



**Mid-Term Review Report:
20-007 Developing a
propoor,
sustainable bushmeat
harvesting model in
Cameroon**

**Submitted to Defra and DFID by Dr Kay
Farmer, LTS International Ltd.**

15 January 2015




Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs


UKaid
from the British people



LTS International Ltd

Pentlands Science Park, Bush Loan
Penicuik, EH26 0PL
United Kingdom

Tel. +44 (0)131 440 5500

Fax. +44 (0)131 440 5501

Email. mail@ltsi.co.uk

Web. www.ltsi.co.uk

Twitter. @LTS_Int

Registered in Scotland Number 100833

Executive Summary

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) report outlines the findings from a review conducted on the Darwin Initiative project, 20-007 'Developing a pro-poor, sustainable bushmeat harvesting model in Cameroon'. The section summarises key findings and recommendations although the latter can be viewed in full in Section 6¹. This project seeks to identify, implement and evaluate key factors necessary to establish a pro-poor model in south-eastern Cameroon. The expected outcome is a reduction in multi-dimensional poverty amongst poor communities living in and around the Dja Biosphere Reserve (DBR) by enabling them to earn an income legally, and contribute to long-term food security whilst reducing the unregulated take of wildlife in the region. A Community Hunting Zone with sustainable offtake quotas, and collection permits for traders, will legalise hunting and trade. This should improve short- and long-term food security for vulnerable communities if the systems are adequately supported and regulated.

The project demonstrates a good balance between biodiversity and poverty elements. Food security is a serious issue for communities living in areas close to the reserve, and their level of dependency on bushmeat for both income and protein is significant. Without intervention biodiversity in the reserve will be, if not already, severely compromised.

Vulnerable communities are targeted although the project is recommended to consider how it will include Baka traders. The need to support the development of alternatives (income and protein) however is paramount to avoiding a future food security crisis in the region and for real community buy-in to tackling poaching. The project partners will be working to identify funders to support these activities (which are outside the scope of the main Darwin project). **The project has the opportunity to formally capture more poverty benefits than stated in the original application.**

The project is learning based and participatory, and throughout has continually reviewed evidence to adapt its strategy. Whilst this approach has caused delays, it is the best method given what the project is trying to achieve, and should deliver a more effective and sustainable project. Delays will mean that the implementation period will be shorter than originally envisaged which may compromise verification of the model. Should this be the case, and given the longevity of lead and partner organisations working together, the reviewer is convinced resources will be found to complete the data collection and provide sufficient support to community governance structures. **In light of delays, and discussions during the review, the project needs to review its updated logframe and work plan, and SMARTEN its indicators now baseline data is available.** This should be completed as soon as possible to ensure timely organisation and implementation. The project may still

¹ Section 6 includes 12 project, 7 programme, and 2 practitioner level recommendations.

achieve the outcome despite the complexities and delays (it was given a score of two, meaning likely to be largely achieved, in the Annual Report Review). **Prior to the review the project provided an updated logframe and this should be a prerequisite for any Darwin Initiative review.**

There is a long history of collaboration between the lead and partner institutions that includes a positive mix of conservation, development, environmental and M&E expertise. Previously established relationships, and knowledge and experience on the local context, have been invaluable to move forward this complex and highly sensitive community driven project. The project works very closely with the government and a seconded staff member serves as Project Manager. **A lesson learnt for biodiversity practitioners is to give the government a concrete role that has a clear tangible benefit for their own department.** Furthermore the inclusion of a partner specifically to support M&E provides a welcome dimension to the collaborative partnership. **The Darwin Initiative should look at how best to deliver learning on this topic to benefit a broader number of projects without such expertise.**

Whilst the project is only mid-way its impact can already be seen. At the project level a great deal of learning has taken place, particularly around M&E. At the community level there has been a reported change in attitude concerning hunting, and communities are more conscious of what constitutes illegal and legal activities, and reasons why it is important to operate legally. Discussions about hunting and trade now take place openly. The register of guns is a surprising but significant conservation and security resource for local authorities. There is strong community interest to participate, emerging strong local leadership, and communities are organising themselves. The project design has incorporated sustainability and legacy into its design from the offset. The project is being driven by the communities with partners mainly providing facilitative and technical support. Financial support is purposely limited (to avoid dependency) and the focus is on supporting the development and management of structures and systems that will provide appropriate locally developed incentives and ownership.

The project has highlighted that a participatory planning process with stakeholders should be an integral part of the project design. This project uniquely combines research and community development but where the communities are a research partner rather than simply being the subject matter. Furthermore that adaptive management is crucial to adopt from project design and throughout implementation. It is this approach that is more likely to lead to success rather than following a specified but unworkable plan. Consultation with externally generated knowledge is crucial to build on existing experience. At the project level a great deal of learning has clearly taken place, and adaptive management demonstrates inward reflection. At the same time the project recognises that there is much to be gained from external consultation, for example through the establishment of a formal structure to solicit external feedback. It is this outward looking and collaborative approach that can help projects maximise their impact.

Community engagement in public forums is essential to ensuring that national conservation and development policies are framed by and responsive to local realities. The results of this project will provide input to the updated Dja Biosphere Management Plan, and the IUCN 'Regional Action Plan for Chimpanzees and Gorillas in Western Equatorial Africa'. The project has necessarily been through a lengthy period of learning and adaptation. It is now at a stage where it has baseline data, and a strategy to establish the necessary structures and systems. There is much discussion on how to best capture and communicate results and lessons learnt but this needs more focus and planning. This should include discussions on how communication and advocacy can contribute to national development policy (Output 4).

It is timely for the project to develop a knowledge sharing strategy to consider how best to communicate results to the different target audiences.

Acronyms

BCSF	Bristol Conservation & Science Foundation
CHZ	Community Hunting Zone
CoP	Community of Practice
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DBR	Dja Biosphere Reserve
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs
DFID	Department for International Development
DI	Darwin Initiative
EAZA	European Association of Zoos & Aquaria
FCFA	Central African Franc
FCTV	Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante
IUCN/SSC/PSG/SGA	International Union of the Conservation Nature, Species Survival Commission, Primate Specialist Group, Great Apes Section
LEF	Living Earth Foundation
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MINFOF	Ministry for Forests & Wildlife
MINRESI	Ministry for Research Science & Innovation
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
SMART	Specific Measureable Achievable Relevant Time-bound
TRIDOM	Tri-national Dja- Odzala-Minkébé landscape
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation & Development
UoB	University of Birmingham
ZSL	Zoological Society of London

Contents

2.1 PROJECT SUMMARY	1
2.2 SCOPE OF THE REVIEW	3
3.1 PARTNERSHIPS	4
3.2 RELEVANCE	7
3.3 EFFICIENCY	10
3.4 EFFECTIVENESS	13
3.5 IMPACT	19
3.6 SUSTAINABILITY	21
3.7 INFLUENCE	22
3.8 INNOVATIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICE	23
4. PROGRAMME REVIEW	24
OUTPUT 1: GOOD APPLICATIONS BECOME GOOD PROJECTS	24
OUTPUT 2: THERE IS INCREASED KNOWLEDGE OF THE LINKAGES BETWEEN BIODIVERSITY AND POVERTY AND MECHANISMS/APPROACHES THAT CAN SECURE GAINS IN BIODIVERSITY AND POVERTY.	24
OUTPUT 3: POSITIVE GAINS IN POVERTY ALLEVIATION DEMONSTRATED IN PRACTICAL BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION FIELD PROJECTS.	25
OUTPUT 4: CAPACITY TO UNDERTAKE WORK SUPPORTING BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION.	26
5. CONCLUSIONS	26
6. RECOMMENDATIONS	27
ANNEX I: UPDATED LOGFRAME	30
ANNEX II: PEOPLE CONSULTED	38
ANNEX III: MATERIALS REVIEWED AS PART OF THE MTR	39

1. Introduction

2.1 Project summary

Project Reference	20-007
Project Title	Developing a pro-poor, sustainable bushmeat harvesting model in Cameroon
Country	Cameroon
Lead Institution	Bristol Conservation and Science Foundation (BCSF)
Partner institutions	Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante (FCTV); Living Earth Foundation (LEF); University of Bristol (UoB)
Darwin Grant Value	£227,158
Start/end dates of project	01/04/2013-31/03/2016
Funder	DFID
Reviewer	Dr Kay H. Farmer, LTS International

In south-eastern Cameroon, illegal hunting (poaching) and trade in wildlife has important impacts on the livelihoods of the rural poor, providing both affordable sources of animal protein and livelihood opportunities for men as hunters and women as traders. However, poor communities living around the Dja Biosphere Reserve² feel they are unfairly victimized by efforts to tackle illegal practices, whilst external traders, responding to a growing demand from urban areas, operate with impunity. This lucrative trade is threatening the long-term food security of the rural poor, as well as impacting negatively on threatened species in the area. Despite the potential economic and biodiversity benefits of a locally-managed and regulated sustainable trade in animals hunted in the wild, there has been little field testing of such models in Cameroon. There is a lack of evidence-based data demonstrating the link between sustainable wildlife harvesting and poverty reduction. These problems were identified following extensive consultation with poor Baka and Bantu communities living close to the reserve, discussions with The Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MINFOF) and other conservation partners, and consultation of the existing literature.

The project is focused on the identification, implementation and evaluation of key factors necessary to establish a pro-poor sustainable wildlife-harvesting model in south-eastern Cameroon. The expected outcome is a reduction in multi-dimensional poverty amongst poor communities living in and around the reserve by enabling them to earn an income legally, and contribute to long-term food security whilst reducing the unregulated take of wildlife in the region. Lessons learned from the evaluation of project processes will feed into the development of an updated Dja Biosphere Reserve Management Plan, and provide data to support the integration of planning for sustainable wildlife management into national development policy.

² <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/407>

According to the current (and original logframe) the expected outputs of the project are:

- Production of a publication for peer-review, covering the implementation and evaluation of a sustainable harvesting model and its impact on poverty indicators (Output 1).
- Hunters and wildlife meat traders across eight³ communities in the Western periphery of the reserve respecting agreed wildlife quotas and providing regular (monthly) data on hunting practice and wildlife consumption, triangulated by game guard reports and third party NGO reports (Output 2).
- Local communities play a more active role in anti-poaching strategies, and are supported in this by the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife game guards (Output 3).
- Project learning influences policy formulation at the regional level and national level, leading to the integration of identified activities into Dja Biosphere Management Plan and national development policy (Output 4).

The first year of the project was spent focusing on defining the parameters of the model. This has included substantive stakeholder engagement to facilitate participation and buy-in, and the collection and presentation of socio-economic and biological baseline data.

The main change to the original project design, discussed in the first Half Year report, is that of the target area. At the time of the project conception, the project partners worked closely with the Conservator of the reserve to identify an appropriate target area, the Western periphery of the reserve. It was subsequently decided by the Conservator (and with the agreement of the project partners) that the project, which seeks to promote a sustainable, legal, commercial trade in wildlife meat, should not work too close to the periphery of a protected area where all commercial hunting is illegal and where the project would face significant problems in determining the provenance of the wildlife meat in question. Following wider stakeholder consultation, a final target site, the Lomié district to the East of the reserve, was selected. This district had already started the ground work for a Community Hunting Zone. Working within the framework of this hunting zone will enable the project to address the legal difficulties associated with trying to develop a sustainable (and legal) wild-caught meat trade in an area where high levels of hunting are carried out in a protected area.

Following the process of presenting and discussing the results of biological and socio-economic data, the location of the hunting zone was further refined and proposed for the northern part of the target area with higher levels of animal populations, and a realistic potential for agreeing targets for sustainable offtake⁴. The application for the Community Hunting Zone is due to be submitted in early 2015. To legalise trade of legally hunted

³ Expanded to 11 after the project started.

⁴ Biological surveys showed that animal populations outside of the reserve have been greatly impacted by hunting activity, with the southern part of the proposed target area being very low in animal presence.

wildlife, the project is also working with bushmeat traders to obtain collection permits. A Community Hunting Zone and collection permits should theoretically improve short- and long-term food security for vulnerable communities, assuming the systems are adequately regulated.

The project recognises that there will need to be a greater emphasis placed on alternatives, both in terms of income and also food sources, for real community buy-in to tackling poaching, and paramount to avoiding a future food security crisis in the region⁵. The project partners will be working to identify funders to support these activities (which are outside the scope of the main Darwin project).

An unexpected but positive output from the project is a register of guns. Cameroonian law dictates that everyone with a gun should register it and pay an annual fee of 5000 FCFA (£6.00) although this is rarely done. With hunter permission Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante compiled a list of the guns and paid the first annual fee for each gun holder⁶. This resulted in the registration of 127 guns, representing not only an important conservation but security resource for local authorities.

The project is a learning based project and throughout has reviewed evidence to continually adapt its strategy. This has caused delays to the project but should deliver a more effective and sustainable approach. Delays however will mean that the implementation period (data collection once the Community Hunting Zone and collection permits are established) will be shorter than originally envisaged which may compromise verification of the model. Given the strong partnership and length of operating period in the region, the reviewer is confident that the project partners will find the resources to fully test the model should this be an issue.

2.2 Scope of the review

The Mid-Term Review is primarily intended to provide an external perspective on project progress and future direction for the benefit of the project partners and the Darwin Initiative. It is a formative review that is designed to:

- i. Ensure that the project activities are being delivered efficiently and effectively, and
- ii. Improve the project's design as it is rolled out.

⁵ The project has identified activities, outside of the scope of current project, important to support the project outcome, and partners will be seeking funding for these activities. This includes the establishment of a core protection zone where the potential for ecotourism will be explored; and support for income generation activities which will provide alternative and new sources of income, as well as theoretically increasing food security to poor people by providing new, alternative sources of animal protein to illegal hunting. The local council has money from timber royalties for local development projects. Local people can apply for money but thus far it has mainly been used for highly visible political activities (e.g., road and bridge building). The project is planning to advocate for food security (which it reports is not a local priority but clearly is nationally (Section 3.2), work with the local council to help develop agriculture practice for example, and help communities to submit applications for this money.

⁶ An amnesty was given to all gun holders so they could declare their weapons with impunity.

The project was assessed against the original proposal and logical framework combined with a host-country field visit 8-16 November 2014. Methods employed included:

- Document review of project documents submitted to Darwin Initiative including project management and technical documents.
- Semi-structured interviews and facilitated discussions with the Project Team at Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante.
- Semi-structured interviews and discussions with Living Earth Foundation Project Manager.
- Telephone interview with Project Leader at Bristol Conservation and Science Foundation.
- Participation in field based meetings with community leaders, hunters, bushmeat traders and government forestry staff⁷.
- Participation in a Community of Practice (CoP) meeting (project advisory structure).

The full list of people interviewed is included in Annex II. The MTR followed the OECD DAC and Darwin criteria for evaluating development assistance (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability) with specific questions set out in the Terms of Reference under these criteria. The scope of the review is split into a review of the Project against the Project Objectives and secondly against Programme Objectives. The report concludes with a series of recommendations at the project, programme and practitioner level.

2. Project review

3.1 Partnerships

There is a long history of collaboration between the lead and partner institutions, a positive mix of conservation, development, environmental, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) expertise.

The mission of the Bristol Conservation & Science Foundation is to identify and implement sustainable solutions to species and ecosystem conservation challenges, through research, action and local collaboration. The foundation, an operating unit of the Bristol Zoological Society⁸, has expertise in the design and implementation of methodologies to assess changes in biological data (animal and plant, including habitat quality), and has a team of biological scientists at the zoo and overseas. They have worked in the target area since 2003 (with the partner organisations) and are responsible for overall project management, reporting and administration.

⁷ The reviewer was introduced to community groups as a representative from the Darwin Initiative interested in learning more about the project, without directly mentioning the terms evaluation, donor etc., to mitigate any potential problems for the project.

⁸ The Society has recently completed a Darwin project in the Comoro Islands, which was co-funded by the French Development Agency, with a £1.2m budget over three years.

Living Earth Foundation⁹ specialises in working with people to resolve their social and environmental challenges across education, environmental and community development projects. They pooled resources and skills with Bristol Conservation & Science Foundation to provide technical advice, mentoring and organizational capacity development support to the local partner Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante. Their Programme Manager acts as the Project Manager, working under the technical guidance of the Project Leader. They provided support to the Darwin application; worked with the local partner on consultations with communities and government counterparts to inform the project design; and have provided training to the national partner in Participatory Learning and Action techniques and socio-economic data collection, monitoring and analysis. The role of Living Earth Foundation role draws upon their 25 year experience of working in community-based development in Cameroon and internationally.

Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante¹⁰ is a Cameroonian organisation working to promote sustainable development and facilitate solutions to the environmental problems facing Cameroon. They are the local implementing partner and responsible for the field implementation of project activities, in particular community engagement activities, community and game guard training, and local data collection and verification. The organisation conducted consultations with communities and game guards to inform the development of this proposal, and their local knowledge helped ensure that the project allowed for sufficient resources to meet the project purpose. They have had a long-term presence of working in the area, and serve as the secretariat of the Dja Actors Forum (a forum for organisations working around the reserve to communicate and collaborate).

The University of Bristol designed the framework for data capture to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed project. The University of Bristol has world-class expertise in evaluation design and data collection when working in socio-economic and environmental change, and conducting analyses of impact and effectiveness. The specific experience of the partner's focal point for this project is Elliott Stern who has advised, designed and led evaluations for OECD, UNESCO, European Commission, World Bank etc. During the project development phase, Bristol Conservation & Science Foundation and the University of Bristol worked together to identify the appropriate monitoring and evaluation system to be used, and Elliot provided substantive technical guidance and advice including helping the project work through its Theory of Change.

⁹ Relevant previous projects include CARPE funded 'Joint game guard-community collaboration on anti-poaching measures' (2011); FAO funded 'Implicating Communities in FLEGT around the DBR' (2010-2011); EC and FCO funded 'Dja Community Periphery Engagement Project' (2006-2008); DFID funded 'Cameroon Environmental Education Support Project' (2002-2006); Cameroon Environmental Education Support Programme II (2002-2006), funded by the EU and Darwin Initiative; and Darwin Training Programme for Integrated Protected Area Management in Ghana 2005-2008.

¹⁰ Previous projects include CARPE funded 'Joint game guard-community collaboration on anti-poaching measures' (2011); FAO funded 'Implicating Communities in FLEGT around the DBR' (2010-2011); EC and FCO funded 'Dja Community Periphery Engagement Project' (2006-2008); and DFID funded 'Cameroon Environmental Education Support Project' (2002-2006).

Bristol Conservation & Science Foundation, Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante, and Living Earth Foundation have been working together around the reserve since 2003, representing a long collaborative history of working in the target area. This has provided knowledge on the local context from the start, and the project has benefitted substantially from already established relationships with local communities, organisations and government agencies. These relationships have been invaluable to move forward this complex and highly sensitive community driven project. In observing the interaction between the partner organisations, there appears to be a very good working relationship, and from discussions and reports, regular visits and exchanges between the partners, and regular stakeholder meetings with the target communities. The communities appear to have a great deal of trust in Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante, providing access to information previously denied to other organisations (e.g., providing information on number of guns kept, and hunting of fully protected Class A species). The stakeholder meeting during the review was very participatory, honest and vocal, demonstrating positive and open relationships between the local partner and communities.

The other key collaborating institution on the project is the Government of Cameroon. Dr. Jules Nguenguim was seconded from the Ministry of Scientific Research and Innovation (MINRESI) to Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante as the in-country Project Manager. The local organisation has a close working relationship with the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife. As highlighted in Section 2.1 at the time of project conception, and during the project, the partners worked closely with the Conservator of the reserve to identify an appropriate target area. The project partners also worked closely with the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife on the collection of biological baseline data to enable the project to determine the parameters for the sustainable wildlife meat trade model. Lessons learned concerning Government partnerships is the importance of ensuring that they have a concrete role to play and can see a tangible benefit for their own department.

A Community of Practice (CoP) has been established with representation from the Ministry for Research and Scientific Innovation, Ministry for Forests and Wildlife, TRAFFIC/IUCN, Université of Dschang Yaoundé, the Institute of Agricultural Research for Development, and the UNOPS/Tri-national Dja- Odzala-Minkébé (TRIDOM) landscape partnership. In this forum a variety of actors can provide feedback on project strategy and activities. The reviewer attended such a meeting where for example, TRAFFIC's representative offered to connect the project to a women's association in the Democratic Republic of Congo that has succeeded in creating a wild meat market in Europe. The reviewer met with the Country Director of the Zoological Society of London Cameroon programme during the field visit. The local partner has been interested for some time in this organisation becoming involved in the project and was introduced remotely. It is this outward looking and collaborative approach that helps projects maximise their impact.

Recommendations to biodiversity practitioners:

When possible, provide government partners with concrete roles so they can see a tangible benefit for their own department.

Projects should look to external partners to provide a positive blend of required expertise. Partnerships can be direct and one-to-one or convened in a collective structure.

3.2 Relevance

The project is locally relevant; it has been driven by community needs and has capitalised on previous activities and structures:

The project identified a high level of dependency by local communities on bushmeat for both income and provision of protein. Bushmeat traders in a meeting during the review recognised the importance of protecting the forest to protect the animals inside the forest on which they depend so much¹¹. As well as a source of protein, culturally bushmeat is important, perceived to keep people strong and healthy, whereas other meat such as chicken is expensive and eaten on special occasions. Hunters have recognised declining levels of wildlife indicated by longer distances travelled to hunt.

The target area Lomié previously started the application process for a Community Hunting Zone. Whilst a lack of finance halted the process, this highlights that the intended outcome of the project is locally relevant and driven. Their earlier application required the establishment of a Management Committee, and it was agreed at the community meeting during the review to keep this existing structure with revisions, e.g., to add representatives from newly participating villages. At the same meeting a list of actions required to progress the application for a Community Hunting Zone were discussed with time frames and persons responsible agreed on.

The project appears appropriately designed given its intended outcome, and includes considerations of both vulnerable and female populations:

The project partners spent the first twelve months defining the parameters of the model (including collection of socio-economic and biological baseline data), twice as long originally envisaged. Whilst this may reflect an over ambitious initial project design, real world conservation rarely adheres to a logical framework, and stakeholder engagement can take substantive time even when partners have been working in the region for some time. With an action learning lens, the project has successfully evolved as the learning process has taken place. The process of getting to this point, and this strategy (along with collection permits for traders) appears to be the only strategy to achieve legitimacy of hunting and trade of non-protected species. As highlighted in Section 2.1 the project has stated that a focus on alternative livelihoods will be necessary to support outcome, impact and sustainability; this

¹¹ At the same traders also stated that protecting the forest was important as it kept Ebola inside. The threat of Ebola has had a big impact on their sales to Yaoundé (not local) due to strong messages from the government to not eat bushmeat. This trade however is slowly returning to normal.

will be explored by partners outside of the current project.

The project by design aims to have a positive impact on the most vulnerable, as at its very core is focused on developing a pro-poor sustainable bushmeat harvesting model. In communities close to the reserve the current average income of a Baka household is £7.00 per month and Bantu £26.00 per month (both tribes were represented at the community meeting of during the review). Hunting represents the primary source of income (for men) but the complicated and costly procedures for obtaining permits forces local hunters into illegality. The same complex and costly process applies to obtaining permits for bushmeat traders. The project is working with traders, who are predominately female, to obtain collection permits which will allow them to trade legally¹². As a consequence of support received from the project the number of bushmeat associations has increased from one to six. Currently however bushmeat trader associations only include Bantu and not Baka representatives. A Community Hunting Zone and collection permits should theoretically improve short- and long-term food security for vulnerable communities, assuming the systems are adequately regulated. Community engagement in public forums is essential to ensuring that national conservation and development policies are framed by and responsive to local realities.

The project is highly relevant given national biodiversity and development priorities, with the Ministry of Scientific Research and Innovation formally recognising it as a research project of national importance:

The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2003)¹³ for Cameroon recognises that the country is endowed with unusually rich and diverse ecological, cultural, and anthropological systems, and if sustainably managed will significantly improve the livelihoods of Cameroon's population. It notes that several important ecosystems are rapidly deteriorating due to unsustainable exploitation, and that as a direct consequence Cameroon's forests have lost 100,000 hectares per year over the last two decades. This is amongst the highest in the Congo Basin. To reverse this trend the government prepared a Natural Resources Development and Protection Programme, especially targeting Cameroon's fauna. Cameroon's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2012)¹⁴ states that between 2000-2012 protected areas have almost doubled, with the creation of protected production areas increased to 72 hunting zones, and community forests to 301 sites during 2004–2011. The same document however states that biodiversity hotspots have received inadequate attention in terms of protection causing them to degenerate, and forest reserves have decreased by nearly one third as a result of recent conversion of forest reserves to other land uses. This document also highlights the causes and consequences of biodiversity loss, and establishes the link between biodiversity, development and wealth creation (poverty alleviation). Major direct and indirect causes of biodiversity loss are identified including

¹² Collection permits are reliant on the approval of the Community Hunting Zone.

¹³ <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2003/cr03249.pdf>

¹⁴ <https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/cm/cm-nbsap-v2-en.pdf>

illegal exploitation of wildlife species and excessive poaching for food and commercial purposes. Poverty in Cameroon varies according to regions, with higher incidences in the forest zone and in the high plateaus, and increases twofold between urban (22%) and rural areas (50%). Where poverty is generalised, the issue of food insecurity becomes apparent with the poor turning to overharvesting of biodiversity resources and poaching, to sustain their livelihoods. Limited access to productive assets is described as one of the key drivers of biodiversity loss. A major objective of the forestry reform programme is to enhance forest-based income opportunities for village communities to improve the livelihood of the rural population living in the forest zones. Ensuring that socio-economic benefits from biodiversity and ecosystem services underpin the fight against poverty alleviation is a national priority¹⁵. The support for a Community Hunting Zone and collection permits, testing of the model, and lessons learnt for other interested communities, supports the government's strategy to alleviate poverty for rural communities, and Cameroon's vision and targets for biodiversity.

The project reports that the boundaries of the reserve are diminishing, that logging companies have been given a piece of the reserve, and that there is planned mining and associated urban expansion in areas adjacent to the reserve¹⁶. The reserve is a UNESCO Man & Biosphere Reserve and not a national park. The implication of this is that whilst the site has the prestige of being a World Heritage Site, there is limited protection and no direct funding by UNESCO. The project reports that as a consequence the reserve gets neglected (politically and financially) by the Cameroonian government as it is not registered on their list of national protected areas. The Dja Biosphere Reserve Management Plan is being revised in early 2015 (the last iteration expired in 2012), and the results and strategy of this project will provide input and direction to the updated plan (Output 4)¹⁷.

In 2011 the Bristol Conservation & Science Foundation established the Dja Actors Forum, a network of organisations working in and around the reserve. Serving as its secretariat, Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante, is working to ensure that the forum can participate in the development and revisions of the Dja Biosphere Management Plan. The project reports that the current plan contains old boundaries, was developed in a top down manner, and is a list of activities that exist on paper only.

The IUCN Species Survival Commission/Primate Specialist Group/Section on Great Apes is currently finalising the updated 'Regional Action Plan for Chimpanzees and Gorillas in

¹⁵ NBSAP (2012) Strategic Goal C: "Promote the sustainable utilization of biodiversity for wealth creation and contribution to poverty alleviation".

¹⁶ The Progress Report (2008) of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2003) states a 4% growth in forestry and logging, and reference is made to several mining related activities. It does not make reference to specific geographical areas where this growth is taking place. <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2008/cr0801.pdf>

¹⁷ The project has learnt that two consultants have been selected for the task of revising the Dja Biosphere Reserve Management Plan but the release of funds is caught in an administrative process at MINFOP stalling the process. A stakeholder meeting is planned for early 2015. The update (which includes biological surveys across the reserve) is being funded by ECOFAC V.

Western Equatorial Africa¹⁸. The action plan has already reviewed and translated recommendations for the Dja Biosphere Reserve and its environs, but there is an interest to receive information from the project on potential of strategies to reduce and mitigate poaching for great apes in the region. The reviewer has connected the project with the Vice-Chair of the Section on Great Apes.

The project partnership is also working on a concurrent project funded by EAZA assessing the illegal ape-trade market around the reserve, the results of which will feed into the current project, Dja Biosphere Management Plan, and the great ape regional action plan.

Recommendation to the project:

Currently only Bantu bushmeat traders are participating in this project (and represented in bushmeat trader associations). Whilst the Baka trade more informally, their trade activities would remain illegal assuming that the Community Hunting Zone and collection permits are approved. Baka are the most vulnerable of communities and consideration of how they can be included so that they too can trade legally should be considered¹. During the review the Field Officer suggested that the best solution may be the development of a Baka bushmeat trader association.

3.3 Efficiency

The project has adopted an efficient adaptive management style:

The recruitment of a Project Manager seconded from the Ministry of Scientific Research and Innovation to the local partner is to be commended given the knowledge and connections he brings to the project. The Project Manager introduced the idea of using students from the Université de Dschang Yaoundé to live in the villages for six months, collecting socio-economic data, and getting a realistic perspective on the life of the community concerning hunting and livelihoods. This approach also provided an opportunity for the students to engage with local youth and discuss biodiversity related issues. This approach and partnership has helped to cement a relationship of trust with the project¹⁹ whilst at the same time building capacity of a cadre of students interested in biodiversity. The Field Officer employed by the local partner is from the target area, and has existing established relationships with local communities, associations, organisations, and government authorities. The Field officer serves as a Coordinator for a network of local environmental groups.

As previously stated the project is learning based and throughout has reviewed evidence to continually adapt its strategy. This has caused delays to the project but should deliver a more

¹⁸ Tutin, C., Stokes, E., Boesch, C., Morgan, D., Samz, C., Reed, T., Blom, A., Walsh, P., Blake, S., Kormos, R. (2005). Regional Action Plan for the Conservation of Chimpanzees and Gorillas in Western Equatorial Africa. IUCN/SSC Primate Specialist Group Conservation International. Washington, DC. <http://www.primate-sg.org/storage/pdf/WEARAP.pdf>

¹⁹ Demonstrated by surrendering information on the number of guns kept which has led to a register of guns to legalise ownership, and exposing the hunting of fully protected Class A species.

effective and sustainable approach. It is hard to imagine, given the need for such a participatory and action learning approach, how the project could have been more efficient in getting to the point where it is now. The project appears to have kept its outcome in mind but sought to find the most appropriate process to achieve this. In light of the review and accompanying discussions the project is working on a revised work plan for the rest of the project. The project will be submitting a request to move funds within Output 3 to include capacity building for the Management Committee as well as the previously identified village level Monitoring Committees. The Management Committee is a previously unidentified but necessary new structure to support the management of the Community Hunting Zone.

The project application did not include SMART indicators and the feedback letter at Stage 1 did not request them²⁰. At the time of submitting the application baseline data was not available for Indicators 1, 2 and 4, but an estimated percentage increase in e.g., change in socio-economic and biological data, and community attitudes, could have been made. The reviewer believes that in this instance the lack of SMART indicators has not negatively impacted the ability to assess progress and impact. Baseline data is now available and indicators can be smartened. Given delays, and reduction of time to test the model, it is unlikely that the project will see changes in socio-economic and biological data during the project time-line.

The technical methodology applied appears appropriate to define the parameters of the model:

As stated in Section 3.1 Bristol Conservation & Science Foundation has expertise in the design and implementation of methodologies to assess changes in biological data, and Living Earth Foundation, socio-economic data. The Ministry of Forests and Wildlife conducted the biological surveys, and also has the responsibility to set national hunting offtake levels. It is assumed that these survey methods, and the method of calculating offtake is robust²¹. It is important however to take the precautionary approach and get external validation given the importance of, and implications for, wildlife populations in the proposed Community Hunting Zone and adjacent reserve. The project has stated that the biological survey will be repeated in the rainy season, and intensified over a smaller area in the new target area. If local offtake levels exceed national ones, the latter will be followed.

The project has demonstrated a good balance between biodiversity and poverty elements:

The level of dependency of local communities on bushmeat for both income and provision of protein is significant. The need to support the development of alternatives is paramount to avoiding a future food security crisis in the region. The project partners will be working to

²⁰ The feedback letter requested additional information on exit strategy and parameters of the proposed model.

²¹ Calculating offtake is complex and requires good baseline data and knowledge of what is sustainable, otherwise the risk is that the proposed Community Hunting Zone becomes depleted to the same levels as the southern part of the target area.

identify funders to support these activities²². It is important that alternative livelihoods target the right individuals (e.g., hunters, traders) and poorest (rather than the most powerful). Alternative livelihoods must be based on sound market analysis, looking at local needs and preferences, and balanced with what is feasible. Eco-tourism was mentioned frequently (and particularly habituation of great apes which is notoriously complex), and often without reference to the significant investment that would be needed to make this a viable option. Caution is urged to not raise local expectations that this is an easy strategy for income generation²³. This was acknowledged and recognised by some members of the team, but not by others. Diversification of livelihood strategies for communities rather than reliance on a single strategy (eco-tourism as the silver bullet) is a more healthy option.

Recommendations for the project:

During the process of the review there was a great deal of discussion and reflection on future activities for the remainder of the project. Not all these activities are explicit in the current list (although may be included under over-arching headings) and there will be new or adapted activities in light of changing time frames and focus. It is important that the project captures this information as soon as possible to ensure timely organisation and implementation. During the review the project discussed developing a revised work plan and who will take the lead on the first draft.

Baseline data is now available and indicators can be smartened. Whilst changes in socio-economic and biological data are unlikely to be seen during the project time-line, adding SMART indicators will facilitate ongoing assessment of progress and impact for the partner organisations. The same recommendation applies to the next section.

Whilst perhaps implicit in Assumption 2 and 4 the project could consider a specific assumption on respect and application of the law by government authorities (given accusations of corruption against some forest guards), and a functioning sanctioning system in place for those that contravene the law. The project reports that well-connected/elite individuals are connected to illegal hunting and trade. The project is already discussing adding an assumption about Ebola.

Gain external validation on survey methods and calculation of sustainable offtake.

The project could consider capturing a broader range of poverty benefits for example, security (register of guns in the area), empowerment (local leadership development, supporting the development of associations), and vulnerability (inclusion of Baka as a

²² This is outside the scope of the main Darwin project.

²³ Approximately a decade ago the Project Leader undertook an MBA which assessed the possibilities of eco-tourism around the reserve. This document should be consulted, in addition to exploring why a tourism project in the region, run by Fauna and Flora International, closed.

vulnerable people). This will necessitate reflection on appropriate M&E to capture the information.

The project is advised to consult existing experience and information on alternative livelihoods rather than learning by trial and error. Several papers have been shared with the project by the reviewer, and there are many other resources available.

3.4 Effectiveness

The project may still achieve the outcome despite complexities and delays:

As a consequence of delays to the project (as explained in 3.2) the implementation period of testing the model will be shorter than originally envisaged which may compromise its verification. Should this be the case, it is hoped that project partners can find the resources to extend the implementation phase so that sufficient data can be collected, and also to provide support to the newly formed associations developed for monitoring and good governance²⁴. These associations are particularly important given accusations of high level corruption and the need for ground level governance. Given the long history of collaboration between the partners and longevity of working in the area, the reviewer is confident that the project will provide the necessary support so that it can continue. The project may still achieve the outcome despite the complexities and delays; it was given a score of two (likely to be largely achieved) in the Annual Report Review.

Please note for this section that no baselines or targets were provided in the application logframe.

Output 1: Production of a publication for peer-review, covering the implementation and evaluation of a sustainable harvesting model and its impact on poverty indicators:

The key indicators for this output are: (1) Publication produced in appropriate journal and disseminated; (2) Percentage change in biodiversity indicators through transects and biodiversity surveys; (3) Percentage change in household income of hunters/traders participating in harvesting model.

Whilst it is too early to have an article published, a range of activities support the delivery of this output and the focus has been on obtaining baseline data for Indicators 2 and 3. Key headlines of the findings include²⁵:

- The average monthly income per hunter is 14,032 FCFA (£17) (the minimum wage in Cameroon is 36,000 FCFA).

²⁴ Once the project has a clearer idea of progress, and if it wishes to submit a request for a re-budget (equivalent to a no-cost extension), it should bear in mind that DEFRA reviews all requests with their justification, and that not all applications are approved.

²⁵ The socio-economic study covered 259 households across 26 villages in the Lomié district of south-eastern Cameroon. It followed 34 hunters on a daily basis over a period of 6 months (with MSc students living in the villages during this time) during February-July 2014.

- 20% of meat is consumed locally within the households (subsistence), 80% is sold.
- In the study area, the average amount of total meat caught per month is 5600Kg, equivalent to 3,060,680 FCFA (£3674) of revenue per month. These figures represent the amount of animal protein and income equivalents that would need to be replaced in the event of all hunting activities being banned.
- The original area for the Community Hunting Zone was in close proximity to the reserve where all hunting is illegal. The study showed that 73% of meat was caught inside the Dja Biosphere Reserve.
- The biological survey identified 17 mammal species in the target area, with the most abundant species being duiker (55% of all species). There was also evidence of protected species - chimpanzees and gorillas (10% and 14% of sightings respectively).
- Analysis of the data shows a comparatively low number of animals present in the southern part of the target area, compared to what 'should' be there in terms of habitat quality. Analysis indicates that there are an insufficient number of animal to support even a small offtake of animals in this area as the thresholds for sustainable take appear to already have been exceeded.

As stated in Section 2.1 the new target area for the Community Hunting Zone has been agreed on, and application for the hunting zone will be submitted in early 2015. The paperwork for collection permits is underway, with the hope that the hunting zone will be approved. Collection of percentage change in biological and household income data is reliant on approval of the hunting zone and collection permits, and testing of the model.

The project is accumulating a huge amount of information and data. It hopes to start writing one paper for publication based on their learning process in early 2015. A publication based on testing the model can only come at the very end of the project. The project is also exploring other communication and knowledge sharing needs and mechanisms.

Recommendations for the project:

As per Section 3.3, get external validation of methods for calculating offtake.

The project has necessarily been through a lengthy period of learning and adaptation. It is now at a stage where it has baseline data, and a strategy to establish the necessary structures and systems. There is much discussion on how to best capture and communicate results and lessons learnt (now and further along), but this needs more focus and planning. Currently discussions on increasing visibility are not focused on how communication and advocacy are contributing to national development policy (Output 4). It is now timely to focus on developing a knowledge sharing strategy for the project. In addition to writing scientific publications and technical briefs, the project is also interested for example in developing a tool kit to guide the development and management of Community Hunting Zone based on project experience and lessons learnt. The Bristol Conservation & Science

Foundation communications (and science) departments may be able to provide guidance to the project on appropriate knowledge sharing platforms.

Output 2: Hunters and wildlife meat traders across eight communities in the Western periphery of the reserve respecting agreed wildlife quotas and providing regular (monthly) data on hunting practice and wildlife consumption, triangulated by game guard reports and third party NGO reports:

The key indicators for this output are: (1) No. of hunters/traders participating in wildlife harvesting model (disaggregated by gender); (2) Changes to hunting and sale of wildlife practice (including species hunted/sold; traps/equipment used; ratio of local consumption at village level to sales at local market); (3) No. of seizures of illegal wildlife in target area (disaggregated by village, and by level of involvement in project). As with Output 1 the focus thus far has been on data collection to help guide the development of the strategy.

The number of communities involved in this project has increased from eight to eleven (nine Bantu and two Baka). Approximately 200 hunters and 200 traders have been involved in project discussions to date (with gender disaggregation of 60:40 men to women). Looking forward, approximately 100 hunters and 120 traders (through the associations) will be involved intensively in future activities (training, testing the model etc.). At the beginning of the project there was one bushmeat association but as a consequence of the project there are now six with approximately twenty persons per association. It took a while for people to come forward as they were scared of being arrested. Bushmeat traders are predominately female; during the review a meeting of bushmeat traders was held in Lomié with nearly 90% female representation (seven female, one male). As stated previously the submission of applications for collection permits, and legalisation of trade, is reliant on the approval of the Community Hunting Zone.

It is too early to report on any changes to hunting and sale of wildlife practice, seizures of illegal trade in the target area, and reduction in wildlife consumption. However as mentioned in Section 2.1 communities have voluntarily provided information on their guns (and ammunition) to the project and authorities.

The project has worked with eleven communities to develop participatory maps detailing hunting trends in their community and wider area. These maps have been designed to enable the community to identify key entry and exit points for hunters, and to thus better monitor illegal use. However, the maps and associated data demonstrate that the majority of hunting is carried out in reserve as a result of decreasing levels of animal presence outside of the reserve. Whilst local communities are vocal about their enthusiasm to protect 'their' resources, and to monitor, and report, abuse by outsiders, current hunting trends show high levels of local, illegal, exploitation of wildlife. The project recognises that there will need to be a greater emphasis placed on alternatives, both in terms of income and also food sources, if real community buy-in to tackling poaching is to have an impact.

Recommendation to project:

There is a possibility that the Community Hunting Zone will not be approved within the time frame of the project (or at all) or that it will not work out at the target area. The project has discussed this and have an unstated contingency plan e.g., focusing efforts on building community capacity per se rather than purely with a view to establishing the hunting zone. It might however be helpful to formalise this plan which in turn may help to maintain a focus on capacity building/governance.

Output 3: Local communities play a more active role in anti-poaching strategies, and are supported in this by Ministry for Forests & Wildlife game guards:

The key indicators for this output are: (1) No. and quality of interactions between communities and game guards; (2) Community attitudes towards law enforcement; (3) No. of seizures reported as a result of community participation in anti-poaching strategies. As mentioned in the previous section no baselines or targets were provided in the application.

The project has thus far supported the development of community based Monitoring Committees (some are new committees and some already existed but are taking on new anti-poaching roles), participatory maps have been developed, training provided on roles and responsibilities of monitoring committees with game guards, and communication channels between game guards and committees established. Through the project each village now has a Monitoring Committee with a limited mandate to survey the zone.

Qualitative interviews have been conducted to obtain a baseline survey of community-game guard collaboration and engagement attitudes towards law enforcement. The projects Annual Report states that there has been increased interaction between communities and game guards as a result of multi-stakeholder participation on key activities such as workshops, community meetings and trainings. Distrust however remains between communities and game guards and vice versa; the project reports that communities feel beaten and blamed for everything because they have no power whereas they believe more powerful hunters, who hunt Class A species (fully protected), bribe game guards and get away with poaching. The communities however are reportedly open to working with game guards as they want to stop outside hunters from coming in. Game guard opinions differ, some see communities as an asset, others see communities and hunters as being all it in together, and thirdly others see community committees as rivals to game guards²⁶. Whilst the Technical Superintendent (from the Ministry for Forests & Wildlife) that attended the community meeting during the review felt there was currently little attitudinal change, and that communities see the government as repressive, he believed that this would change as they start working together more. The game guard already felt that the gun registry was a

²⁶ This is why for example community Monitoring Committees have not been given phones as projects elsewhere have found this has led to a great deal of jealousy by game guards.

great step forward. He recommended that the Monitoring Committee should be officially recognised, by decree, and given more power beyond monitoring; he would like them to have the power to seize as by the time game guards get to the scene the hunter has often already gone. Whilst it is too early at this stage to ascribe any attitudinal change or to attribute it to the project, the interest to empower Monitoring Committees by the government, and information on guns provided by communities to the government, demonstrate a relationship of trust developing between community level governance mechanisms and government authorities. Whilst it is also very early to look at seizure data, it is encouraging that communities have reported hunting of protected species.

During the review the community meeting discussion focused on the Management Committee, the governance structure for the Community Hunting Zone²⁷. The village Djapostem already has a committee from a failed attempt to establish a hunting zone in 2006 and it was agreed by all communities to keep this existing structure but add representatives from other villages and perhaps change some existing members. The process, timelines and responsible persons, of getting to the point of submitting the application for a Community Hunting Zone, was agreed on. This includes for example the presentation of meeting minutes by those present to other members of their village, and for existing local Management Committee members to go to other villages to ensure the concept of the committee and process is understood. The local partner was asked if they could provide funding for transportation supporting community members to get to these meetings.

Output 4: Project learning influences policy formulation at the regional level and national level, leading to the integration of identified activities into the Dja Biosphere Management Plan and national development policy:

The key indicators for this output are: (1) Project learning integrated into Dja Biosphere Management Plan; (2) No. of references to project findings in third party publications, media reports and policy papers; (3) Project learning integrated into the revision of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.

Activities carried out under this output have focused on establishing channels of communication for the project to share learning. As mentioned in Section 3.1 the Dja Actors Forum was established for organisations working in and around the reserve, and it is hoped this forum will be able to provide input to the Dja Biosphere Management Plan which is being revised in early 2015 (the last iteration expired in 2012). Given delays in starting the

²⁷ In light of the MTR and accompanying discussions the project will be working on a revised work plan for the rest of the project. The project may make a request to move funds within Output 3 to include capacity building for the Management Committee (mentoring process) as well as the previously identified community level Monitoring (anti-poaching) Committees. The Management Committee is a previously unidentified but necessary new structure to support the management of the CHZ.

revision, and to try and reenergise the process, the local partner is discussing writing a letter to the Ministry for Forests and Wildlife to emphasise the importance of updating the plan.

The project has been discussing how it can increase project visibility and advocacy. For example, attendance at an IIED conference in South Africa on community roles in illegal wildlife enforcement, and presentations at a national cultural festival on environmental services. A national television channel CRT TV made a film about the project (Y1 Q4 and Y2 Q1) which was aired several times (Y2 Q4)²⁸. The project is interested in getting featured on a national television series 'Science and Development'. No news articles have been written on the project yet. Currently discussions on increasing visibility are not focused on how communication and advocacy are contributing to national development policy (Output 4), and this links back to the recommendation in Section 3.4 concerning formalising the knowledge sharing strategy.

The project is also looking at other ways to share learning. The Conservator of the reserve has visited the project site. Once the Community Hunting Zone is in place the project would like to bring someone from the Ministry for Forests and Wildlife Yaoundé office for them to see how the project and hunting zone works. Furthermore to take some members of the Management Committee to visit established hunting zones as working examples, and degraded areas in the North-west to demonstrate what can happen if forests become empty, areas degraded etc.²⁹. The project wants to film aspects of the exchange visit to show committee and community members to broaden learning.

Cameroon's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP II) was finalised in 2012. Given its recent completion, with strategic goals and targets set for 2020, it is unclear how the project plans to integrate learning (Indicator 3 for Output 4) unless it is referring to the next iteration.

The majority of assumptions remain valid, and the project has demonstrated an adaptive management style in the face of operational, technical and cultural challenges:

At the output level, the project made the following assumptions:

- (1) Traditional hunters and wildlife traders open to engagement by the project;
- (2) Game guards open to collaboration with local communities;
- (3) Economic and social benefits of the harvesting model provide sufficient incentives for participation;

²⁸ The project reports a mixed reaction to the film by communities in the target area. Reportedly city dwellers were surprised about traditional lifestyles, and the number of guns for example; the project discussed whether this represents a disconnect between bushmeat consumption in urban environments and where it comes from.

²⁹ The project is planning to submit an application to the Rufford Foundation to fund the exchange visits.

(4) National government open to policy dialogue.

The project states that assumptions (1) and (2) have held true. This has been demonstrated throughout this and previous sections. Assumption (3) will be tested as part of the feasibility analysis that will be conducted following the completion of data collection. In terms of Assumption (4), the project reports a significant disconnect between government rhetoric and action in terms of promoting conservation in the wider Dja Biosphere landscape. Changes have been made to the reserves periphery boundary, allowing the government to auction off previously protected space to logging companies, with a correspondingly negative impact of biodiversity conservation in the region. As previously indicated the government has however agreed to revise the Management Plan for the reserve.

Not an original project assumption, but the project partners are monitoring the potential impact of Ebola on the project. Whilst there have not been any cases of Ebola in Cameroon, concerns about Ebola are impacting the bushmeat trade. In a time of heightened concerns about Ebola, this could impact on government providing authorisations to support legal hunting and trade (e.g. supporting the establishment of the Community Hunting Zone and collection permits for bushmeat traders). Currently this is a hypothetical risk but one that has been signalled by the project. The current Ebola crisis has had an unexpected benefit, in that the fear of disease has led some people to consider alternatives to wild-caught meat. The partners are looking to build on this opportunity for behavioural change but acknowledge that it will not last in the long-term unless the knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP) of people becomes tacit, understanding the dangers of eating wild-caught meat. Bushmeat traders in Lomié stated that whilst local trade was unaffected, trade from Yaoundé was, but that this was already returning to normal.

Sections 2.1 and 3.2 highlights the extent of the projects ability to adapt its approach in response to changing assumptions and risks.

Recommendation for the project:

Refer to Section 3.3 concerning adding an assumption about respect and application of the law, and a functioning sanctioning system.

3.5 Impact

The project is mid-way and due to the participatory and adaptive management nature of the design, is now only at the point where it is moving ahead with an agreed strategy. It is however already demonstrating an impact at the local and project level.

The project has had an impact on local stakeholder and partner knowledge on M&E, biodiversity, and socio-economic context:

At the project level a great deal of learning has clearly taken place. This project uniquely combines research and community development but where the communities are a research

partner rather than simply being the subject matter. The process of action research (activity/research → consultation with stakeholder → adaptation of activities/research) has provided substantive learning (by doing) for the local partner. Likewise Living Earth Foundation reports substantive learning about M&E. The aim is that the learning from this project will help inform other projects, and indeed the project intends to write a publication early next year about their learning process. The lessons learnt from this project will be fed to the communities that have agreed to act as controls who are also interested in developing a Community Hunting Zone in their area.

The data that has thus far been generated, and discussions with stakeholders, has led to the development of a strategy to support pro-poor sustainable bushmeat harvesting. Once the Community Hunting Zone and collection permits are approved, then the model can be tested.

Hunters have received presentations on the law, user rights, legal and illegal hunting practices, protected and non-protected species. Traders have increased their capacity on knowledge of the law, species, disease transmission, permits and taxes. Whilst game guards have not received targeted training they have participated in two training events. At these events the relationship between traders and game guards were discussed. Approximately 200 hunters, 200 traders, and 17 game guards, have been involved in these discussions. Training on reporting techniques will follow the submission of dossiers for the hunting zone and collection permits. The results of the biological and socio-economic surveys have been presented to community stakeholders, enhancing knowledge of their own socio-economic situation. The scientific data and mapping process has been appreciated by the communities, in some instances serving to validate their own assumptions, for example, biological survey data indicating declining wildlife populations confirming the greater distance covered by hunters to find wildlife to hunt.

The project is starting to have a positive impact on relations between local communities and non-government and government authorities, benefitting the management of natural resources and security:

Discussions about hunting and trade now take place openly (previously these topics were not openly discussed due to fear of being penalised and criminalisation). There has been a reported change in attitude concerning hunting, and communities are more conscious of what constitutes illegal and legal activities, and reasons why it is important to operate legally. Game guards and communities are starting to work together (also refer to Section 3.4, under Output 3). The register of guns is a significant conservation and security resource for local authorities, and legalisation of gun ownership may de-stigmatise gun owners.

The project is empowering of communities, helping to support ownership and development of sustainable governance models:

As observed at the community meeting in the village Djapostem there is strong community interest to participate, emerging strong local leadership, and communities are organising

themselves. Governance systems are being established, led by the communities and facilitated by the local partner, to ensure local ownership and governance. Baka are included in these discussions and will be represented on the Management Committee, as well as at the village level on Monitoring Committees. As mentioned in Section 3.2 the project needs to discuss how best to include Baka traders.

3.6 Sustainability

The project design has incorporated sustainability and legacy into its design from the offset:

The partners have been working together in the target area for many years, and will very likely continue to do so. This means that they will maintain a focus on working to ensure that the model and supporting activities continue. As mentioned in Section 3.2 the project acknowledges that there will need to be support for alternative livelihoods and is already investigating possibilities for this outside of the current project. The partners recently submitted an unsuccessful application to the Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) Challenge Fund to address developing sustainable livelihoods (fish farming) for communities living close to the reserve.

The project is being driven by the communities with partners mainly providing facilitative and technical support. Financial support is purposely limited (to avoid dependency) and the focus is on supporting the development and management of structures and systems that will provide appropriate locally developed incentives (Assumption 3) and ownership. For example, the development of a Management Committee to manage the Community Hunting Zone, and supporting Monitoring Committees to monitor poaching and illegal trade (and possibly have the power to seize). The project is also looking at how these committees can be supported to function. For example, when meat gets seized the local administration (game guards and council) get a percentage of the auction price. For the hunting zone to work the communities will play a key role and it is important to find a way to make the system work and be sustainable; the project is looking at how the committees can receive something for their part in combatting illegal trade³⁰. The Chief game guard in Djomedjah (a village in the target area) for example has agreed that the Monitoring Committee can help to operate the barrier in this village and will give 12% of funds from auction to the committee. Assuming that the model works there is also a possibility to look at a premium price (and label) for 'sustainable sourced meat', profits from which could be directed back to help support the implementation of the Community Hunting Zone.

³⁰ The project has compiled information from other hunting zones and hopes to find a student to review and analyse the data for lessons learnt.

Recommendations to the project:

It will be the responsibility of the Ministry for Forests & Wildlife to conduct biological and socio-economic surveys of the Community Hunting Zone (and reserve) post-project to monitor if the model is working. This requires the government to have the necessary capacity and motivation. Whilst this is beyond the control (and time frame) of the current project, the project partnership could consider if there are strategies (in addition to providing input to the Dja Biosphere Management Plan) to encourage (appropriately timed) ongoing testing of the model. The partners have worked in the target area for many years and plan to continue to do so.

The project is investing substantive time in building capacity of target communities to sustainably manage their own natural resources. This has generated a great deal of interest from other areas wanting hunting zones, indeed cooperation from control group communities is based on receiving lessons learnt from the current project. A future consideration for partners is take a train the trainer approach and build capacity of local NGO's to help new communities navigate the process. This links to the interest of the project to develop a tool-kit for developing and managing Community Hunting Zones.

3.7 Influence

It is too early to assess influence (the latter part of the project that will test the model) but the project is working collaboratively with key partners to exert influence:

The project has much potential value locally, nationally and regionally, and given it is working closely with government partners, is well positioned to exert influence. Lessons learnt will help support other communities looking at Community Hunting Zones, and as stated above this is the basis for control communities cooperating with the project. Lessons learnt will also be helpful to projects regionally looking to develop similar systems.

As stated in Section 3.2, and assuming that the revision of the Dja Reserve Management Plan goes ahead, the project will provide input to the updated version via the Dja Actors Forum. Likewise the partnership is currently providing input to the updated 'Regional Action Plan for Chimpanzees and Gorillas in Western Equatorial Africa'.

Also as stated in Section 2.1, the local partner plans to lobby the local council to prioritise food security in the region. Despite it being heavily emphasized in national development and biodiversity reports (See Section 3.2) local investment has mainly focused on high profile construction projects.

3.8 Innovations, lessons learned and best practice

A participatory planning process with stakeholders should be an integral part of the project design:

This project uniquely combines research and community development but where the communities are a research partner rather than simply being the subject matter. Rather than going to the community with a design in place, this has very much been a bottom up approach, indeed it was an approach previously identified by the communities, and the project partners have simply facilitated its progress. This maintains ownership and should help support legacy and sustainability. It has also helped to build trust between the communities and project partners, as does the presence and longevity of the partners working in the area.

The particular lessons learned in terms of the partnerships with Government has been the importance of ensuring that they have a concrete role to play and so they can see a tangible benefit for their own department.

Adaptive management is crucial to adopt from project design and throughout implementation:

The process of action research (activities/research → consultation with stakeholder's → adaptation of activities/research) has provided substantive learning (by doing) and strategy revision. It is this approach that is more likely to lead to success rather than following a specified but unworkable plan. This requires individuals in the team that are willing and able to think critically about whether a certain activity or method is working (or relevant). It also requires a constant flow of information feeding back; this is where strong M&E systems are apparent because they are used as more than a reporting tool for donors. The collaborative includes a partner to provide formal support for M&E.

Furthermore the project is forward looking and has already identified strategies that will be needed to support the project outcome beyond its current timeframe. This will be supported by the longevity of the collaborative thematically and regionally.

Consultation with externally generated knowledge is crucial to build on existing experience:

At the project level a great deal of learning has clearly taken place, and inward reflection is demonstrated as mentioned above. The project however recognises that there is much to be gained from external consultation, and for example, established a Community of Practice to help provide external guidance to the project in a more formalised manner. The challenge for the project is to encourage members of this mechanism to engage given their own competing priorities. It is also seeking lessons learnt from already established Community Hunting Zones, alternative livelihood projects, and eco-tourism sites. It is this outward looking and collaborative approach that can help projects maximise their impact.

4. Programme review

Output 1: Good applications become good projects

The project was well designed, participatory in nature, characterised by an adaptive management style, with clear roles for each partners, and a history of working well together thematically and regionally. The inclusion of a partner specifically to provide support for M&E has undoubtedly benefitted the project, particularly concerning the need for action and reflection in this innovative project. An updated logframe was provided immediately prior to the review which was exceptionally helpful. This was reviewed during the site visit in light of discussions and developments. The project was extremely cooperative in helping to organise and execute the review, and responded positively to feedback provided.

As mentioned in Section 3.3 the project application did not include SMART indicators but this does not appear to have negatively impacted the projects ability to monitor progress. This is likely due to the projects adaptive management style and a specific partner providing support for M&E.

Recommendations for the project:

As a consequence of delays to the project the main focus has been on defining the model, with the revised aim of a six month period of implementation (this is dependent on the length of time it takes for the government to review the application for the Community Hunting Zone) to collect data to verify the model. The project logframe needs to be reviewed with this in mind to check if current activities and indicators remain applicable.

Refer to Section 3.2 on revising the work plan.

Refer to Section 3.3 concerning the recommendation for adding baselines and setting targets now baseline data is available.

Output 2: There is increased knowledge of the linkages between biodiversity and poverty and mechanisms/approaches that can secure gains in biodiversity and poverty.

The basic premise of the project is an approach, and development of supporting mechanisms, that can secure gains in biodiversity and poverty. The project is focused on the identification, implementation and evaluation of key factors necessary to establish a pro-

poor sustainable wildlife-harvesting model in south-eastern Cameroon. The project is producing learning on the process that they have adopted, and when the model is tested, communicate evidence as to whether it works.

Production of a publication for peer-review, covering the implementation and evaluation of a sustainable harvesting model and its impact on poverty indicators is the focus of Output 1. Bristol Conservation & Science Foundation and the Project Leader have sufficient expertise to provide scientific rigour to the process. This publication will come at the end of the project although there are plans to write a publication early next year on the learning process of the project. There are also discussions about other knowledge sharing mechanisms beyond peer reviewed journals to target different audiences. In this way the project has great potential to inform other Darwin Initiative funded programmes and projects.

As stated in Section 3.7 the project has much potential value locally, nationally and regionally, and given it is working closely with government partners, is well positioned to exert influence. Lessons learnt will help support other communities looking at Community Hunting Zones, indeed this is the basis for communities outside of the target area (serving as controls) cooperating with the project. Lessons learnt will also be helpful to projects regionally looking to develop similar systems. Assuming that the revision of the Dja Biosphere Management Plan goes ahead, the project will provide input to the updated version via the Dja Actors Forum. Likewise the partnership is currently providing input to the updated 'Regional Action Plan for Chimpanzees and Gorillas in Western Equatorial Africa'.

Output 3: Positive gains in poverty alleviation demonstrated in practical biodiversity conservation field projects.

Given delays the testing of the model will fall into the last six months of the project and more time is really needed to get meaningful results. Any positive gain in poverty alleviation will likely be demonstrated after the project. Given what the project is trying to achieve, three years is a very short time frame. The project has provided baselines of average monthly income of the hunters, the average amount of bushmeat caught per month (and revenue this represents), and the percentage of meat consumed locally within the households (subsistence) and that which is transported (commercialised). These figures also point towards the amount of animal protein and income equivalents that would need to be replaced in the event of all hunting activities being banned. Approximately 200 hunters and 200 traders have been involved in discussion and it is likely that 100 hunters and 120 traders (through bushmeat trader associations) will be involved in the testing of the model.

Other benefits which could potentially be captured include security given the register of guns but it is unlikely that this will make an impact during the project life span. Furthermore,

empowerment of local communities and leadership could be considered.

As stated previously the project aims to provide input to the revision of the Dja Biosphere Management Plan. Likewise the project is currently providing input to the 'Regional Action Plan for Chimpanzees and Gorillas in Western Equatorial Africa'.

Recommendations to the project:

Refer to Section 3.3 concerning capturing a broader range of poverty benefits.

Output 4: Capacity to undertake work supporting biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation.

Individual capacity is being developed as a direct result of the project. The Standard Measures stated the aim for eight Cameroonian nationals (gender ratio not known) to obtain MSc's during the project and for 60 persons to receive other forms of education/training. Certainly during the review some of the MSc students were present and about to go through the process of defending their thesis. Some expressed an interest to continue working on the project with the local partner, and/or to apply for a Darwin Fellowship.

The local partner seems sufficiently experienced, and well positioned, to continue to work on work supporting biodiversity conservation and poverty, and have a long history of doing so. During the review they stated that they have learnt a great deal about M&E from having a formal partner providing this focused support, and the process of adaptive management (action research/ learning process). This will help them with future projects.

5. Conclusions

The project comprises a positive mix of conservation, environmental, development and M&E partners, with a long history of working together in the region. The project demonstrates a good balance between biodiversity and poverty elements, and has the potential to positively impact short- and long-term food security of vulnerable communities, assuming the model is proven to be viable, and the system adequately supported and regulated. The need to support the development of alternatives (income and protein) has been identified as crucial to avoiding a future food security crisis in the region, and project partners are working to identify funders to support these activities (which are outside the scope of the main Darwin project).

The project work plan initially envisaged defining the parameters of the pro-poor sustainable bushmeat hunting model within the first six months of the project. This was too ambitious and instead the project partners spent the first twelve months developing the model to

ensure participation of stakeholders, and government buy-in to and participation in the process. This will compromise the implementation period and verification of the model. Should this be the case, and given the longevity of the partnership, the reviewer is convinced that the partners will find the resources to extend the implementation phase so that sufficient data can be collected, and support provided to the newly formed committees and associations. The project has been designed from the offset to consider sustainability, being community driven and owned, and incorporating considerations of governance structure and systems beyond the project life span.

The project highlights the importance of adaptive management, inward reflection and external consultation to progress within challenging logistical, political and cultural environs. Furthermore the challenge of developing and implementing biodiversity and poverty alleviation projects, and demonstrate associated impacts, within a relatively short-time frame.

6. Recommendations

At the project level:

- Currently only Bantu bushmeat traders are participating in this project (and represented in bushmeat trader associations). Whilst the Baka trade more informally, their trade activities would remain illegal assuming that the Community Hunting Zone and collection permits are approved. Baka are the most vulnerable of communities and consideration of how they can be included so that they too can trade legally should be considered. During the review the local partner Field Officer suggested that the best solution may be the development of a Baka trader association to ensure that they have a voice which might otherwise be lost by participating in a Bantu association.
- During the process of the review there has been a great deal of discussion and reflection on future activities for the remainder of the project. Not all these activities are explicit in the current list (although may be included under over-arching headings) and there will be new or adapted activities in light of changing time frames and focus. It is important that the project captures this information as soon as possible to ensure timely organisation and implementation. During the review the project discussed developing a revised work plan and who will take the lead on the first draft.
- Baseline data is now available and indicators can be smartened. Whilst changes in socio-economic and biological data are unlikely to be seen during the project timeline, adding SMART indicators will facilitate ongoing assessment of progress and impact for the partners.

- Whilst perhaps implicit in assumption 2 and 4 the project could consider a specific assumption on respect and application of the law by government authorities (given accusations of corruption against some forest guards), and a functioning sanctioning system in place for those that contravene the law.
- Gain external validation on survey methods and methods used to calculate sustainable offtake.
- The project could consider capturing a broader range of poverty benefits for example, security (register of guns in the area), empowerment (local leadership development, supporting the development of associations), and vulnerability (inclusion of Baka as a vulnerable people). This will necessitate reflection on appropriate M&E to capture the information.
- The project is advised to consult existing experience and information on alternative livelihoods (including tourism) rather than learning by trial and error. Several papers have been shared with the project by the reviewer and many more are available.
- The project has necessarily been through a lengthy period of learning and adaptation. It is now at a stage where it has baseline data, and a strategy to establish the necessary structures and systems. It is now timely to focus on developing a knowledge sharing strategy for the project. There is much discussion on how to best capture and communicate results and lessons learnt (now and further along) but this needs more focus and planning. Currently discussions on increasing visibility are not focused on how communication and advocacy may contribute to national development policy (Output 4). In addition to writing scientific publications and technical briefs, the project is also interested for example in developing a tool kit to guide the development and management of Community Hunting Zone based on project experience and lessons learnt. The Bristol Conservation & Science Foundation communications (and science) departments may be able to provide guidance to the project on appropriate knowledge sharing platforms.
- There is a possibility that the Community Hunting Zone will not be approved within the time frame of the project (or at all) or that it will not work out at the target area. The project has discussed this and have an unstated contingency plan e.g., focusing efforts on building community capacity per se rather than purely with a view to establishing the Community Hunting Zone. It might however be useful to formalise this plan which in turn may help to maintain a focus on capacity building/governance.
- It will be the responsibility of the Ministry for Forests & Wildlife to conduct biological and socio-economic surveys of the Community Hunting Zone (and reserve) post-project to monitor if the model is working. This requires the government to have the necessary capacity and motivation. Whilst this is beyond the control (and time frame) of the current project, the project partnership could consider if there are strategies (in addition to providing input to the Dja Biosphere Management Plan) to encourage

(appropriately timed) ongoing testing of the model. The partners however have worked in the target area for many years and plan to continue to do so.

- The project is investing substantive time in building capacity of target communities to sustainably manage their own natural resources. This has generated a great deal of interest from other areas wanting hunting zones, indeed cooperation from control group communities is based on receiving lessons learnt from the current project. A future consideration for the partners is to take a train the trainer approach and build capacity of local NGO's to help new communities navigate the process. This links to the projects interest to develop a tool kit focused on how to develop and manage a Community Hunting Zone.
- As a consequence of delays to the project the main focus will be on developing the model, with the revised aim of a six month period of implementation (this is dependent on the length of time it takes for the government to review the application for the Community Hunting Zone) to collect data to verify the model. The project logframe needs to be reviewed with this in mind to check if current activities and indicators remain applicable.

For biodiversity practitioners:

- When possible provide government partners with concrete roles so they can see a tangible benefit for their own department.
- Projects should look to external partners to provide a positive blend of required expertise. Partnerships can be direct and one-to-one or convened in a collective structure.

Annex I: Updated logframe

Update for MTR provided by project 28.10.14

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress to date (April 2013 – October 2014)	Comments by reviewer
<p>Goal/Impact</p> <p>The long-term food security of vulnerable forest-based populations in south east Cameroon is strengthened through a pro-poor sustainable wildlife trade that provides communities living in protected areas with increased rights over resources and economic benefits from a regulated trade. The promotion of a model enabling the sustainable take of animals for food will contribute to poverty alleviation through both reduced food insecurity, and increased income for poor people through their involvement in a legalised trade. The biodiversity status of key wildlife species (including threatened species) will be improved as a result of a reduction in unsustainable off-take and improved monitoring.</p>			
<p>Purpose/Outcome</p> <p>The identification, implementation and evaluation of key factors necessary to establish a pro-poor sustainable wildlife-harvesting model in south-eastern Cameroon. The aim is to reduce multi-dimensional poverty amongst poor communities living in and around the DBR by enabling them to earn an income legally, and contribute to long-term food security whilst reducing the unregulated take of wildlife in the region. Lessons learned from the evaluation of project processes will feed into the development of an updated DBR Management Plan and will provide data to support the integration of planning</p>	<p>Change in the socio-economic data gathered during the action: livelihood analysis (including household income, expenditure, revenue streams).</p> <p>Change in the biological data gathered during the action: Exploitation and production ratio rates of key indicator species; species abundance (measured through transects).</p> <p>Demonstration of causal pathways linking biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction, building on the theory of change</p>	<p>Comprehensive socio-economic baseline data collected by 6 MSc students across 11 communities. This included information on household income, revenue streams, hunting patterns, consumption patterns (e.g., sources of protein). Full reports, and summary reports, available.</p> <p>MINFOF (led by Conservator of DBR) carried out a biological survey to identify and quantify animal populations in the proposed CHZ. Data cross-referenced with socio-economic surveys (e.g., hunting patterns). Full report available.</p> <p>Work with University of Bristol M&E expert to identify causal pathways. These will be tested through the project, with follow up data collection and analysis.</p>	

<p>for sustainable wildlife management into national development policy.</p>	<p>and the use of base-line data.</p> <p>Community (hunters, traders and local households) attitudes towards wildlife resource management and relations with government game guards.</p> <p>Changes made to the DBR Management Plan; in particular new activities and indicators added.</p> <p>Level of integration of data on bushmeat consumption in national economic statistics and national development policy.</p>	<p>More positive attitudes towards game guards as a result of project activities (building of trust between the two groups). Greater understanding of the threats of unsustainable resource use – and of the unsustainability of current resource use patterns. Very positive attitudes towards the establishment of a CHZ as an opportunity for community involvement in resource management.</p> <p>MINFOF is in the process of recruiting a consultant to facilitate the updating of the DBR Management Plan. The project partners will be key stakeholders in the process, feeding in project findings and learning.</p> <p>Advocacy activities carried out to date include: Short documentary film on the project aired on CRTV (national TV); use of the CoP (which includes government representative) to share project findings, particular regarding current levels of exploitation of bushmeat, and communities' dependency on bushmeat in terms of income and protein; participation at relevant regional meetings (UNESCO chaired Dja Actors meeting and AWF/IUCN chaired Dja planning meeting).</p>	
<p>Output 1: Production of a publication for peer-review, covering the implementation and evaluation of a sustainable harvesting model and its impact on poverty indicators.</p>			
<p>Activity 1.1</p>	<p><u>Activities:</u> Assembling project resources (in-country)</p>	<p>Necessary human resources and capital equipment in place.</p>	
<p>Activity 1.2</p>	<p>Project launch meeting (in-country) for partners</p>	<p>Project launch meeting held with project partners in July 2013; formal project launch held with external stakeholders in October 2013.</p>	

Activity 1.3	Selection of target communities (and identification of control groups)	Target communities selected.	Increased number of target communities from 8 to 11
Activity 1.4	Identification and establishment of agreed parameters for the sustainable wildlife-harvesting model (community consultation; MINFOF consultation; review of literature and best practice).	Key parameters identified, as well as key challenges and risks. Formal consultation process carried out with MINFOF, CoP and communities. Initial biological survey showed current highly unsustainable take in southern part of the proposed CHZ, and absence of animal populations. Decision to focus on northern part of the zone.	
Activity 1.5	Baseline review for socio-economic and biological indicators.	Baseline review completed and full documents available.	
Activity 1.6	Establishment of Community of Practice (COP).	10 Member CoP established; four meetings held to date (February 2014, July 2014, October 2014, November 2014).	1 CoP meeting held during the MTR
Activity 1.7	Identification and setting of agreed quotas for harvesting (off-take levels) (community consultation; MINFOF consultation; review of literature and best practice; discussion with COP).	Quota levels to set by MINFOF, following the demarcation of the CHZ. MINOF has national off-take levels, project data can guide local offtake. This is an ongoing process.	During the MTR, the following was agreed with the target communities: Management Committee for CHZ to be established (target end of December 2014); Agreed Management Plan (target Jan/Feb 2015); Submission of application of CHZ with Management Plan (target March 2015). Within the project: Collection of additional biological data to verify off-take rate, help demarcate areas, id specific strategies, and includes data collection in the rainy season. Target is to collect data in August/Sept and analyse in October 2015 - data to be discussed with the Management Committee, amend management plan with agreed quotas etc.
Activity 1.8	Partnership agreements between project, hunters and traders, and MINFOF game guards.	Free Prior and Informed Consent obtained from the communities. FCTV to draw up a partnership/management agreement with local	Conversations initiated during the MTR about roles on the CHZ Management Committee. Project looking to move funds

		communities as part of the process of the establishment of the Community Hunting Zone (e.g., project level agreements in place, but we need to develop specific agreements relating to the roles and responsibilities of actors with regards to the CHZ).	to expand capacity building from Monitoring Committee to Management Committee (to include community leadership, monitoring, conflict resolution, financial management, strategic planning). Project also looking at exchange visits for members of Management Committee to visit existing CHZ's and degraded area in North-west (funding application to Rufford Foundation). Target is for this to be conducted March-Sept 2015 whilst waiting for CHZ to be approved.
Activity 1.9	Ongoing monitoring of implementation of partnership agreements and data collection by communities and local partner with monthly reports submitted to BCSF (see Output 2)	FCTV has regular (minimum monthly) meetings, both formal and informal, with local communities and regular activity reports are submitted to LEF/BCSF.	Two meetings held during the MTR - one with community representatives/hunters, and one with bushmeat traders. Target for communities to start data collection Nov 2015 - FCTV role to monitor how data is being collected by the Monitoring Committees.
Activity 1.10	Monthly reports published on website and dissemination of project newsletter.	Project leaflets have been produced and reports are regularly shared with CoP and MINFOF.	Modify contents as more likely to about development of model than testing. Target Jan 2015
Activity 1.11	Six-monthly review (data collection) of biological indicators and socio-economic surveys.	Comprehensive baseline completed with data collected over a 5-month period. The next review (data collection) will be carried out in 2015.	This will tie in with the last 6 months of the project
Activity 1.12	Six-monthly analysis of data by University of Bristol (analysis of causal pathways).	Meetings held every three to four months with University of Bristol to discuss progress to date and to reflect on causal pathways.	M&E partner UoB writes a report, shared with FCTV and discussed at next field visit/every 3-4 months
Activity 1.13	Six-monthly meetings of COP.	See Activity 1.6.	
Activity 1.14	Six monthly project review meetings with local communities, hunters and traders and local game guards to enable feedback from beneficiaries.	Regular feedback meetings held with key stakeholders (including communities, hunters, traders and game guards). Project review meeting held in October 2014 to discuss progress to date and to reflect and agree way forward.	Follow up meeting in November 2014 during the MTR to discuss Management committee structure and roles, plus schedule of work required to submit the application for a CHZ.

			Meeting scheduled for Feb 2015 after submission of application for CHZ.
Activity 1.15	Modification to model based on findings of Activities 1.12, 1.13 and 1.14.	The data collection has informed the development of the model. The emphasis to date (and the modifications to date) have focused on the specific target area in question.	
Activity 1.16	Development of draft publication for review.	N/A at this stage but ongoing process of documentation of project findings.	One publication based on learning process - start early 2015. Then later publication on results after end of project.
Activity 1.17	Draft publication reviewed by CoP.	N/A at this stage.	
Activity 1.18	Finalised publication circulated for peer review.	N/A at this stage.	
Activity 1.19	Dissemination of final publication.	N/A at this stage.	
Output 2. (Hunters and wildlife meat traders across eight communities in the Western periphery of the DBR respecting agreed wildlife quotas and providing regular (monthly) data on hunting practice and wildlife consumption, triangulated by game guard reports and third party NGO reports.			
Activity 2.1	Focus group discussions to establish parameters (cross ref. Activities 1.4 and 1.7)	10 Focus Group meetings held. MSc students based within the target communities allows for continued community engagement. Free Prior and Informed Consent obtained.	
Activity 2.2	Partnership agreements between project, hunters and traders, and MINFOF game guards (cross ref. Activity 1.8)	Cross ref. Activity 1.8.	Agreement will develop from the CHZ Management Plan (Feb/Mar 2015), but signed partnership agreements from 11 villages already in place.
Activity 2.3	Training for hunters/traders and game guards on reporting techniques.	Focus Group meetings held to discuss potential forms of collaboration, roles of local monitoring committees and reporting systems. Tailored training will be held as part of the process of establishing the CHZ.	Hunters have received training on: the law, users rights, legal and illegal hunting practices, protected and non-protected species. Traders have received training on: the law, species, disease transmission, permits and taxes. Game guards were not target with specific training but were involved the training session for hunters and traders. R/ship between traders and game guards discussed. A meeting is still needed with game guards only. Approximately 200 hunters. 200 traders,

			and 17 guards. Training on reporting techniques for hunters and traders will come after submission of the application for the CHZ.
Activity 2.4	Monthly reports on hunting practice (wildlife capture, sales); completed by participants, triangulated with game guard data and verified by FCTV community-based staff.	MSc students have provided reports on hunting practice over a 5-month period. This data has been shared with, and verified by, game guards.	
Activity 2.5	Community-based awareness-raising on food security issues.	Between July 2014 and October 2014, FCTV shared the results of the data collection carried out to date with the communities. One key element of this focused on long-term food security in the face of unsustainable resource use. Further awareness-raising materials will be developed and refined; it will also be important to integrate concerns about Ebola into any awareness-raising materials.	FCTV to lobby local council to highlight food security as an important issue. Grants are available for high visibility projects such as road and bridge building. FCTV to support local communities with application for e.g., agricultural projects to local council.
Activity 2.6	Information workshops on rules, regulations and procedures relating to obtaining hunting and bushmeat collection permits.	Information workshops on procurement of bushmeat collection (trade) and hunting permits held.	
Activity 2.7	Post-workshop support for permit procurement.	Logistical support given to bushmeat traders in Lomié to procure permits, allowing them to carry out their economic activities legally.	
Activity 2.8	Establishment of mechanisms for community feedback and ongoing review of project in light of community feedback (cross ref. Activity 1.14).	Cross ref. Activity 1.14.	
Output 3: Local communities play a more active role in anti-poaching strategies, and are supported in this by government (MINFOF) game guards.			
Activity 3.1	Baseline survey of level of community-game guard collaboration and engagement and attitudes towards law enforcement.	Qualitative interviews carried out.	
Activity 3.2	Establishment of community-based monitoring networks.	The project has supported the establishment of community-based monitoring committees across 11 villages (some new committees; some existing	Already in place. New system to be developed in Management Plan for CHZ. Still necessary even if CHZ not approved.

		committees taking on new roles to include anti-poaching missions).	
Activity 3.3	Participatory mapping of poaching hotspots, including entry and exit points into protected area etc.	11 participatory maps established (see attached).	
Activity 3.4	Capacity-building training for local communities (members of monitoring networks) and game guards.	Training on roles and responsibilities of monitoring committees carried out in partnership with local game guards.	FCTV presented how they work in other areas. The game guards present how they work. Then a discussion to talk about how they would all work together.
Activity 3.5	Development of, and support to the implementation of, community-specific poaching monitoring strategies – in partnership with game guards.	Communication channels between local head of game guards (chef de poste) and monitoring committees established.	FCTV to explore lessons learnt from other CHZ's – have data compiled and student is going to review it.
Activity 3.6	Data collection, field verification and data analysis.	Monitoring committees provide FCTV with updates in terms of activities carried out and relationships with game guards.	Data collected informally. System to be finalised in Management Plan for the CHZ, then there will be formal data collection and analysis. Primarily role of data is for the Management Committee, but secondary for FCTV to analyse trends
Activity 3.7	Publication and dissemination of lessons learned and project reports.	Raw material being collated. Case study on community based monitoring systems to be produced.	Not just papers but also presentation at the IIED conference in South Africa on community roles in illegal wildlife enforcement, and at a national cultural festival on environmental services; lots of internal reports; also looking developing technical briefs/tool kits.
Output 4: Project learning influences policy formulation at the regional level and national level, leading to the integration of identified activities into DBR Management Plan and national development policy.			
Activity 4.1	Establishment of Community of Practice (cross ref Activities 1.6 and 1.13).	Cross Ref. Activity 1.6	
Activity 4.2	Meetings of multi-stakeholder Dja Actors Forum	Presentation of project at 2 Dja Actors meetings in July 2014 and October 2014.	Will also meet in 2015, at least twice to review DBR Management Plan
Activity 4.3	Publication of annual reviews	In October 2014, an annual review workshop was carried out with key stakeholders in Lomié. The report will be shared on LEF and BCSF websites.	Not yet realised due to delays and action learning. Only current equivalent is annual report for Darwin.

Activity 4.4	Learning visit to project site for MINFOF	The Conservator of the DBR has participated in project field activities and has met with the communities planning the CHZ. More formal learning visits (with Yaoundé based MINFOF personnel) will be held once the CHZ is established.	
Activity 4.5	National Advocacy workshop	N/A at this stage.	The project needs to start discussing their communications and advocacy strategy to maximise impact.
Activity 4.6	Policy Forums	N/A at this stage.	The project needs to start discussing their communications and advocacy strategy to maximise impact.
Activity 4.7	Publication of media materials (newspaper articles etc.).	One television documentary produced and aired on Cameroonian State TV.	No news articles yet. Project interested in getting featured on national series called Science and Development.

Annex II: People consulted

Name	Title	Organisation	Date
Lios McGilchrist	Programme Manager (UK Project Manager)	Living Earth Foundation	28.10.14; and throughout the field visit 09.11.14- 14.11.14
Mama Mouamfon	Director	Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante	09.11.14 and 14.11.14
Jules Romain Ngueguim	Project Manager	Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante (seconded from the Ministry for Research Science & Innovation)	Throughout the field visit 09.11.14- 14.11.14
Elias Djoh	Field Officer	Fondation Camerounaise de la Terre Vivante	Throughout the field visit 09.11.14- 14.11.14
Raphael Fouda	Technical Superintendent	Ministry for Forests & Wildlife	11.11.14
Neil Maddison	Head of Conservation Programmes (Project Leader)	Bristol Conservation & Science Foundation	18.11.14
Vince Smith	Country Manager, Cameroon	Zoological Society of London	15.11.14
Hunters/community representatives meeting (approx. 100 persons)	n/a	n/a	11.11.14
Bushmeat trader association meeting (10 persons)	n/a	n/a	12.11.14
Community of Practice meeting (15 persons)	n/a	n/a	14.11.14

Annex III: Materials reviewed as part of the MTR

1. Darwin Stage 2 application
2. Darwin Annual report
3. Darwin Annual report review
4. Darwin Half-year report
5. Darwin Updated log frame
6. Project summary report of socio-economic data collection (June 2013-August 2014)
7. Project biological Survey report (July 2014)
8. Project report from project annual review meeting (October 2014)
9. Capacity statement LEF-BCSF-FCTV
10. Terms of Reference for great ape meat supply chains in Cameroon
11. Report on great ape meat supply project
12. Dja Management Plan (2004)
13. National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2012)
14. Cameroon Vision 2035
15. 5th Cameroon report for the Convention of Biological Diversity (2014)
16. Cameroon Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2003) and Progress Report (2008)