Darwin Initiative Innovation Annual Report

To be completed with reference to the "Project Reporting Information Note": (https://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/resources-for-projects/information-notes-learning-notes-briefing-papers-and-reviews/).

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

Submission Deadline: 30th April 2023

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

Darwin Initiative Project Information

Project reference	DARNV009
Project title	**Developing and testing a sustainability assessment framework for wildlife use**
Country/ies	Tanzania, South Africa, Indonesia
Lead Partner	IIED
Project partner(s)	TRAFFIC, EPIC Biodiversity, Endangered Wildlife Trust
Darwin Initiative grant value	£78,268
Start/end dates of project	Originally April 2022-September 2023 but via change request changed to June 2022 – 31 March 2024
Reporting period (e.g. Apr 2022 – Mar 2023) and number (e.g. Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	June 2022-Mar 2023: Annual Report 1
Project Leader name	DILYS ROE
Project website/blog/social media	Assessing the sustainability of wild species use | International Institute for Environment and Development (iied.org)
Report author(s) and date	Dilys Roe May 2023

1. Project summary

Sustainable use of wild species is one of three pillars of the CBD as well as being supported by other biodiversity conventions including CITES, CMS and RAMSAR and highlighted as a key element of SDG 15. SU is an essential part of sustainable development in the Global South. In South Africa, for example, SU underpins the country's national "Biodiversity Economy" strategy and is seen as a vehicle both for national economic development and social upliftment. In the wake of Covid-19, however, concerns have, however, been raised regarding the lack of regulatory frameworks governing SU. For example, there are few globally recognised standards overseeing the links that exist between wild animal resources, zoonotic disease risks and animal welfare. As a result, the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework now includes targets to ensure the use of biodiversity is not only sustainable and legal, but also safe.

In reality, however, there is no straightforward way to determine if this is the case. Sustainability science is complex technically challenging to assess. Safety in the form of zoonotic disease risk is equally difficult to assess. Nevertheless, an approach is needed that cuts through the complexity, is accessible to conservation practitioners and policy makers and increases confidence that alignment with the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework is being achieved.

A useful starting point is the existing single or multi-discipline frameworks that are already deployed to assess sustainability from different dimensions. Examples include the CITES Non-Detriment Findings process (which is largely based on ecological criteria); the BioTrade Principles and Criteria (ecological, economic and social criteria); the IUCN Wildlife Health Specialist Group guidelines on wildlife disease risk analysis; and the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) guidance on animal welfare standards.

The purpose of this small innovation project is to identify potentially useful existing frameworks and pull the relevant components into one comprehensive multi-dimensional framework that provides policy makers and practitioners with a single source of guidance to assess if use is "sustainable, legal and safe" in line with the requirements of the Global Biodiversity Framework. Our new framework, guided by experts, will include social, environmental, economic, human health and animal welfare dimensions. The prototype framework will then be tested on case studies currently being collected by the IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group, as well as by practical situations that partners are currently dealing with including game ranching and reptile skin production.

2. Project stakeholders/ partners

The partners in the project are:

- IIED
- TRAFFIC
- Endangered Wildlife Trust
- EPIC Biodiversity

The four partners are jointly working to identify relevant frameworks, standards and principles and develop the prototype framework and then TRAFFIC, EWT and EPIC will test the framework in places where they are already working.

In addition to the core partners, the project is collaborating with the IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group which has developed a database of case studies of wildlife use examples which can be used to test the applicability of the framework.

The project has also established an international multi-disciplinary expert group to help ensure the prototype framework is as scientifically robust as possible while at the same time being simple enough for practitioners and wildlife users to apply. The expert group will help further refine the framework after testing.

The experts include:

Simon Marsh (Wild Welfare, UK)
Paolo Martelli (Hong Kong Aquatic Park)
Leopoldo Stuardo (World Organisation for Animal Health)
Tiggy Grillo (IUCN Wildlife Health Specialist Group)
Dr Osman A Dar (UK Health Security Agency)
Brenda Parlee (Univ Alberta, Canada)

Marla Emery (Ex – IPBES Sustainable Use Assessment, US)
John-Mark Kilian (Umsizi Sustainable Social Solutions, South Africa)
James MacGregor (UK Economist)
Frank Vorhies (African Wildlife Economy Institute)
Matt Child (South Africa National Biodiversity Institute)
John Donaldson (Ex IPBES Sustainable Use Assessment, South Africa)
Khalid Pasha (IUCN Asia)
Sue Stolton/Nigel Dudley (Equilibrium Solutions UK)

3. Project progress

3.1 Progress in carrying out project Activities

This project started in June 2022, so this report covers the period June to March (10 months).

Planned activities in this period all relate to Output 1: Existing sustainability assessment frameworks reviewed and draft multidimensional framework developed

1.1 Identify relevant experts to join our Multidisciplinary Expert Group

1.2 Conduct a literature review to identify relevant existing frameworks that address one of more of our 5 sustainability dimensions.

1.3 Analysis and synthesis of existing frameworks to produce zero draft 5-dimensional framework

1.4 Review by multi-disciplinary expert group and finalisation

Activity 1.1: We held an inception meeting with the project partners in June. At this meeting we reviewed the workplan, set up a shared folder in order to deposit relevant literature that each partner was aware; and shared ideas on names and contacts of potential members of the expert group and subsequently sent out invitations to join. After a further round of discussion on expert group members we sent out invitations to join. 14 individuals have accepted to join the group as highlighted under Section 2 above.

Activity 1.2: Our literature search and consultation with experts identified 39 different frameworks/standards/sets of principles to use as the basis for our multi-dimensional framework. Consultation with members of the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management (CPW) at a CPW meeting in February 2023 identified a further 4 frameworks and also allowed for discussions on potential scoring mechanisms. Full details of all the frameworks standards and principles we have identified and considered are available in Annex 4.1 – Assessment framework – All principles.

Activity 1.3: We are still in the process of synthesising the principles into a 5-dimensional framework with no more than 10 principles per dimension. The latest version of the framework is available Annex 4.2 - Assessment framework - Summary table synthesised 5D Principles consolidated - DRAFT

Activity 1.4: We had to postpone a planned MEG meeting due to personal circumstances of one project team member and this is now in the process of being rescheduled to late May/early June for review of the framework.

Activity 2.1: Testing against three ongoing initiatives in South Africa, Tanzania, Indonesia

This activity is delayed due to delays in completing activities 1.3 and 1.4

3.2 Progress towards project Outputs

Ouput 1: Existing sustainability assessment frameworks reviewed and draft multidimensional framework developed.

Overall, we are slightly behind schedule in achieving this Output but expect to be back on track following a meeting of the MEG which is scheduled for late May/early June. After this we will be ready to progress to Output 2 – testing.

The indicators for Output 1 are:

1.1 By end of Q1 members of multidisciplinary expert group (MEG) convened and starting to identify useful existing frameworks
1.2 By end of Q2 existing frameworks identified and synthesised into zero draft sustainability assessment framework and reviewed by MEG

With regard to indicator 1.1: Section 2 above details the individuals who have agreed to join the MEG some of whom have already provided suggestions of frameworks (for example the Wild Welfare Assessment methodology.

With regard to indicator 1.2: Section 3.1 describes our progress towards meeting this indicator, and specifically that significant progress has been made but that we are a few months behind schedule overall. The delay is due to a number of factors including a key member of the project team leaving and not yet being replaced, and another team member having to take time out from work due to personal circumstances.

Output 2: Zero draft framework field tested against ongoing wildlife use initiatives

Progress against this output is delayed because it is dependent on the completion of Output 1. We expect to make up for lost time in Q1 and 2 of Year 2.

3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

The anticipated outcome for this project is that by the end of the project “A novel tool for assessing sustainability of wildlife use from multiple perspectives including ecological (conservation), social/economic (livelihoods) and health (zoonosis risk/welfare) has been developed and tested and made widely available”.

Progress towards achieving the outcome is behind schedule due to the issues noted in the sections above. However, we are confident that we will achieve the outcome by the end of the project. We will however review progress against the implementation timetable at the end of Q1 in Year 2 to ensure we have made up for lost time and if not explore options for a short no-cost extension to the project. We don’t however currently anticipate that this will be necessary.

The indicators for the outcome are:

0.1 By end of project, zero draft assessment framework has been developed and tested in at least 3 different contexts (against baseline of 0)
0.2 By the end of the project, at least three wildlife management organisations (govt, private sector, civil society) has reported positively on potential of framework to improve supply chain management to mitigate risks to biodiversity conservation as a result of assessment findings
0.3 By the end of the project, at least three wildlife management organisations (govt, private sector, civil society) has reported positively on potential of framework to improve supply chain management to enhance contributions of wildlife use to poverty alleviation and improved livelihoods

0.4 By the end of the project, at least three wildlife management organisations (govt, private sector, civil society) has reported positively on use of framework to mitigate animal or human health risks
0.5 By end of the project feedback has been collected by at least 50 actual or potential users and scope for further development into a standard assessed

We have nearly met indicator 0.1 and are on track with our testing plans to meet indicators 0.2 – 0.5.

3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

The outcome level assumptions are:
0.1 Relevant stakeholders see value in framework and are willing to test it. We think this is a reasonable assumption based on in-country discussions as well as informal discussions with CBD and CITES Secretariat staff
0.2 -0.4 Relevant wildlife supply chain managers are willing to acknowledge findings of assessment and take action based on findings. Longer term impacts on conservation, livelihoods and health/welfare risks are dependent on this assumption holding true, however we think this is a reasonable assumption based on informal discussions to date
0.5 Potential users are willing to provide feedback; standard developers are able to determine potential based on experience derived from project

It is not yet possible to test whether or not these assumptions hold true since we are not yet at the stage of testing the framework – the process on which all these assumptions are based. Where the development of framework was presented – e.g. at a UNEP-organised meeting of the partners of the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management (CPW) - it was viewed by partners – including CBD and CITES Secretariat – as useful and relevant to the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and CITES Decisions.

Output 1 assumptions are:
1.1 Suitable experts can be identified and are willing to join MEG
1.2 It is possible to synthesise multiple different dimensions of sustainability into one framework.

These two assumptions both appear to hold true: 1) We identified 15 potential members of the MEG of which 13 have agreed to join; 2) We have identified key principles for each of our five dimensions of sustainability drawing on a wide range of existing frameworks.

The output 2 assumptions is:
2.1 The framework is testable with the ongoing initiatives we are anticipating using as pilots.

It is not yet possible to test this assumption since we have not yet started the testing of the framework but we expect it to hold true based on the knowledge of the partners of these ongoing initiatives and their engagement with them.

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

The anticipated impact that this project contributes to is: Decisions on sustainable use of wildlife are based on robust analysis resulting in management interventions that balance conservation and livelihoods, human health and animal welfare.

It is too early in the project to assess our contribution to this impact but we should have a clearer idea once we start to get some feedback from applications of the framework from wildlife users and manager. Our emerging framework is able to identify principles that cover all these different dimensions of sustainability. We will be testing its practical application next year.

4. Project support to the Conventions, Treaties or Agreements

Again, it is early to judge our contribution at this stage in the project. However, since the proposal was agreed, Parties to the CBD have concluded negotiations over the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the agreed framework includes two key targets – Targets 5 and 9 – which both emphasise the need for use of wild species to be sustainable, legal and safe. The monitoring framework for these targets is still being developed but we anticipate that our framework will provide a useful tool for Parties to use in their reporting. Two of the project partners are involved in developing an indicator for Target 5 and will be exploring options for incorporating the framework into that indicator.

5. Project support to poverty reduction

It is too early to determine how our project is contributing to poverty alleviation and in reality these effects will only be felt beyond the duration of the project. The recently published IPBES Sustainable Use Assessment highlights how use of wild species is an existential issue for many indigenous people and local communities (IPLCs). Our project is intended to help secure sustainable use and hence secure the livelihoods that are dependent upon it.

6. Gender equality and social inclusion

Our project is currently desk based and it is not possible for it to proactively contribute to ensuring individuals achieve equitable outcomes. Nevertheless, the principles that are emerging in our draft assessment framework will specifically support gender disaggregated assessment of the sustainability of wild species use, providing users with information to improve the gender equity of their operations. For example, one of the principles against which wildlife use will be scored in the social sustainability domain is “The use of the species should promote gender equality and racial/ethnic equality” (see Annex 4.2 - Assessment framework - Summary table synthesised 5D Principles consolidated - DRAFT)

Please quantify the proportion of women on the Project Board[1].	The project board comprises 8 people – two from each partner organisation. 4 of these are women and 4 are men
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].	None of the project partners are led by women but all 4 have women in the senior leadership team.

7. Monitoring and evaluation

Our project team has met online several times over the course of the project to review progress and for adaptive management to adjust our implementation timetable. Due to a delay in the start of the project we were able to adjust the timing of our plans and submit a change request to reflect this (which was agreed).

We are using the logframe as our key M&E tool as we develop the framework – and partners have all been checking in against the indicators. Once we start the field testing of the prototype framework next financial year project partners will be collecting feedback from users as part of our M&E.

We have also established an expert advisory group help guide the technical aspects of the project. They have not yet had a review role to play since we are delayed in producing our prototype framework but they will be a key component of our M&E approach next year.

[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.

8. Lessons learnt

The project team has worked well together – mainly because the partners (and individuals involved) are generally well known to each other and so it has been straightforward to keep and active informal dialogue open.

However, because this is a small, low budget project, it has perhaps been harder for it to remain high on the priority list for partners - hence some slippage in our timeframe. The lead partner – IIED – had employed a junior researcher to lead much of the framework development literature review and her departure has left a gap in the team which now more senior – and expensive – staff are having to fill. In hindsight we were probably overly ambitious both in our proposed timeframe and in our proposed budget. Nevertheless, all the partners remain very committed to the project as we see so much potential value in the framework. This commitment we are confident will make up for the lack of available budget and we remain confident that we will deliver a useful framework by the end of the project.

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

When the project was funded we were asked to include some specific cases where use of a wild species had already been deemed sustainable or unsustainable in our testing. We will use the IUCN SULI Species Use Database to test the framework against some of these cases (although NB this will be desk-based testing against written case studies, not testing on in situ, “real life” examples).

10. Risk Management

Other than the unforeseen staffing availability, no other new risk arose. The risk register has been updated and shared along the technical report.

11. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

No further comments other than to repeat our acknowledgement that we are running behind schedule due to unforeseen staffing availability.

12. Sustainability and legacy

The project doesn’t yet have any profile in the countries where it will be tested since we are not yet at the stage of rolling out the draft framework. We have however presented the project at a meeting of the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management in February 2023, generating considerable interest amongst members and resulting in the addition of a representative from the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH) to our MEG.

13. Darwin Initiative identity

We don’t yet have any public-facing outputs from the project so have not produced anything with the Darwin logo on. We have, however, acknowledged the Darwin Initiative on the project web page on the IIED website (Assessing the sustainability of wild species use | International Institute for Environment and Development (iied.org)).

Once we have some outputs to share we will promote these via the website but also via our respective Twitter feeds, tagging the Darwin Initiative in the process.

14. Safeguarding

Has your Safeguarding Policy been updated in the past 12 months?		No
Have any concerns been investigated in the past 12 months		No
Does your project have a Safeguarding focal point?	Yes As Project lead, Dilys Roe is the safeguarding focal point. If concern arises, she will follow IIED policy and procedure.	
Has the focal point attended any formal training in the last 12 months?	No	
What proportion (and number) of project staff have received formal training on Safeguarding?		Past: 50 % - 4 Planned: 50 % - 4
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**		
Does the project have any developments or activities planned around Safeguarding in the coming 12 months? If so please specify. No		

15. 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 Initiative Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)	[redacted]			
Consultancy costs				
Overhead Costs				
Travel and subsistence				
Operating Costs				
Capital items (see below)				
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)				
Others (see below)				
TOTAL	**£40,964**	**£40,909**		

16. 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).

NOTHING TO REPORT HERE FOR THIS YEAR

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 2022-2023

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2022 - March 2023	Actions required/planned for next period
Impact Decisions on sustainable use of wildlife are based on robust analysis resulting in management interventions that balance conservation and livelihoods, human health and animal welfare.		Our emerging framework is able to identify principles that cover all these different dimensions of sustainability. We will be testing its practical application next year	
Outcome A novel tool for assessing sustainability of wildlife use from multiple perspectives including ecological (conservation), social/economic (livelihoods) and health (zoonosis risk/welfare) has been developed and tested and made widely available	0.1By end of project, zero draft assessment framework has been developed and tested in at least 3 different contexts (against baseline of 0) 0.2 By the end of the project, at least three wildlife management organisations (govt, private sector, civil society) has reported positively on potential of framework to improve supply chain management to mitigate risks to biodiversity conservation as a result of assessment findings 0.3 By the end of the project, at least three wildlife management organisations (govt, private sector, civil society) has reported positively on potential of framework to improve supply chain management to enhance contributions of wildlife use to poverty alleviation and improved livelihoods 0.4 By the end of the project, at least three wildlife management organisations (govt, private sector, civil society) has reported positively	0.1 – framework is still in development – zero draft anticipated to be completed by end May 2023 0.2 Not yet started 0.3 Not yet started 0.4 Not yet started 0.5 Not yet started	1. Finalised draft framework subject to peer review by MEG 2. Agree scoring mechanism 3. Start testing in Tanzania, South Africa, Indonesia 4. Start reviewing against documented case studies in IUCN SULi database 5. Disseminate findings and collate feedback

	on use of framework to mitigate animal or human health risks 0.5 By end of the project feedback has been collected by at least 50 actual or potential users and scope for further development into a standard assessed.		
Output 1. Existing sustainability assessment frameworks reviewed and draft multidimensional framework developed	1.1 By end of Q1 members of multidisciplinary expert group (MEG) convened and starting to identify useful existing frameworks 1.2 By end of Q2 existing frameworks identified and synthesised into zero draft sustainability assessment framework and reviewed by MEG	MEG established. Members are listed in Section 2 Existing frameworks identified via literature search, MEG members and other experts (including members of Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management). Evidence provide in Section 3.1 Draft framework partially synthesised – due to be finalised and presented to MEG at end of May 2023 – See activity report in Section 3.1	
Activity 1.1 Identify relevant experts and invite to join Multidisciplinary expert group (MEG)		Completed	No further action
Activity 1.2, Literature search and call out to experts via the MEG and SULi list serv and Wildlife Health Specialist Group List Serv for existing frameworks		Completed	No further action
Activity 1.3 Analysis and synthesis of existing frameworks to produce zero draft sustainability assessment framework		Nearly completed	Lead partner to address partner comments and edits on draft synthesis
Activity 1.4 Review by MEG and finalisation		Expected at MEG meeting in late May	MEG meeting date to be confirmed and draft framework circulated Feedback following MEG meeting to be incorporated
Output 2. Zero draft framework field tested against ongoing wildlife use initiatives	2.1 By end of Year 1 pilot testing completed	Pilot testing not yet carried out since start of project delayed Zero draft framework not yet revised since testing not yet carried out	

	2.2 By end of Yr 2 Q1, Zero draft framework revised based on testing		
Activity 2.1. Testing against three ongoing initiatives in South Africa, Tanzania, Indonesia		Not yet started	Testing due to start September 2023
Activity 2.2. Testing against documented case studies identified in literature through ongoing SULi project		Not yet started	Testing due to start June 2023
Activity 2.3 Revision of draft framework		Not yet started	Planned for January 2024
Output 3. Guidance for application of the framework developed and disseminated	3.1 By end of Yr 2 q1 User friendly guidance developed 3.2 By end of project, framework and guidance disseminated to at least 100 policy makers and practitioners and feedback collected 3.3 By end of project potential for further development scoped	Work towards this output has not yet started and will commence in January 2024	
Activity 3.1 Development of framework guidance		Not yet started	Planned for Feb 2024
Activity 3.2 Dissemination of framework and guidance		Not yet started	Planned for Feb 2024
Activity 3.3 Dissemination of user feedback survey and analysis of feedback		Not yet started	Planned for March 2024
Activity 3.4 Scoping of future development		Not yet started	Planned for March 2024

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: Decisions on sustainable use of wildlife are based on robust analysis resulting in management interventions that balance conservation and livelihoods, human health and animal welfare. (Max 30 words)			
Outcome: A novel tool for assessing sustainability of wildlife use from multiple perspectives including ecological (conservation), social/economic (livelihoods) and health (zoonosis risk/welfare) has been developed and tested and made widely available	0.1 By end of project, zero draft assessment framework has been developed and tested in at least 3 different contexts (against baseline of 0) 0.2 By the end of the project, at least three wildlife management organisations (govt, private sector, civil society) has reported positively on potential of framework to improve supply chain management to mitigate risks to biodiversity conservation as a result of assessment findings 0.3 By the end of the project, at least three wildlife management organisations (govt, private sector, civil society) has reported positively on potential of framework to improve supply chain management to enhance contributions of wildlife use to poverty alleviation and improved livelihoods 0.4 By the end of the project, at least three wildlife management organisations (govt, private sector, civil society) has reported positively on use of framework to mitigate animal or human health risks	0.1 Project reports; multi disciplinary expert committee meeting minutes; case study testing reports; web updates. 0.2 -0.4 Written records from authorities and end users of framework; meeting minutes; feedback from users survey 0.5 Feedback from users survey; feedback from standards developers	0.1 Relevant stakeholders see value in framework and are willing to test it. We think this is a reasonable assumption based on in-country discussions as well as informal discussions with CBD and CITES Secretariat staff 0.2 -0.4Relevant wildlife supply chain managers are willing to acknowledge findings of assessment and take action based on findings. Longer term impacts on conservation, livelihoods and health/welfare risks are dependent on this assumption holding true, however we think this is a reasonable assumption based on informal discussions to date. 0.5 Potential users are willing to provide feedback; standard developers are able to determine potential based on experience derived from project

	0.5 By end of the project feedback has been collected by at least 50 actual or potential users and scope for further development into a standard assessed.		
Outputs: **1**. Existing sustainability assessment frameworks reviewed and draft multidimensional framework developed	1.3 By end of Q1 members of multidisciplinary expert group (MEG) convened and starting to identify useful existing frameworks 1.4 By end of Q2 existing frameworks identified and synthesised into zero draft sustainability assessment framework and reviewed by MEG	1.1. Project reports, meeting minutes and attendance lists, 1.2. Literature review report; existence of draft framework	1.1 Suitable experts can be identified and are willing to join MEG 1.2 It is possible to synthesise multiple different dimensions of sustainability into one framework. We do not anticipate a problem with either of these assumptions based on discussions we (IIED and TRAFFIC) have already held with veterinarians, epidemiologists and animal welfare specialists
2. Zero draft framework field tested against ongoing wildlife use initiatives	2.3 By end of Year 1 pilot testing completed 2.4 By end of Yr 2 Q1, Zero draft framework revised based on testing	2.1 Reports of pilot testing, feedback from users, project updated 2.2 Revised version of framework available	2.1 The framework is testable with the ongoing initiatives we are anticipating using as pilots. We expect this assumption to hold true based on the knowledge of the partners of these ongoing initiatives and their engagement with them
3. Guidance for application of the framework developed and disseminated	3.1 By end of Yr 2 q1 User friendly guidance developed 3.2 By end of project, framework and guidance disseminated to at least 100 policy makers and practitioners and feedback collected 3.3 By end of project potential for further development scoped	3.1 Project reports; guidance available on project web page 3.2 Dissemination records; references to the survey in specialist meeting reports eg the CITES Working Group on zoonotic diseases; user survey feedback; web download stats 3.3 User survey feedback, minutes of meetings; project reports	3.1 Practitioners and policy makers are interested in the assessment framework and willing to engage in further testing or provide feedback. We expect this assumption to hold true based on our ongoing discussions on this issue with key policy makers eg CITES Secretariat, CBD Secretariat and through our (IIED, TRAFFIC) involvement in the

			Collaborative Partnership on Wildlife (CPW)

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)

1.1 Identify relevant experts and invite to join Multidisciplinary expert group (MEG)
1.2 Literature search and call out to experts via the MEG and SULi list serv and Wildlife Health Specialist Group List Serv for existing frameworks
1.3 Analysis and synthesis of existing frameworks to produce zero draft sustainability assessment framework
1.4 Review by MEG and finalisation
2.1 Testing against three ongoing initiatives in South Africa, Tanzania, Indonesia
2.2 Testing against documented case studies identified in literature through ongoing SULi project
2.3 Revision of draft framework
3.1 Development of framework guidance
3.2 Dissemination of framework and guidance
3.3 Dissemination of user feedback survey and analysis of feedback
3.4 Scoping of future development

Annex 3: Standard Indicators

NB: Our project is intended to produce a beta version of a 5D sustainability assessment framework, guidance on applying the framework and three test applications. Without double counting the same output (ie the assessment framework) against multiple indicators it is not possible to identify five core indicators to which this project contributes. We have identified 4 core indicators plus three additional indicators, but this is a very small (in terms of budget and timeframe) project with a very limited number of outputs. Furthermore, the standard indicators were not available at the time the project was planned so a certain amount of retro-fitting is required to address them but it seems counterproductive to retro fit to the extent that the indicators do not actually reflect what the project is seeking to achieve, hence we have not tried to force alignment with five core indicators

Table 1 Project Standard Indicators

DI Indicator number	Name of indicator using original wording	Name of Indicator after adjusting wording to align with DI Standard Indicators	Units	Disaggregation	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
DI-A03	Number of local/national organisations with improved capacity as a result of the project	Number of wildlife user organisations who have tested the 5D framework and found it useful in improving practice	Organisations	None	0			0	3
DI-B02	Number of new/improved species management plans available and endorsed	Number of wildlife use initiatives with improved sustainable use procedures	Number	None	0			0	2
DI-C01	Number of best practice guides and knowledge products published and endorsed	Multi-dimensional framework for assessing sustainability of wild species use available and endorsed	Number	None	0			0	1
DI-C05	Number of projects contributing data insights and case studies to national MEA related reporting processes and calls for evidence	Number of case studies or other inputs based on the framework contributing to CITES and CBD processes	Number	None	0			0	2
DI -C14	Number of decision makers attending briefing events	Number of wildlife managers/users/decision makers reached through project outreach	Number	None	0			0	50

DI Indicator number	Name of indicator using original wording	Name of Indicator after adjusting wording to align with DI Standard Indicators	Units	Disaggregation	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
DI-C18	Number of papers published in peer reviewed journals	Number of papers submitted to peer reviewed journals	Number	None	0			0	1
DI – C19	Number of other publications produced	Number of other publications produced	Number	None	0`			0	2

Table 2 Publications

Title	Type (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (authors, year)	Gender of Lead Author	Nationality of Lead Author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. weblink or publisher if not available online)

No publications planned or produced in Year 1

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
Do you have hard copies of material you need to submit with the report? If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number. However, we would expect that most material will now be electronic.	N/A
If you are submitting photos for publicity purposes, do these meet the outlined requirements (see section 16)?	N/A
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.	