

## CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	World Pheasant Association
<b>Project Title:</b>	Strategic planning to safeguard the Green Peafowl
<b>Date of Report:</b>	September 2011
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Philip McGowan director@pheasant.org.uk

**CEPF Region:** Indo-Burma

**Strategic Direction:** Strategic Direction 1 and specifically Investment Priority 1.1: Identify and secure core populations of 67 globally threatened species from overexploitation and illegal trade.

**Grant Amount:** USD12758

**Project Dates:** 12 February 2010-31 June 2011

**Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):** Consultation was wide-ranging but this review and strategic planning project did not involve implementation of any activities.

### Conservation Impacts

***Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.***

Green Peafowl is one of the high priority species singled out for species-specific action in the Ecosystem Profile. Although its historical distribution is very large, it is known from fragmented localities throughout SE Asia. Because its remaining distribution is so highly fragmented it is very difficult to take a species-wide approach to conserving this species, despite its rapidly deteriorating status. There is now both a clear picture of the species' status and a strategy for its conservation. Whilst resources are required for implementation of this strategy, at least the needs are clear. We are seeking funds to co-ordinate the implementation of this strategy.

***Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project against the expected results detailed in the approved proposal.***

We have produced the primary output, which is the production of a status review and conservation strategy. The secondary output, of a published paper, is now in hand. There has been a significant shift in the publication field in conservation journals in the last five years or so and it is now virtually impossible to envisage a single species review and strategy being published in a widely established journal. There has been much debate about this and the trend is increasingly towards publication of papers with wide generality (ie affecting many species and applicable in several different contexts). Publication of this review and strategy is, therefore, likely to be in a more specialized journal, such as the *International Journal of Galliformes Conservation*, *Journal of Threatened Taxa* or, possibly *Forktail*, which is now listed in the ornithological journals.

***Please provide the following information where relevant:***

**Hectares Protected:** N/A

**Species Conserved:** N/A

**Corridors Created:** N/A

***Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.***

The biggest challenge arose from gathering this information and, especially, preparing the conservation strategy, largely remotely. Some differences of opinion on the strategic objectives would have been much better settled in a workshop setting, as would disputes over details of status and habitat requirements.

***Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?***

CEPF subsequently supported two/three field studies on this species and a meeting was held in Bangkok in March 2011 (to coincide with the ATBC conference in Bangkok) to discuss approaches and methods to fieldwork. The basis of a fieldwork-orientated consortium has, therefore, been laid.

## **Lessons Learned**

***Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.***

Despite the perceived costs in holding a workshop in the region to undertake strategic planning, it would, in this instance, have been very helpful indeed. We employed the 'new' IUCN SSC approach to Strategic Conservation Planning and, as noted in the strategy itself, we modified this so that it was far more relevant to the urgent nature of the Green Peafowl's situation. Therefore, rather than having an 'inspirational' Vision, we had one that is more basic, but is nonetheless likely to be very challenging to achieve.

A second issue is that of responsibility for undertaking/promoting the necessary actions. This could have been widely discussed at a workshop and agreement reached on the approach to take. The issue arose during the circulation of the strategy and it was difficult to reach agreement as the drawn out nature of reviewing meant that some key reviewers were not able to contribute continually. This could have been addressed during an intensive 2-3 day meeting.

***Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)***

As noted above, a strategic planning workshop would have strengthened both the document and also the network of contacts built up.

***Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)***

None

***Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:***

There is great concern for this species, but a real concern is that implementing meaningful actions is very difficult indeed. This is because of the scale of action necessary – stopping hunting, which is so embedded in many communities, is a significant task. Beneficial actions are, therefore, likely to be conducted alongside existing conservation interventions.

## **ADDITIONAL FUNDING**

***Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.***

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
World Pheasant Association	A	2000	WPA staff time on project and in developing applications to implement strategy

***\*Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:***

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- C** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

### **Sustainability/Replicability**

***Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.***

The fundamental issue is long-term sustainability and in this case this is implementing the strategy. The over-riding issue is hunting and how this might be curtailed. It is such a significant issue and one that faces many species in SE Asia. Next steps are, therefore, likely to involve promoting Green Peafowl needs into existing conservation programmes/activities and urging managers and others to take action to reduce hunting. This will be difficult as the fundamental need is for staff time to urge and co-ordinate the strategy's implementation and it is difficult to obtain funds for this.

***Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.***

Initially we saw this project as a one-off piece of work, with a view to exploring the potential to implement the strategy. We are now involved in two survey/field projects and are seeking funds to promote the implementation of the strategy. We have one application submitted (resubmission requested) and so are encouraged that there is a chance of securing some funds to carry on this work.

The work is also generating discussion within IUCN SSC's Subcommittee on Species Conservation Planning where the challenge is to create strategic plans for species conservation that are both well founded and have the best chance of implementation. Green Peafowl exemplifies the challenges facing such strategies because of the dispersed nature of priority populations and the relentless nature of pressures on them.

### **Safeguard Policy Assessment**

***Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.***

There were none required.

**Performance Tracking Report Addendum**

**CEPF Global Targets**

**(Enter Grant Term)**

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.  
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

<b>Project Results</b>	<b>Is this question relevant?</b>	<b>If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.</b>	<b>Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.</b>	<b>Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011. (Attach annexes if necessary)</b>
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	No			Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No			Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	No			

**If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table.**



## **Additional Comments/Recommendations**

## **Information Sharing and CEPF Policy**

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

### **Please include your full contact details below:**

**Name:** Dr Philip McGowan

**Organization name:** World Pheasant Association

**Mailing address:** Newcastle Biology Field Station, Close House Estate, Heddon on the Wall,  
Newcastle, NE15 0HT

**Tel:** +44 (0) 1661 853397

**Fax:**

**E-mail:** [director@pheasant.org.uk](mailto:director@pheasant.org.uk)