's sustainable business team, WWF's Nature Based Solutions team, and local communities to ensure the agroforestry models proposed and promoted are feasible, sustainable, nature-positive, and income-generating.

4. Project support to the Conventions, Treaties or Agreements

Convention on Biological Biodiversity-Aichi Goal C Target 12 and Goal E Target 19: This project has contributed to Goal C by promoting effective mitigation measures through capacity building workshops and best-practice guidelines development (Output 1) and supporting livelihoods that reduce threats to elephants such as habitat destruction and harmful mitigation practices and support conservation initiatives (Output 3 and 4, Annex 7). The regional workshops are also addressing Strategic Goal E by supporting knowledge sharing and participatory co-development of coexistence strategies (Annex 8).

Thailand Regional Elephant Action Plans: This project is supporting Thailand's regional sWEFCOM action plan Goal 2 by gathering baseline data on capacity and mitigation effectiveness (Annex 5) develop best-practice mitigation protocol for reducing damage to livelihoods by elephants. The project has also supported goal 3 by assessing current practices and capacity of community and DNP ERRUs and supporting knowledge-sharing and trainings (Annex 6). Year 1 also focused on the Goal 4 (providing financial relief to people affected by wild elephants) by promoting and building capacity for alternative elephant-resilient livelihoods in sWEFCOM (Annex 7).

CMS: The project has supported CMS Goal 4 by building community capacity for alternative livelihoods which directly support the coexistence of humans and elephants (e.g., coffee; Annex 7), and Goal 6 through capacity building and knowledge-sharing regional and national meetings.

Sustainable Development Goals: In line with Goals 8 and 13, the proposed agroforestry models are considering climate change and sustainable, resilient livelihoods (Annex 7). Community engagement activities, including agroforestry capacity building trainings, have supported and elevated participation of women to ensure gender equality and agency (Goal 5). Finally, threats to elephants and biodiversity (Goal 15) are being addressed by tying project outputs to elephant conservation and assessing changes in attitudes and capacity for communities to coexist with elephants (Annex 5 and 6).

5. Project support for multidimensional poverty reduction

This project is directly engaging communities and stakeholders across Thailand. Output 1 has engaged 333 people, including 197 community members, 92 government representatives, and 44 CSO/NGO representatives through regional meetings in 5 HEC forest complex areas. These stakeholders will be empowered to co-develop and select best-practice mitigation strategies for

implementation which are contextually appropriate and cost-effective, reducing the risk of sinking money into ineffective mitigation tools. For example, a key priority strategy in several forest complexes is decentralization, which would allow local subdistrict governments to utilize funds for elephant management strategies (e.g. ERRU support, compensation for crop damage) more rapidly and effectively than the central government and increase local governance over elephant management. However, despite approval from the central government, local governments currently lack the knowledge and capacity to properly and legally utilize their funds, so past regional meetings have provided an opportunity to understand current challenges and future meetings will aim to help fill these capacity gaps.

Current government compensation schemes (through central government and DNP) for crops and property/life are currently largely considered insufficient and ineffective by local communities and stymied by complex and incongruent requirements. The successful design and adoption of a participatorily co-designed HEC insurance scheme, financed by the government and/or private sector, would provide significant financial relief for HEC afflicted farmers who are unable to obtain government compensation, or for whom the compensation is insufficient to offset the costs of damage.

In addition, 198 farmers (117 male, 81 female, at least 10% indigenous), have been engaged in sWEFCOM through focus group discussions thus far to understand current agricultural practices and assess interest in and existing capacity for transition to agroforestry. Data from the agroforestry suitability assessments (Annex 7) will be housed on the HEVN website and made broadly available to communities across the sWEFCOM and disseminated at future regional meetings for potential scaling. ZSL and HEVN are currently seeking additional funding to support model farms in the landscape and disseminate the assessment results and suggested planting models to interested communities via training workshops. Finally, ongoing community coffee business trainings in Thong Pha Phum are supporting existing and new coffee growers to transition to coffee agroforestry and/or improve quality, yield, and sustainability to increase income and biodiversity-friendly farming practices.

6. Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI)

Please quantify the proportion of women on the Project Board ¹ .	¾ of the ZSL’s project board are women
Please quantify the proportion of project partners that are led by women, or which have a senior leadership team consisting of at least 50% women ² .	½ of HEVN’s leadership team are women

GESI Scale	Description	Put X where you think your project is on the scale
Not yet sensitive	The GESI context may have been considered but the project isn’t quite meeting the requirements of a ‘sensitive’ approach	
Sensitive	The GESI context has been considered and project activities take this into account in their design and implementation. The project addresses basic needs and vulnerabilities of women and marginalised groups and the project will not contribute to or create further inequalities.	

¹ A Project Board has overall authority for the project, is accountable for its success or failure, and supports the senior project manager to successfully deliver the project.

² Partners that have formal governance role in the project, and a formal relationship with the project that may involve staff costs and/or budget management responsibilities.

Empowering	The project has all the characteristics of a 'sensitive' approach whilst also increasing equal access to assets, resources and capabilities for women and marginalised groups	X
Transformative	The project has all the characteristics of an 'empowering' approach whilst also addressing unequal power relationships and seeking institutional and societal change	

In the past year, the project team has been receiving ESMS training in ZSL's FAIRER framework through a series of workshops led by ZSL's Environmental and Social Safeguarding Specialist. This has included consideration of power, privilege and positionality, development of an environmental and social safeguarding plan, stepwise engagement, and FPIC plan, obtaining approval from the ZSL Human Ethics Committee prior to community engagement activities, and development of a locally appropriate grievance mechanism. We have set a goal of at least 30% engagement of women and 30% indigenous in community engagement activities to ensure equitable participation. Regional meetings have fallen somewhat short of the 30% gender target (20% of attendees were women), which is likely due to most community attendance being of ERRU members, who are typically male. This is something we will aim to address and resolve in future regional meetings by working closely with regional partners to ensure equitable female representation at the meetings. Many of the women who did join held relatively high-level positions in local government and CSOs. Agroforestry engagement activities in sWEFCOM so far have engaged 458 people, of which 60% were local farmers and 37% were female. Obtaining information on indigenous peoples is more challenging, as many self-identify as Thai upon receiving citizenship cards for legal reasons or refuse to divulge ethnic identity (70% opted out of answering during FGDs). However, at least 7 of 16 communities engaged as part of this project are known to include indigenous peoples. In addition, HEVN has 3 indigenous staff (Karen and Mon) who have been supporting engagement with local communities in Thong Pha Phum and providing translation into local languages as necessary.

7. Monitoring and evaluation

A detailed workplan and monitoring and evaluation framework was developed for this project early in year 1 and has been used to monitor progress against project activities and indicators. Project achievements and contribution to the project outcome are monitored as number of successfully completed activities, changes in stakeholder capacity, wellbeing, and attitudes over the course of the project, number of follow-up initiatives as a result of project activities, and establishment of mechanisms for standardized and long-term monitoring of HEC. The project workplan is reviewed and monitored regularly by the project manager to ensure timely follow-up of activities and outputs and flag delays or changes in activities during bi-weekly project team meetings. In early April, the project team met to reflect on Y1 activities, identify challenges, changes, and delays, and co-develop a Y2 workplan and timeline accounting for these challenges. We are currently drafting SMARTer and more appropriate and feasible indicators utilizing Darwin's updated indicator guidance menu which we will submit with a future change request.

8. Lessons learnt

Overall, progress towards the project objectives has been largely positive. By collaborating closely with partners across the country, regional workshops in each forest complex region were tailored towards specific local contexts while building off and sharing lessons learned from other regions. The national meeting on Thai Elephant Day provided a forum for further exchanging knowledge, broadly disseminating challenges faced by local communities across the country and identifying priority strategies for sustainable coexistence. Key challenges included early delays in scheduling regional meetings, which resulted in many workshops scheduled within the later months of the project year and delaying data collection for the systematic review. With relationships now in place and building off Year 1 workshops, we anticipate future scheduling to go more smoothly.

We also struggled to find an appropriate insurance broker for Output 2 and were thus unable to utilize these funds in Year 1. Year 1 was spent establishing relationships with relevant agencies, including the government body responsible for clearing development and research of new insurance schemes and private sector associate responsible for designing schemes, translating and disseminating IIED's How-To guide for human-wildlife conflict insurance, assessing existing insurance and compensation schemes in Thailand, and increasing interest and support for development of an HEC insurance scheme (where before there was much skepticism about the feasibility). With these relationships now in place, ZSL is well suited to move forward with Output 2 activities, including private and public sector engagement and farmer focus groups.

Regarding agroforestry stakeholder engagement activities, collaboration between public and private sectors has accelerated project implementation and efficiency. However, many activities had to be delayed due to farmers being busy during the harvest season. For future similar projects, we will plan for workshops and activities to start earlier in the year, with regular reporting to community stakeholders, to avoid conflict with the harvest season. No significant changes are planned for the coming year despite initial delays, as operations are expected to continue smoothly. Regular engagement and communication with local communities is essential due to the presence of numerous other stakeholders, including government agencies, other CSOs and both international and local NGOs, operating within these communities which can potentially lead to confusion regarding goal alignment and overlapping activities.

In the future, thorough stakeholder mapping and early engagement is clear to ensure smooth planning and timely execution of activities. We are planning to submit a change request with the updated timeline, workplan, and indicators in early Year 2, though we do not anticipate the need for a financial change component.

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

N/A

10. Risk Management

No new major risks have arisen. The project team conducted an end-of-year capacity assessment of the team staff to identify strengths and weaknesses in capability to continue executing the project and any major risks to project implementation. Strategies and opportunities were identified to address the weaknesses, including outsourcing part-time staff to support project activities as needed and capacity-building trainings supported by ZSL UK (e.g. financial training, government and private sector engagement, policy and advocacy).

10. Sustainability and legacy

The project involves multi-stakeholder collaboration between the DNP, local subdistrict governments, local communities, universities, and NGOs/CSOs across Thailand. The regional and national meetings have elevated the project's profile and increased cross-sector collaboration. In addition, regional meetings (past and future) include knowledge-sharing and capacity building components focused on regional priorities. As there is demonstrated overlap between different regional priorities, Year 2 and Year 3 regional meetings will build on local expertise and facilitate cross-country learning to support priority strategies and adapt them for regional contexts.

Generalized HEC data compiled and mapped by the project will be publicly available via the resiliency framework on the HEVN website. Survey data results, guidelines, systematic review, and assessments will be translated into Thai and disseminated to all project partners (with sensitive and individually identifiable data removed per data privacy laws and ethical protocol) to ensure collaborative and transparent development of the coexistence model. Regular stakeholder engagement will provide opportunities for feedback throughout the project and participatory development of guidelines, insurance scheme, and agroforestry feasibility assessment.

The core objectives of promoting human-elephant coexistence and reducing conflict through capacity building, community engagement, livelihood strengthening, insurance model development, and mitigation best-practice are still in place. Activities are being continuously refined based on ongoing assessments and feedback from community interactions, for example, tailoring regional meetings to support regional priority strategies and capacity needs.

The project has planned various strategies to ensure a sustained legacy across social, economic, ecological, and technical dimensions. The project has established multi-stakeholder workshops and participatory activities to engage communities and stakeholders in conservation efforts, enhancing community capacity and ownership of the project outcomes. The project is supporting livelihoods aimed at reducing the economic dependency on high-risk crops that attract elephants, thereby fostering more sustainable local economies. The project includes continuous monitoring activities and adaptive management strategies that are informed by data collection on human-elephant conflicts and community engagement activities. This approach helps in making timely adjustments to conservation strategies based on the latest data and community feedback. The expansion of the SAFER (System for Alerting Farmers to Elephant Raids) early warning system and other innovative technologies like AI-integrated camera traps and HEC monitoring applications will ensure ongoing technical support for communities to manage and mitigate human-elephant conflicts effectively.

11. Darwin Initiative identity

The Darwin initiative has been recognized as the primary funding body for this project at all meetings and engagement activities. The logo is displayed prominently on all project presentations and posters, including during the livestreamed Thai Elephant Day event. Darwin is also recognized on HEVN’s website (humanelephantvoices.org) in project-related posts and on social media, which sees regular engagement. Many INGOs in-country are familiar with Darwin, as are some smaller local CSOs. In February, ahead of the national meeting, ZSL and HEVN also conducted a press conference hosted by the Foreign Correspondents Club of Thailand. The press conference hosted a panel of notable experts in elephant conservation to introduce the upcoming national workshop and briefly discuss the complexity of the HEC issue to the Thai public, ongoing challenges, and innovative solutions. As a result, the project and Darwin has gained improved visibility among local and international press in Thailand, and we have already responded to numerous interviews and calls for content.

12. Safeguarding

Has your Safeguarding Policy been updated in the past 12 months?	Yes/No
Have any concerns been investigated in the past 12 months	Yes/No
Does your project have a Safeguarding focal point?	Yes/No
Has the focal point attended any formal training in the last 12 months?	<p>Yes/No [<i>If yes, please provide date and details of training</i>]</p> <p>The safeguarding focal point as well as most implementing project staff have received ZSL FAIRER training (ZSL’s equivalent of Environmental and Social Safeguards), which has included training on inclusive engagement and FPIC, development of grievance mechanisms, Environmental and Social risk assessments and the development of an environmental and social safeguarding plan (ESSP) for the sWEFCOM community engagement activities (Outputs 3 and 4).</p>
What proportion (and number) of project staff have received formal training on Safeguarding?	<p>Past: 75% [6]</p> <p>Planned: 25% [2]</p>

Has there been any lessons learnt or challenges on Safeguarding in the past 12 months? Please ensure no sensitive data is included within responses.

No safeguarding issues have been flagged during the project so far. More broadly however, there were some challenges identified during FGDs conducted in Thong Pha Phum, such as difficulties following the FPIC process pre steps due to the short time frame in which many FGDs were conducted. We have reviewed this and made adaptations to ensure the next round of focus groups in lower Kanchanaburi fully follow the process steps which will include pre-meetings with local leaders to discuss the surveys and explain their purpose in advance of the FGDs taking place.

Does the project have any developments or activities planned around Safeguarding in the coming 12 months? If so please specify.

Additional stakeholder engagement plans and ESSPs will be developed for Output 1 and 2 activities in early Y2.

Please describe any community sensitisation that has taken place over the past 12 months; include topics covered and number of participants.

29 community engagement activities were conducted in the last 12 months within sWEFCOM, engaging a total of 456 people. These included individual meetings with village leaders and key community members to introduce the project objectives and obtain high-level FPIC, coffee capacity-building and business training workshops, and regional agroforestry FGDs. In addition, 333 stakeholders, including 197 community members, were engaged through regional meetings in 5 HEC-afflicted forest complexes to share lessons learned in elephant management and develop regional strategic priorities.

Have there been any concerns around Health, Safety and Security of your project over the past year? If yes, please outline how this was resolved.

N/A

13. Project expenditure

Table 1: Project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2022 – 31 March 2023)

Project spend (indicative) since last Annual Report	2022/23 Grant (£)	2022/23 Total Darwin Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)				
Consultancy costs				See below
Overhead Costs				
Travel and subsistence				See below
Operating Costs				
Capital items (see below)				
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)				
Others (see below)				

TOTAL	172,405.00	173,189.89	-4%	
--------------	-------------------	------------	-----	--

We were unable to hire an insurance consultant in Y1, precluding utilization of GBP 2,500. In addition, due to delays in formal registration of the implementing partner and funding disbursement, some partner consultancy funds were not utilized in the first six months of the project (e.g. part-time finance officer). Output 4 activity delays to Y2 also reduced the amount of Y1 travel and subsistence funds utilized by the partner. Because the underspend was unanticipated until the last few months of the project, we have not yet approved the budget change with Darwin.

Table 2: Project mobilising of matched funding during the reporting period (1 April 2022 – 31 March 2023)

	Matched funding secured to date	Total matched funding expected by end of project
Matched funding leveraged by the partners to deliver the project.		
Total additional finance mobilised by new activities building on evidence, best practices and project (£)		

14. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

ZSL and HEVN are also hosting a Hackathon Initiative in Year 2 and 3 focused on addressing human-elephant conflicts. This year-long series of events and activities is being conducted in collaboration with key stakeholders including HEVN, Thai PBS television, various private sector entities, and academic institutions. The initiative will kick off with a series of workshops and brainstorming sessions that aim to bring innovative ideas and technologies to the forefront of conflict mitigation. Participants will have the opportunity to work directly with experts from conservation, technology, and community development sectors to develop practical and sustainable solutions.

15. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements or progress of your project so far (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes

I agree for the Biodiversity Challenge Funds Secretariat to publish the content of this section (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here).

File Type (Image / Video / Graphic)	File Name or File Location	Caption, country and credit	Online accounts to be tagged (leave blank if none)	Consent of subjects received (delete as necessary)
				Yes / No
				Yes / No
				Yes / No
				Yes / No
				Yes / No

Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against logframe for Financial Year 2023-2024

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2022 - March 2023	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Impact</p> <p>A sustainable model for human-elephant coexistence based on effective HEC mitigation strategies that enhance human wellbeing and reduce threats to elephants has been adopted across Thailand benefitting all elephant populations</p>		<p>Regional meetings have supported progress towards regional priorities such as decentralization of elephant management which will empower local communities and increase timeliness and effectiveness of interventions. Agroforestry and NbS engagement activities are supporting transition towards livelihoods that promote coexistence between communities and elephants.</p>	
<p>Outcome</p> <p>An evidence-based model for human-elephant coexistence in Thailand increases country-wide capacity for HWC mitigation, including insurance and elephant-friendly livelihoods, improving human wellbeing and attitudes toward elephants and protected areas.</p>	<p>0.1 Improved capacity and capability of 23 organizations and communities in 5 regions (~1,000 people, 30% women and indigenous, benefitting ca. 30,000 HEC-afflicted HH) working in elephant conservation in Thailand (including DNP, NGOs, and universities) to assess, implement, and monitor suitable, sustainable, cost-effective HEC mitigation measures by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, with midline surveys conducted in Y2. [DI-A03]</p> <p>0.2 HEC mitigation best practice and standardized M&E co-developed and adopted into DNP elephant NAP and implemented by 70% (n = 16) of partner organizations by project end [DI-C01]</p> <p>0.3 National HEC insurance feasibility assessment, including costs and benefits, informs government and community-level options to offset elephant damages by the end of Y2 and, where appropriate, pilot</p>	<p>Baseline capacity and capability of 26 organizations and local community members from five regions was successfully assessed during Y1 (ca. 212 people, 20% women). Baseline organizational and individual capacity to plan, implement, and monitor elephant mitigation strategies was low across all organization types and forest complexes (Annex 5. Table 1).</p> <p>Co-development and drafting of the best-practice guidelines are still on track for Year 2 following activities 1.1-1.3 and 2.1-2.2.</p> <p>The HEC feasibility assessment However, this project will still aim to identify key players and collate necessary data for designing an insurance scheme, including developing HEC risk maps, calculating premiums, assessing community</p>	<p>Year 2 regional meetings will focus on addressing capacity needs for regional priority HEC mitigation strategies. Capacity will be re-assessed in Year 3.</p> <p>Upcoming Y2 workshops will co-develop best-practice guidelines for regional priority strategies. Capacity building workshops in Y3 will support dissemination and implementation of final guidelines.</p> <p>Engagement with private and public sector stakeholders and community focus groups, and HEC situation assessment planned for completion within Y2 to support insurance feasibility assessment in Y3.</p>

	schemes are in place by end of Y3. [DI-C01]	willingness-to-pay, and identifying barriers to adoption.	
	0.4 Improved capacity of CBO members in business and product development, assessed annually (60 HH) to ensure they are progressing in Output 4. [DI-A04]	Capacity baseline surveys have been delayed to Year 2	Baseline capacity will be conducted in early year two for the newly registered community enterprise members tailored to the Thai context and compared to endline assessments at the end of Year 3.
	<p>0.5 Increase in subjective and relational aspects of wellbeing among 70% of sWEFCOM households engaged in elephant-friendly community business market chain (total 60 HH, 30% women and indigenous) by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, assessed as:</p> <p>0.5.1 Improved perceived security (e.g., safety from elephant injury) as a result of training workshops in effective, nonviolent deterrence methods and reduced HEC rates</p> <p>0.5.2 Improved dimensions of social capital (community relations, dignity, ability to help others), particularly for women and indigenous people, achieved via development of more participatory and collaborative community business structure that ensures representative governance and connection to a broader elephant-friendly business support network.</p> <p>0.5.3 Reduced perceived vulnerability to human-elephant conflict (e.g., effects on savings and capital) as a result of</p>	Wellbeing baseline surveys have been delayed to Year 2	Baseline wellbeing will be conducted in early year two for the newly registered community enterprise members tailored to the Thai context and compared to endline assessments at the end of Year 3.

	community business financial support mechanism and competitive products. [DI-D16]		
	0.6 70% of sWEFCOM households engaged in elephant-friendly community business market chain (60 HH) report improved attitudes toward elephants and protected areas by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, as a result of effective mitigation via elephant-friendly livelihoods.	Baseline attitude surveys have been delayed to Year 2	Baseline attitudes will be conducted in early year two for the newly registered community enterprise members tailored to the Thai context and compared to endline assessments at the end of Year 3.
<p>Output 1. A country-wide systematic review of all human-elephant conflict mitigation projects in Thailand identifies effectiveness of mitigation tools trialed, and informs best practice and M&E guidelines that are promoted across 5 HEC regions of Thailand</p>	<p>1.1 Data on mitigation methods and assessment collated from partners across Thailand, systematically reviewed and analysed in Y1. Report written with participatory input from all partners including DNP at end of Y1 and a paper submitted for publication in a relevant peer-reviewed journal by the end of Y2. [DI-C18]</p>	<p>Data on mitigation methods was collected from 65 representatives from civil society/public sector organizations and 147 community ERRUs from regional meetings in 5 HEC-afflicted forest complexes. Quantitative and qualitative data is being collated and will be systematically mapped and reviewed in May-August 2024. See Annex 5-6 for summary of survey data.</p>	
<p>1.2 Best practice guidelines for HEC mitigation tools, including suitability, requirements, risks, and cost-analyses co-developed by end of Y1. [DI-C01]</p>	<p>Development of best practice guidelines have been delayed to Y2 to increase opportunities for additional data collection and participatory feedback during Y2 regional meetings.</p>		
<p>1.3 Best practice guidelines for locally appropriate, systematic and adaptive monitoring and evaluation of HEC mitigation methods co-developed by end of Y1. [DI-C01]</p>	<p>This has been delayed to Y2.</p>		
<p>1.4 Best practice guidelines for HEC mitigation, monitoring and evaluation framework, and lessons learned disseminated to:</p>	<p>This is on course for delivery in Year 3.</p>		

	<p>1.4.1 DNP and all partners (n=23) from 5 regions via HECx national capacity-building workshops in Y3;</p> <p>1.4.2 Communities across 5 regions (~1,000 people, 30% women and indigenous, benefitting ca. 30,000 HEC-afflicted HH) via community-level HECx capacity building workshops in Y2 and Y3;</p> <p>1.4.3 Other elephant range States via public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3. [DI-A01]</p>	
<p>Activity 1.1 Baseline and endline HEC mitigation capacity assessment of all project partners within HEVN network (23) and annual assessment of communities in 5 HEC regions.</p>	<p>Capacity surveys tailored to different stakeholders were disbursed to regional meeting attendees in five forest complexes over the course of Year 1 (Annex 5 and 6) and six priority strategies were identified for managing elephants.</p>	<p>Follow-up regional meetings will focus on co-developing best-practice guidelines for priority strategies and supporting regional capacity needs. Targeted dissemination of the OCA surveys in Y2 which will collect more detailed information about specific mitigation tool studies used by various national parks after clearance from central DNP.</p>
<p>Activity 1.2 Systematic review (synthesis/analysis) of data on HEC mitigation measures and monitoring methods collated from all partners in Thailand since 2002.</p>	<p>Data on HEC mitigation methods and effectiveness was collated from organizational capacity surveys (n = 65) and quantitative HEC data collated from Kui Buri, Khao Yai, and sWEFCOM, but scheduling delays of Y1 regional meetings have pushed the systematic review to Y2.</p>	<p>A masters student from University College will be leading on the systematic map/review in Y2 with direct oversight from ZSL staff. ZSL has also recently obtained permission from DNP to access and utilize the existing national HEC database which will inform the systematic review and HEC situational assessment (Output 2).</p>
<p>Activity 1.3 Co-development of best-practice guidelines for HEC mitigation and M&E with DNP and all partners by end of Y1. Report and paper published by end of Y2.</p>	<p>Delayed to Y2.</p>	<p>Best-practice recommendations following up on Y1 discussions will be co-developed during regional meetings in Y2 and disseminated to all partners and stakeholders for feedback in Y3.</p>
<p>Activity 1.4 National capacity-building workshops (Bangkok) introduce the project and assess existing capacity of elephant conservation partners in Y1 and disseminate project results in Y3.</p>	<p>A national meeting was held in Bangkok on March 16, 2024 for Thai Elephant Day. Fifty-one people attended from five HEC forest complexes, and the event was hosted and publicly livestreamed by the Thai Public Broadcasting Service.</p>	<p>The next national workshop is on course for Year 3.</p>
<p>Activity 1.5 Community-level workshops introduce project and assess capacity(Y1), disseminate best-practice mitigation, HWC insurance feasibility and livelihood</p>	<p>Regional meetings conducted in five forest complexes introduced the Darwin project, assessed existing organizational capacity and community ERRU practices and challenges (Annexes 5 and 6), and</p>	<p>Year 2 regional meetings are currently being scheduled with regional partners.</p>

framework(Y2), and elephant-friendly business models(Y3) to 5 HEC regions.	facilitated discussions for identifying and implementing regional elephant management priorities (Annex 8). The meetings engaged a total of 333 participants (59% community members, 28% government representatives, and 13% CSO/NGO).	
Activity 1.6 Public Community of Practice webinar shares lessons learned and best-practice guidelines to other elephant range countries (Kenya, Nepal, Sri Lanka).	On track for Year 3	On track for Year 3
Output 2. Assessment of the feasibility of human-elephant conflict insurance schemes (including commercial, corporate CSR and community-based) for supporting long-term human-elephant coexistence across Thailand.	2.1 Data on financial impact of HEC (crop damage including damage to plantation crops; damage to infrastructure) collated from partners and analysed, and additional data collected as needed from representative areas across Thailand and analysed, by end of Q4Y1. [DI-C19]	Collection of quantitative human elephant conflict data from DNP is ongoing. Qualitative data of elephant locations and conflict areas has been obtained for all five forest complex regions via participatory mapping and additional data will be collated during regional focus groups planned for Y2. Additional details in section 3.2 of report.
	2.2 Willingness to pay (WTP) premiums and linking premiums and eligibility for insurance to crop protection and 'riskiness' of crop type established by end of Q2Y2 via focus groups and interviews in 5 HEC regions (~250 individuals, 30% women and indigenous). [DI-C19]	Still on track for delivery in project Years 2 and 3 per scheduled activities.
	2.3 Feasibility of crop protection compliance and payments monitoring systems established by end of Y2. [DI-C19]	Still on track for delivery in project Years 2 and 3 per scheduled activities.
	2.4 Insurance companies' interest in and ability to insure against HEC established (including viability of meeting the industries' risk management and re-insurance standards) by end of Y2. [DI-C19]	Still on track for delivery in project Years 2 and 3 per scheduled activities.
	2.5 Feasibility of alternatives to commercial insurance (government schemes, companies' CSR, community based micro-finance) established by end of Y2. [DI-C19]	Still on track for delivery in project Years 2 and 3 per scheduled activities.

	2.6 Feasible pilot schemes are established and evaluated in Y3. [DI-B12]	This indicator may be removed due to early delays and complexities in establishing a pilot within the project timeframe.
	2.7 Insurance feasibility case studies (Thailand, Sri Lanka, Kenya, and Malaysia) shared with other elephant range countries via public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3. [DI-C13]	Still on track for delivery in project Years 2 and 3 per scheduled activities.
Activity 2.1 Collation and analysis of data on financial impact of HEC. Situation analysis of HEC and role for insurance published by end of Y1.	The national situation analysis of HEC, as with the systematic review, has been delayed to Y2.	Collation and integration of additional data from DNP and key NGOs. Regional focus groups will also provide more detailed qualitative information on HEC across Thailand. We also have planned follow-up engagement with key public and private sector which will help narrow down key data needs to develop a feasible insurance scheme.
Activity 2.2 Focus groups in 5 forest complexes with farming communities assess WTP premiums, insurance eligibility, existing financial support mechanisms, feasibility of crop protection compliance, etc.	Delayed to Year 2 (approved via change request)	Key implementation partners in each HEC region are being engaged to support scheduling and planning of the regional meetings and focus groups.
Activity 2.3 Interviews/meetings with plantation companies in Bangkok to assess feasibility/acceptability of monitoring compliance	This is on track for Year 2	This is on track for Year 2
Activity 2.4 Interviews/meetings with insurance agencies to assess buy-in and feasibility of various insurance schemes	This is on track for Year 2	This is on track for Year 2
Activity 2.5 Assessment supported by IIED identifies feasible HEC insurance schemes. Insurance product designed with insurance agencies.	This is on track for Year 3	This is on track for Year 3
Activity 2.6 Pilot schemes established in Y3Q1 with technical support for implementation from IIED	This activity may be removed due to early delays and complexities in establishing a pilot within the project timeframe.	
Activity 2.7 Monitoring and reviewing of insurance scheme by end of Y3	This activity may be removed due to early delays and complexities in establishing a pilot within the project timeframe.	

<p>Output 3. Identification of alternative and/or enhanced livelihoods (e.g., agroforestry, elephant-resilient crops) that promote human-elephant coexistence in sWEFCOM informs future forward climate and HEC resilient livelihoods that promotes HECx.</p>	<p>3.1 Agroforestry/livelihood systems (based on existing coffee agroforestry model) builds scalable elephant and crop resiliency mapping framework, embedded within national HEVN network, to assess crop suitability across the sWEFCOM landscape (ca. 2,000 km²), identifying climate and HEC resilient options, and modelling areas prone to HEC by end of Y1. [DI-B04]</p>	<p>Data from soil surveys, farm mapping activities, and focus groups have contributed to the development of agroclimactic and suitability maps which will be integrated with human-elephant conflict data collected by ZSL and HEVN into a resiliency map on the HEVN website. HEVN is currently partnering with a Thai tech company to develop the website.</p>
	<p>3.2 Market analysis identifies and prioritizes suitable 'elephant friendly' products, cost-to-convert ratios, and sustainable financial mechanisms (e.g. community-based microfinance, CBO, CSR, insurance) for economically viable and inclusive livelihood enhancement promoting HECx across 16 HEC zones (~8,000 HH) in the sWEFCOM landscape by end of Y1. [DI-C19]</p>	<p>Soil assessments, farm surveys, farmer consultations (via consultation meetings and FGDs), topographical features, and land suitability criteria have informed development of a guidebook for suitable elephant-resilient agroforestry model species and planting plans for sWEFCOM that maximize ecological benefits and economic returns (Annex 7).</p>
	<p>3.3 Community-led focus groups in 16 HEC conflict zones across the sWEFCOM (ca. 160 HH) assesses farmer receptiveness to viable elephant friendly alternative and/or enhanced livelihoods (e.g., agroforestry, organic products, CSR) by Q2Y2; barriers to adoption farther adoption pathways identified e.g., microfinance by Q4 Y2. [DI-C19]</p>	<p>FGDs have been conducted in 10 out of 16 communities (117 HH) in high-altitude western areas of Kanchanaburi. The FGDs have provided valuable insights into current agricultural practices and receptiveness of local communities towards alternative agroforestry and livelihood systems. Barriers to adoption identified so far include accessibility of water, land rights, local markets, debt, which will need to be considered in development of sustainable agroforestry models.</p>
	<p>3.4 HEC livelihood resiliency framework incorporates market and insurance cost-benefit ratios and serves as dynamic resource, housed within the HEVN network platform to inform and strengthen elephant-friendly livelihoods for:</p> <p>3.4.1 16 HEC zones in the sWEFCOM (~8,000 HH) via landscape-level workshops by end of Y2;</p> <p>3.4.2 National HEC conflict zone partners (23 partners from 5 regions) as a scalable model via HECx capacity building workshop by end of Y3;</p>	<p>This is on track for Year 2</p>

	3.5 And other elephant range states through sharing adaptive resiliency mapping framework via a public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3.	
Activity 3.1 Soil and farm mapping surveys to groundtruth spatial maps and inform biogeographical variables of feasibility assessment, conducted in Y1	Soil and farm mapping surveys were conducted by a consultant agronomist in Year 1 and yielded significant insights into the spatial distribution of soil properties, land use patterns, and biogeographical variables within the study area. A soil nutrient assessment coupled with agroclimactic mapping delineated 3 distinct clusters based on landscape and altitude (section 3.1 in the report and Annex 7).	This activity has been completed.
Activity 3.2 Viable Elephant-friendly alternative agroforestry/livelihood system(s) determined for model farms using biogeographical (soil mapping, climate) and HEC data (from partners) for 16 HEC zones in sWEFCOM	Data from Activities 3.1 and 3.5 were integrated by the consultant agronomist to develop species selection and planting guides, site suitability maps, and soil nutrient assessments (Annex 7).	This activity has been completed.
Activity 3.3 Market analysis identifies agroforestry/livelihood product buyers and collective action structures (e.g., CBO and associated microfinance, training and input supply services) across 16 HEC zones	This is on track for Year 2	The development of a financial model and implementation guidelines, including market structures, for key agroforestry models is slated for development and refinement in Year 2.
Activity 3.4 Interactive map of agroforestry/livelihood options for sWEFCOM landscape co-developed with Suranaree University and DLD and integrated into HEVN website	HEVN is currently partnering with a Thai tech company to store and manage the resiliency map and data (including crop suitability and soil maps from Activities 3.1-3.3 and HEC data from HEVN and ZSL for sWEFCOM) on the HEVN website.	We currently exploring avenues for integrating the map with a new HEC monitoring application developed by Suranaree University and proposed for adoption by DNP and community ERRUs. A working draft of the site is expected to be up and running by end of Y2.
Activity 3.5 Community-led focus groups in 16 HEC zones assess receptiveness to identified alternative elephant-friendly agroforestry/livelihoods systems	FGDs have been conducted in 10 out of 16 communities in the Thong Pha Phum District and high-altitude areas of Kanchanaburi. These FGDs engaged 198 farmers (117 male, 81 female, at least 10% indigenous).	FGDs for the remaining 6 communities in low-altitude eastern Kanchanaburi are planned for early May with all data analyzed and summarized by end of Y2Q1.
Output 4. Elephant-friendly livelihood and community cooperatives/ business organizations strengthened and scaled to support long-term human-elephant coexistence and provide financial and	4.1 An established community cooperative/business organization (CBO) piloting elephant-friendly livelihoods in Thong Pha Phum (TPP) zone (10 HH in 2 communities) in sWEFCOM is reinforced with support in	Improved communication and coordination among farmers, government agencies, coffee processors, roasters, and buyers. Feedback sessions have identified issues and obstacles and stakeholder engagement workshops

social resilience for HEC-afflicted communities in sWEFCOM.	business operations and management for 'Chang Baa' coffee production from source to market by end of Y1, with membership scaled to include 50 new members (20 HH in production and 30 additional HH along chain of production - processing, packaging, transport and marketing), with 30% membership of women and indigenous groups (Hmong and Karen) by end of Y2. [DI-B10]	enhanced understanding of the challenges and potential solutions in the coffee production chain.
	4.2 Seed funding supports CBO with assets, inputs, skills and finance to ensure product quality and quantity of coffee production (by end Y1), establishing a scalable M&E framework that meets both national 'elephant friendly' and health and safety standards by end of Y2, where 100% of participating CBO members (60 HH) meet standards by end of Y3. [DI-A04]	Farmers are now involved in testing and evaluating their coffee using the cupping method and have gained exposure to high-quality coffee from national competitions. Workshops have provided training on coffee quality assessment, and essential equipment for evaluation has been made available.
	4.3 Sustainable finance model established for CBO by end of Y2 to support investments in scaling livelihood pilot (coffee production) and HEC mitigation beyond life of the project, where CBO has sufficient resources, capacity and self-resilience to independently manage/operate sustainable business model by end of Y3. [DI-C19]	On track for delivery in project Year 2
	4.4 CBO members (60 HH) connected with national 'elephant friendly' product network in 3 additional HEC regions, product-specific market systems and suppliers (e.g., transportation of goods, marketing) by end of Y2, and high-value national markets (e.g., Royal Thai Foundation, Phufa Products) by end of Y3. [DI-A04]	On track for delivery in project Year 2 and 3
	4.5 CBO business model results in a 30% increase in sales value of goods against Y1 baseline for coffee-producing CBO households (10 HH) by end of Y3. [DI-A11]	On track for delivery in project Year 2 and 3. Baseline surveys delayed to Y2.

	<p>4.6 Agroforestry/Livelihood, market, and insurance feasibility assessments inform two additional HEC resilient livelihood business models in high-conflict zones in sWEFCOM (Thamanao and Mai Plasoi, ~160 HH) by end of Y2, with two business model workshops and reports delivered by end of Y3. [DI-B03]</p>	<p>On track for delivery in project Year 2 and 3.</p>
	<p>4.7 Roadshow of resiliency mapping framework and successful elephant friendly business models (from TPP and three additional CBOs in elephant friendly product national network) share lessons learned across 16 HEC zones around 9 protected areas in sWEFCOM (~270 people benefitting ca. 8,000 HH) and 4 other HEC regions (~960 people benefitting ca. 27,000 HH) by end of Y3.</p>	<p>On track for delivery in project Year 3.</p>
<p>Activity 4.1 Establishment of a governance structure, development of responsibilities and/or articles of incorporation and monthly CBO meetings, leading to incorporation (if determined by the community).</p>	<p>The CBO leader of 3 Community-Based Organizations (CBO) and the Agricultural Occupation Promotion and Development Center (Highland Agricultural Extension) established a steering committee for the project. Regular online meetings were held to guide the process. The CBO leader decided to formalize the organization by incorporating it as a legal entity focused on elephant-friendly coffee farming and production, aiming to receive government support and secure funding.</p>	<p>The CBO incorporation process is expected to be completed before the 2024/2025 coffee harvest season with continued support from HEVN.</p>
<p>Activity 4.2 Business operations and management workshops support existing Chang Baa coffee CBO in TPP (60 members)</p>	<p>Workshops on business operations and management were organized to support the existing coffee CBO in the TPP area, which has 60 members. The workshops aim to bridge the gap between agricultural and business sectors, encouraging sustainable partnerships. Additionally, these sessions guide farmers through the supply chain, helping them increase the value of their products.</p>	<p>The existing coffee CBO is in the process of registering as a community enterprise, with support from the HEVN team in business planning and brainstorming. Continued trainings are scheduled for Y2.</p>
<p>Activity 4.3 All CBO members trained to monitor/report HEC incidents and coached in safe, effective, non-violent deterrence methods. Data collected by HEVN at monthly steering committee meetings.</p>	<p>CBO members were trained to monitor and report HEC incidents. These reports were discussed during monthly steering committee meetings. Safe and non-violent deterrence methods were taught in a separate training session following a regional workshop.</p>	<p>In year 2, the method for recording HEC incidents will transition to an online platform using a new template co-designed by the DNP and the provincial agriculture department to facilitate data sharing among organizations.</p>

<p>Activity 4.4 Agroforestry/livelihoods training workshops and annual product testing to meet national and buyer standards</p>	<p>We organized coffee cupping events for farmers and stakeholders and supported coffee CBOs in submitting coffee samples for quality assessment. Specialized training sessions focused on selecting and roasting coffee samples for competitions. We are collaborating with a robusta grader to develop quality improvement guidelines.</p>	<p>The quality assessment process is scheduled to take place from November 2024 to February 2025, aligning with the coffee harvest season in Thong Pha Phum.</p>
<p>Activity 4.5 Business operations and management workshops conducted in two additional HEC zones (Thamano and Mae Plasoi)</p>	<p>This is on track for year 3.</p>	<p>This is on track for year 3.</p>
<p>Activity 4.6 Capacity assessment surveys conducted annually to assess progress and needs for CBOs (60 HH) through the project</p>	<p>This has been delayed to year 2.</p>	<p>Capacity assessment surveys will be conducted in year two for new members who have registered with the community enterprise.</p>
<p>Activity 4.7 Baseline and endline household income assessments adapted with appropriate indicators for Thailand context developed, conducted, and analysed for community business members (60 HH)</p>	<p>This has been delayed to year 2.</p>	<p>Baseline household income assessments will be conducted in year two for the newly registered community enterprise members. These assessments will use indicators tailored to the Thai context to analyze the income changes among 60 households involved in the community business.</p>

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

Project Summary	SMART Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
Impact: A sustainable model for human-elephant coexistence based on effective HEC mitigation strategies that enhance human wellbeing and reduce threats to elephants has been adopted across Thailand benefitting all elephant populations			
Outcome: (Max 30 words) An evidence-based model for human-elephant coexistence in Thailand increases country-wide capacity for HWC mitigation, including insurance and elephant-friendly livelihoods, improving human wellbeing and attitudes toward elephants and protected areas.	0.1 Improved capacity and capability of 23 organizations and communities in 5 regions (~1,000 people, 30% women and indigenous, benefitting ca. 30,000 HEC-afflicted HH) working in elephant conservation in Thailand (including DNP, NGOs, and universities) to assess, implement, and monitor suitable, sustainable, cost-effective HEC mitigation measures by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, with midline surveys conducted in Y2. 0.2 HEC mitigation best practice and standardized M&E co-developed and adopted into DNP elephant NAP and implemented by 70% (n = 16) of partner organizations by project end 0.3 National HEC insurance feasibility assessment, including costs and benefits, informs government and community-level options to offset elephant damages by the end of Y2 and, where appropriate, pilot schemes are in place by end of Y3. 0.4 Improved capacity of CBO members in business and product development, assessed annually	0.1 Baseline, midline, and endline capacity assessment using the Organizational Capacity Assessment tool (OCA) from Capacity for Conservation plus the methods of Gerrie et al. (2022) [21] 0.2 DNP National action plan, annual partner reports 0.3 Reports on the feasibility assessment; evidence of corporate (CSR or commercial) interest in pilot schemes; reports on pilot scheme implementation 0.4 Capacity assessment surveys conducted using Organizational Capacity Assessment tool 0.5 Baseline and endline socioeconomic surveys collecting data from all sWEFCOM community business members (60 HH) to construct Wellbeing Index (subjective wellbeing, financial wellbeing, material style of life metrics, social relations, etc.) based on guiding principles of Woodhouse et al., 2015 [22] ('Voices of the Poor' well-being domains and Wellbeing in Developing Countries (WeD) guidelines) 0.6 Baseline and endline socioeconomic surveys collecting	The proposed HECx model (mitigation and monitoring best practice, feasible insurance schemes and alternative livelihoods) is able to prove its value to the Department of National Parks, Wildlife, and Plants and other stakeholders across the landscape, including elephant conservation NGOs/CBOs, through improved outcomes and post-project sustainability. As a result, the model is adopted by relevant stakeholders across the country. Communities are interested in and willing to shift away from current livelihoods and mitigation methods. Improved income and wellbeing of local communities, resulting from declining HEC and enhanced livelihoods, reflects reduced costs of living with wildlife and coupled with regular outreach that reinforces that these benefits are dependent on supporting wildlife conservation.

	<p>(60 HH) to ensure they are progressing in Output 4.</p> <p>0.5 Increase in subjective and relational aspects of wellbeing among 70% of sWEFCOM households engaged in elephant-friendly community business market chain (total 60 HH, 30% women and indigenous) by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, assessed as:</p> <p>0.5.1 Improved perceived security (e.g., safety from elephant injury) as a result of training workshops in effective, nonviolent deterrence methods and reduced HEC rates</p> <p>0.5.2 Improved dimensions of social capital (community relations, dignity, ability to help others), particularly for women and indigenous people, achieved via development of more participatory and collaborative community business structure that ensures representative governance and connection to a broader elephant-friendly business support network.</p> <p>0.5.3 Reduced perceived vulnerability to human-elephant conflict (e.g., effects on savings and capital) as a result of community business financial support mechanism and competitive products.</p> <p>0.6 70% of sWEFCOM households engaged in elephant-friendly</p>	<p>data from all sWEFCOM community business members to construct:</p> <p>0.6.1 Conservation Attitude Index (Ratings and Likert scales, 'willingness to pay' for conservation outcomes, grievances and conflicts with protected area staff and wildlife)</p> <p>0.6.2 Metric of net benefit perceived from protected areas (Likert and ratings scales on objective and subjective benefits (income, wellbeing, cultural traditions) and costs (access, park, and wildlife conflict).</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<p>community business market chain (60 HH) report improved attitudes toward elephants and protected areas by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, as a result of effective mitigation via elephant-friendly livelihoods.</p>		
<p>Outputs: 1. A country-wide systematic review of all human-elephant conflict mitigation projects in Thailand identifies effectiveness of mitigation tools trialed, and informs best practice and M&E guidelines that are promoted across 5 HEC regions of Thailand</p>	<p>1.5 Data on mitigation methods and assessment collated from partners across Thailand, systematically reviewed and analysed in Y1. Report written with participatory input from all partners including DNP at end of Y1 and a paper submitted for publication in a relevant peer-reviewed journal by the end of Y2.</p> <p>1.6 Best practice guidelines for HEC mitigation tools, including suitability, requirements, risks, and cost-analyses co-developed by end of Y1.</p> <p>1.7 Best practice guidelines for locally appropriate, systematic and adaptive monitoring and evaluation of HEC mitigation methods co-developed by end of Y1.</p> <p>1.8 Best practice guidelines for HEC mitigation, monitoring and evaluation framework, and lessons learned disseminated to:</p> <p>1.8.1 DNP and all partners (n=23) from 5 regions via HECx national capacity-building workshops in Y3;</p> <p>1.8.2 Communities across 5 regions (~1,000 people, 30% women</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Final report; publication in peer-reviewed journal 2. Workshop notes and minutes, photographs, guidelines 3. Workshop notes and minutes, photographs, guidelines 4. Training curriculum; meeting and workshop notes and minutes, photographs, webinar recording 	<p>Sufficient data made available from partners for a meaningful review of the effectiveness of mitigation and monitoring strategies.</p> <p>Willingness of all partners including DNP to co-develop Guidelines and to attend capacity-building workshops.</p> <p>DNP and national partners see value in implementing evidence-based best practice mitigation measures and monitoring framework for evolving lessons learned the long-term.</p> <p>Partners in other elephant range countries (e.g., range country government agencies, other NGOs/CSOs, Elephant Conservation Group, IUCN Asian Elephant Specialist Group) see value in resulting national assessment and monitoring and evaluation framework.</p>

	<p>and indigenous, benefitting ca. 30,000 HEC-afflicted HH) via community-level HECx capacity building workshops in Y2 and Y3;</p> <p>1.8.3 Other elephant range States via public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3.</p>		
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>2. Assessment of the feasibility of human-elephant conflict insurance schemes (including commercial, corporate CSR and community-based) for supporting long-term human-elephant coexistence across Thailand.</p>	<p>2.8 Data on financial impact of HEC (crop damage including damage to plantation crops; damage to infrastructure) collated from partners and analysed, and additional data collected as needed from representative areas across Thailand and analysed, by end of Q4Y1.</p> <p>2.9 Willingness to pay (WTP) premiums and linking premiums and eligibility for insurance to crop protection and 'riskiness' of crop type established by end of Q2Y2 via focus groups and interviews in 5 HEC regions (~250 individuals, 30% women and indigenous).</p> <p>2.10 Feasibility of crop protection compliance and payments monitoring systems established by end of Y2.</p> <p>2.11 Insurance companies' interest in and ability to insure against HEC established (including viability of meeting the industries' risk management and re-insurance standards) by end of Y2.</p> <p>2.12 Feasibility of alternatives to commercial insurance (government</p>	<p>2.1 Collated reports; reports on fieldwork-based data collection; analyses and summaries.</p> <p>2.2 Focus group reports and analyses; reports on consultations with plantation companies</p> <p>2.3 Reports and analyses</p> <p>2.4 Reports on meetings, workshop notes, written analyses/position statements</p> <p>2.5 Reports on meetings, workshop notes, written analyses/position statements</p> <p>2.6 Inception reports; progress reports; analyses presented in white paper</p> <p>2.7 Reports on Community of Practice and recording of webinar</p>	<p>Business model is developed which incentivises and finances farmers to adopt wildlife-friendly practices (e.g., crops unattractive to elephants, other mitigation measures) in exchange for lower premiums, avoiding moral hazards associated with compensation schemes.</p> <p>Insurance companies are willing to partner on the project and suitable compromises are developed so that insurance companies are willing and able to insure high-risk HEC-afflicted farmers at reasonable premiums.</p> <p>Proposed insurance schemes meet IIED's requirements for successful and sustainable implementation (cost effective insurance administration, timely and fair insurance payments, incentives for damage prevention, financial sustainability of premium payments) based on successful models and lessons learned in Kenya and Sri Lanka (DI 25-004). IIED will be a consulting partner for Output 2 and ensure best-practice delivery.</p> <p>Partners in other elephant range countries (e.g., range country government agencies, other NGOs/CSOs, Elephant Conservation Group, IUCN Asian Elephant Specialist Group) see value insurance assessment</p>

	<p>schemes, companies' CSR, community based micro-finance) established by end of Y2.</p> <p>2.13 Feasible pilot schemes are established and evaluated in Y3.</p> <p>2.14 Insurance feasibility case studies (Thailand, Sri Lanka, Kenya, and Malaysia) shared with other elephant range countries via public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3.</p>		<p>and pilot scheme results, adapting them for their own purposes.</p>
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>3. Identification of alternative and/or enhanced livelihoods (e.g., agroforestry, elephant-resilient crops) that promote human-elephant coexistence in sWEFCOM informs future forward climate and HEC resilient livelihoods that promotes HECx.</p>	<p>3.6 Agroforestry/livelihood systems (based on existing coffee agroforestry model) builds scalable elephant and crop resiliency mapping framework, embedded within national HEVN network, to assess crop suitability across the sWEFCOM landscape (ca. 2,000 km²), identifying climate and HEC resilient options, and modelling areas prone to HEC by end of Y1.</p> <p>3.7 Market analysis identifies and prioritizes suitable 'elephant friendly' products, cost-to-convert ratios, and sustainable financial mechanisms (e.g. community-based microfinance, CBO, CSR, insurance) for economically viable and inclusive livelihood enhancement promoting HECx across 16 HEC zones (~8,000 HH) in the sWEFCOM landscape by end of Y1.</p> <p>3.8 Community-led focus groups in 16 HEC conflict zones across the</p>	<p>3.1 soil sample tests, agroforestry/livelihoodsystem document, online interactive mapping framework published to HEVN website</p> <p>3.2 Market analysis report</p> <p>3.3 Focus group notes, barriers assessment and interventions report</p> <p>3.4 Alternative agroforestry/livelihoods and farmer adoption pathways report, dissemination of workshop notes, webinar recording</p>	<p>University partners acquire adequate information from existing data sources to build resiliency framework.</p> <p>Elephant-friendly products identified by the project represent a sustainable investment, with market prices remaining relatively stable and competitive.</p> <p>Proposed elephant-friendly business models and livelihood plans are considered sufficiently viable and attractive by communities. Financial mechanisms are suitable in scope and scale to support initial investment into proposed elephant friendly business models.</p> <p>Elephant and crop resiliency framework is built in way that can be scaled and replicated in both national and international site-based contexts for broad scale application and partners see value in resulting model.</p>

	<p>sWEFCOM (ca. 160 HH) assesses farmer receptiveness to viable elephant friendly alternative and/or enhanced livelihoods (e.g., agroforestry, organic products, CSR) by Q2Y2; barriers to adoption farther adoption pathways identified e.g., microfinance by Q4 Y2.</p> <p>3.9 HEC livelihood resiliency framework incorporates market and insurance cost-benefit ratios and serves as dynamic resource, housed within the HEVN network platform to inform and strengthen elephant-friendly livelihoods for:</p> <p>3.9.1 16 HEC zones in the sWEFCOM (~8,000 HH) via landscape-level workshops by end of Y2;</p> <p>3.9.2 National HEC conflict zone partners (23 partners from 5 regions) as a scalable model via HECx capacity building workshop by end of Y3;</p> <p>3.9.3 And other elephant range states through sharing adaptive resiliency mapping framework via a public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3.</p>		
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>4. Elephant-friendly livelihood and community cooperatives/ business organizations strengthened and scaled to support long-term human-elephant coexistence and provide financial and social resilience for HEC-afflicted communities in sWEFCOM.</p>	<p>4.8 An established community cooperative/business organization (CBO) piloting elephant-friendly livelihoods in Thong Pha Phum (TPP) zone (10 HH in 2 communities) in sWEFCOM is reinforced with support in business</p>	<p>4.1 Community business plan, steering committee meeting records and minutes; Community business and membership records</p> <p>4.2 Management guidelines for processing facility integrated into</p>	<p>No significant annual differences in environmental variables that could alter elephant movement behavior and patterns or significantly affect business members' financial situations.</p> <p>Elephants do not shift to consuming the alternative crop or raiding households.</p>

	<p>operations and management for 'Chang Baa' coffee production from source to market by end of Y1, with membership scaled to include 50 new members (20 HH in production and 30 additional HH along chain of production - processing, packaging, transport and marketing), with 30% membership of women and indigenous groups (Hmong and Karen) by end of Y2.</p> <p>4.9 Seed funding supports CBO with assets, inputs, skills and finance to ensure product quality and quantity of coffee production (by end Y1), establishing a scalable M&E framework that meets both national 'elephant friendly' and health and safety standards by end of Y2, where 100% of participating CBO members (60 HH) meet standards by end of Y3.</p> <p>4.10 Sustainable finance model established for CBO by end of Y2 to support investments in scaling livelihood pilot (coffee production) and HEC mitigation beyond life of the project, where CBO has sufficient resources, capacity and self-resilience to independently manage/operate sustainable business model by end of Y3.</p> <p>4.11 CBO members (60 HH) connected with national 'elephant friendly' product network in 3 additional HEC regions, product-specific market systems and</p>	<p>business plan, certification of standards met</p> <p>4.3 Financial mechanism formation records, photographs, membership records, Master Plan for Self-Reliance (assessed annually)</p> <p>4.4 Independent assessment and examination reports (e.g., Organizational Capacity Assessment tool or Conservation Standards)</p> <p>4.5 Community business records, baseline and endline socio-economic survey; Crop-raid monitoring data, baseline and endline socio-economic survey</p> <p>4.6 Feasibility assessment report, dissemination workshop notes; business model workshop agendas, presentations, and reports, dissemination workshop minutes</p> <p>4.7 Reports including videos of roadshow</p>	<p>Communities are interested in and willing to consider alternative livelihood scenarios, engage in surveys and livelihood pilots, and invest in financial support schemes.</p> <p>Community members understand that alternative livelihoods and CBO activities are directly linked to their engagement in conservation and human-elephant coexistence. This includes community members who are not direct beneficiaries, through word of mouth from community leaders and fellow community neighbours.</p> <p>Successful livelihoods existing and developed under the community business represent a viable business case for investment by the financial schemes, as seen in previous ZSL work in Kenya (DI 26-006) and the Philippines (DI 21-020 & 24-016).</p> <p>Aimed-for levels of female and indigenous participation are achieved based on pre-project understanding of community socioeconomics and demographics and results from previous/ongoing CBO implementation in the area.</p> <p>The CBO network engages necessary and sufficient community buy-in, social cohesion, and access to financial services (savings and loans) to be sustainable, competitive, and profitable.</p> <p>A supplementary widespread and reliable revenue stream, unimpacted by human-elephant conflict, will partially decouple community wellbeing from HEC, providing a basis for coexistence,</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>suppliers (e.g., transportation of goods, marketing) by end of Y2, and high-value national markets (e.g., Royal Thai Foundation, Phufa Products) by end of Y3.</p> <p>4.12 CBO business model results in a 30% increase in sales value of goods against Y1 baseline for coffee-producing CBO households (10 HH) by end of Y3.</p> <p>4.13 Agroforestry/Livelihood, market, and insurance feasibility assessments inform two additional HEC resilient livelihood business models in high-conflict zones in sWEFCOM (Thamano and Mai Plasoi, ~160 HH) by end of Y2, with two business model workshops and reports delivered by end of Y3.</p> <p>4.14 Roadshow of resiliency mapping framework and successful elephant friendly business models (from TPP and three additional CBOs in elephant friendly product national network) share lessons learned across 16 HEC zones around 9 protected areas in sWEFCOM (~270 people benefitting ca. 8,000 HH) and 4 other HEC regions (~960 people benefitting ca. 27,000 HH) by end of Y3.</p>		<p>with enough knowledge and modelling predicted about HEC incidents (i.e. activities elsewhere do not create new drivers of HEC).</p> <p>Access to enhanced and diversified livelihoods (in conjunction with financial schemes and mitigation interventions if appropriate) will reduce the need to engage in illegal, environmentally-damaging activities for income supplementation.</p> <p>Coffee production knowledge, skills and assets developed by the project are sufficient in the event of any repeated extreme weather conditions over the life of the project.</p> <p>Economies of scale gained through establishing/supporting/strengthening the CBO gain sufficient market share to lead to profit for producers despite externalities in the market during the life of the project.</p>
--	--	--	---

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. Each activity should start on a new line and be no more than approximately 25 words.)

Output 1

- 1.1 Baseline and endline HEC mitigation capacity assessment of all project partners within HEVN network (23) and annual assessment of communities in 5 HEC regions.
- 1.2 Systematic review (synthesis/analysis) of data on HEC mitigation measures and monitoring methods collated from all partners in Thailand since 2002.
- 1.3 Co-development of best-practice guidelines for HEC mitigation and M&E with DNP and all partners by end of Y1. Report and paper published by end of Y2.
- 1.4 National capacity-building workshops (Bangkok) introduce the project and assess existing capacity of elephant conservation partners in Y1 and disseminate project results in Y3.
- 1.5 Community-level workshops introduce project and assess capacity(Y1), disseminate best-practice mitigation, HWC insurance feasibility and livelihood framework(Y2), and elephant-friendly business models(Y3) to 5 HEC regions.
- 1.6 Public Community of Practice webinar shares lessons learned and best-practice guidelines to other elephant range countries (Kenya, Nepal, Sri Lanka).

Output 2

- 2.1 Collation and analysis of data on financial impact of HEC. Situation analysis of HEC and role for insurance published by end of Y1.
- 2.2 Focus groups in 5 forest complexes with farming communities assess WTP premiums, insurance eligibility, existing financial support mechanisms, feasibility of crop protection compliance, etc.
- 2.3 Interviews/meetings with plantation companies in Bangkok to assesses feasibility/acceptability of monitoring compliance
- 2.4 Interviews/meetings with insurance agencies to assess buy-in and feasibility of various insurance schemes
- 2.5 Assessment supported by IIED identifies feasible HEC insurance schemes. Insurance product designed with insurance agencies.
- 2.6 Pilot schemes established in Y3Q1 with technical support for implementation from IIED
- 2.7 Monitoring and reviewing of insurance scheme by end of Y3

Output 3

- 3.1 Soil and farm mapping surveys to groundtruth spatial maps and inform biogeographical variables of feasibility assessment, conducted in Y1
- 3.2 Viable Elephant-friendly alternative agroforestry/livelihood system(s) determined for model farms using biogeographical (soil mapping, climate) and HEC data (from partners) for 16 HEC zones in sWEFCOM
- 3.3 Market analysis identifies agroforestry/livelihood product buyers and collective action structures (e.g., CBO and associated microfinance, training and input supply services) across 16 HEC zones
- 3.4 Interactive map of agroforestry/livelihood options for sWEFCOM landscape co-developed with Suranaree University and DLD and integrated into HEVN website
- 3.5 Community-led focus groups in 16 HEC zones assess receptiveness to identified alternative elephant-friendly agroforestry/livelihoods systems

Output 4

- 4.1 Establishment of a governance structure, development of responsibilities and/or articles of incorporation and monthly CBO meetings, leading to incorporation (if determined by the community).
- 4.2 Business operations and management workshops support existing Chang Baa coffee CBO in TPP (60 members)
- 4.3 All CBO members trained to monitor/report HEC incidents and coached in safe, effective, non-violent deterrence methods. Data collected by HEVN at monthly steering committee meetings.
- 4.4 Agroforestry/livelihoods training workshops and annual product testing to meet national and buyer standards
- 4.5 Business operations and management workshops conducted in two additional HEC zones (Thamanao and Mae Plasoi)
- 4.6 Capacity assessment surveys conducted annually to assess progress and needs for CBOs (60 HH) through the project
- 4.7 Baseline and endline household income assessments adapted with appropriate indicators for Thailand context developed, conducted, and analysed for community business members (60 HH)

Annex 3: Standard Indicators

Note: At the time of proposal submission, the Darwin Standard Indicators had not yet been required. We are currently preparing an indicator map which will convert existing project indicators to match the DI SMART standards and will submit this table as an attachment. We anticipate this to be ready by the end of May

Table 1 Project Standard Indicators

DI Indicator number	Name of indicator	Units	Disaggregation	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
E.g. DI-A01	E.g. Number of people in eligible countries who have completed structured and relevant training	People	Men	20			20	60
E.g. DI-A01	E.g. Number of people in eligible countries who have completed structured and relevant training	People	Women	30			30	60
E.g. DI-B01	E.g. Number of new or improved habitat management plans available and endorsed	Number	New	1			1	2
E.g. DI-B01	E.g. Number of new or improved habitat management plans available and endorsed	Number	Improved	1			1	3

Table 2 Publications

Title	Type (e.g. journals, best practice manual, blog post, online videos, podcasts, 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)

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

Annex 4: Supporting information including project site map and references

Annex 5. Organizational capacity and HEC mitigation survey data summary

Annex 6. ERRU survey data summary

Annex 7. Agroforestry reports

Annex 8. Darwin project Year 1 summary posters

Checklist for submission

	Check
Different reporting templates have different questions, and it is important you use the correct one. Have you checked you have used the correct template (checking fund, type of report (i.e. Annual or Final), and year) and deleted the blue guidance text before submission?	X
Is the report less than 10MB? If so, please email to BCF-Reports@niras.com putting the project number in the Subject line.	X
Is your report more than 10MB? If so, please discuss with BCF-Reports@niras.com about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	
Have you included means of verification? You should not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	X
If you are submitting photos for publicity purposes, do these meet the outlined requirements (see Section 16)?	
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.	