

Darwin Initiative Main Project Annual Report

Important note: To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders:

it is expected that this report will be no more than 10 pages in length, excluding annexes

Submission Deadline: 30 April

Darwin Project Information

Project Reference	22-004
Project Title	Collaborative Conflict Management for Community Livelihoods and Conservation
Host Country/ies	Mongolia, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan
Contract Holder Institution	University of Aberdeen
Partner institutions	Snow Leopard Trust, Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Snow Leopard Conservation Foundation (Mongolia), Snow Leopard Foundation (Pakistan), Snow Leopard Foundation in Kyrgyzstan
Darwin Grant Value	265,914
Funder (DFID/Defra)	Defra
Start/end dates of project	1 April 2015-31 March 2018
Reporting period (e.g., Apr 2015 – Mar 2016) and number (e.g., Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	Apr 2015-Mar 2016, Annual Report 1
Project Leader name	Stephen Redpath
Project website/blog/Twitter	http://www.snowleopard.org/learn/monitoring-our-impact/darwin-initiative
Report author(s) and date	Stephen Redpath, Jennifer Snell Rullman, Siri Okamoto, Juliette Young, 30 April 2016

1. Project Rationale

Effective strategies that resolve conflicts between human livelihoods and biodiversity conservation are urgently sought. Large predators are particularly problematic as they are of high conservation interest but often have severe impacts on human livelihood. The endangered snow leopard of Central Asia exemplifies this problem. Across their 12-country range, snow leopards co-occur with herding communities inside and outside of protected areas. Annual per capita GDP varies from \$1155 - \$3673 and >40% of these rural herders live below national poverty lines. Average annual livestock depredation rates range from 3-13%, and >50% of these losses occur when animals are in poorly constructed corrals. Losses are often equivalent to up to one month's income.

Unsurprisingly, retribution killing of snow leopards is widespread, sometimes involving the illegal selling of leopard parts, and this killing represents a critical threat. In addition, wild ungulates, on which snow leopards depend, compete with livestock and are also killed.

Previous work has shown that the abundance of snow leopards is strongly correlated with wild ungulates, which are therefore critical to the long-term conservation of snow leopards.

Finding cost effective ways of supporting the coexistence of rural communities with large predators is extremely challenging. The value of community involvement for effective nature conservation is often emphasized in conservation policies and environmental rhetoric. Yet, in large parts of Asia, wildlife conservation and management continues to be coercive and involve top-down state control, which is both morally questionable and often unsustainable over the longer term. There are limited field examples of robust, bottom-up models of wildlife conservation and conflict management that are based on deep community involvement.

This project seeks to tackle these problems by empowering rural pastoralist communities in central Asia to develop multi-pronged conservation schemes to support the sustainable coexistence of herding communities with wild ungulates and predators. Through this project we are working with herder households in in Altay Mountains, Mongolia; Hindu Kush-Pamir, Pakistan, and Tien Shan Mountains, Kyrgyzstan, to:

- 1) Reduce livestock losses through improved corrals. We provide designs and materials not available locally, communities provide labour.
- 2) Offset economic losses via insurance programmes. Households pay premiums into a community-managed fund for livestock they want to insure; elected committees investigate livestock kills and pay out claims.
- 3) Improve livelihoods via conservation-linked handicrafts. Building on women's wool/felting skills and traditional artistry, we train them to meet international market standards. We set mutually-agreed base prices, guarantee to purchase bulk orders and provide access to US markets.

To implement these programmes, we are developing toolkits for field implements, and recruiting 'Champions' from within communities. We are testing the effectiveness of individual programmes vs. combined programme approaches, and active 'representative' communities vs. control communities (no interventions) on income and attitudes of herders. We are also looking at biological indicators in representative vs. control communities.

This project is taking place in Central Asia: specifically Altay Mountains, Mongolia; Hindu Kush-Pamir, Pakistan, and Tien Shan Mountains, Kyrgyzstan.



2. Project Partnerships

A formal MoU was signed between University of Aberdeen, SLT and CEH; SLT signed as representative of in-country partners SLF, SLCF and SLFK. The partnership initially formed as a result of a long-term collaboration between Redpath (University of Aberdeen) and Mishra (Interim Executive Director of SLT) and a shared interest of both, together with the partners to improve our collective understanding of the impact of community-based conservation on livelihoods and conservation. Community-based conservation is a core part of the mission of SLCF, SLF, and SLFK and therefore this project is important to their long-term strategies.

To date, all partners have been closely involved in the planning, monitoring and evaluation. Regular meetings have taken place via skype/in person involving Redpath, Mishra (Project Leader), Okamoto (SLT Development Director), Snell Rullman (SLT, Assistant Director of Conservation) and Young (Centre for Ecology & Hydrology). Skype meetings to discuss Darwin project: 2015 - Apr 13th, **Apr 16th**, May 13th, **June 25th**, June 26th, June 29th, Aug 11th, Oct 2nd, Oct 19th, Nov 5th, **Nov 19th**, Dec 1st, 2016, Jan 29th, Feb 1st, **Feb 18th**, **Mar 24th**. Bolded dates were more formal and involved in-country partners, unbolded dates were informal; minutes available for formal meetings (Annex 0.1a-0.1e). In person meetings: Redpath, Mishra, Snell Rullman with Mongolian team 30th May – 17th June 2015. Mishra with Pakistan & Kyrgyzstan teams Sept 3-8, 2015. During meetings, we reviewed progress against the logframe, collaborated on the protocols, training agenda, toolkit development and implementation plan and reviewed milestones and next steps. SLCF, SLF, and SLFK are overseeing implementation of the project on the ground, e.g. selection of representative vs control regions, selecting champions, collecting data, etc. They have provided feedback on survey protocols and on trainings.

Strengths. The partnership has worked extremely well and has been greatly strengthened by the inclusion of a social scientist (Young, CEH). Her expertise and experience of conservation conflicts and of evaluating the social and environmental outcomes of conservation initiatives has brought a great deal to the training components of the project. Additionally, her strengths in developing socio-economic surveys has increased SLT's knowledge and skill set in designing good questions for a more robust survey process. The development of the toolkit and training module was an important achievement of the project; pulling the 85 page partners principles document into a succinct training process for all partners.

Challenges: The diversity of settings in which we work has made us realise the challenge of generalising our approach. For example, the term 'community' had to be defined differently for Mongolia vs Pakistan or Kyrgyzstan. In the latter two, community is more akin to what we in the West are accustomed to (a geographically confined number of households that share some form of unifying governance). However in Mongolia the socio-cultural history, combined with the geographic landscape, has created a much different scenario in which households are widely spread apart, move regularly, and are often wary of communal activities. Local governance is in charge of a region, but not a set number of discrete households. Therefore the way we count 'communities' had to be redefined as those households working together under a unifying programme. Having to make adjustments of this sort, as well as having to ensure that all our methods/protocols were appropriate and manageable in the field took much more discussion than anticipated over a longer period of time. But in the end, this was a fruitful way for all partners to gain a greater understanding and appreciation for the unique human environments each worked in.

- Annex 0.1a-e: meeting notes for bolded dates above

3. Project Progress

3.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

Towards Output 1-Conservation initiatives established in 47 communities with >20 communities engaged in multiple programmes: During the year, field implementers attended meetings with 40 'representative' programme communities (32 Mongolia, 5 Pakistan, 3 Kyrgyzstan). For Mongolia and Kyrgyzstan, see example evidence of meetings according to deliverables, e.g. signing of contracts, purchasing of handicrafts—as described below. In Pakistan, a summary of meetings per community was captured in the SLFK Annual Report 2015. The purpose of the meetings was to maintain current engagement in handicraft, livestock insurance, corral-building initiatives, and to discuss expansion of initiatives, e.g. uptake of multiple programs.

Within these 40 communities, field implementers met with 32 current communities (28 Mongolia, 1 Pakistan, 3 Kyrgyzstan) active in handicrafts; during meetings they placed/collected product orders (payment and shipping information below). They also met with 8 communities (5 Mongolia, 3 Pakistan) active in insurance; during meetings they reviewed claims rates and oversaw claims management/payments (claims payment information below).

They met with 7 communities (5 Mongolia, 2 Kyrgyzstan), currently active in handicrafts and/or insurance to discuss building predator-proof corrals.

In addition to the above, field implementers reached out to 6 other communities (4 Mongolia, 2 Pakistan) not currently engaged with handicrafts, insurance, or corral initiatives to discuss uptake of one or more of the three programmes.

As part of meetings in Mongolia, 32 currently active communities updated existing conservation contracts, which are mutual agreements governing programme norms and responsibilities (i.e. as noted, part of the evidence towards Activity 1.1. is Activity 1.2). Contracts in Kyrgyzstan will be renewed/updated in April 2016. (Pakistan communities renew every 5 years and/or amend when there is an agreed change to be made.).

These meetings also facilitated progress towards activities 1.3 and 1.5 (initiation of corral building and handicrafts payments). In Pakistan the valley of Shimshal in Gilgit-Baltistan Province (Central Karakoram Conservation Complex) was selected for a new village-level predator-proof corral, in coordination with the local Shimshal valley organization. Total livestock holdings of the valley are 9,000+, but the corral will be prioritized at a site where community feels chances of mass livestock killing by predators are highest. The corral dimensions are tentatively 20 x 70 feet, depending on site selected, and it will accommodate 300-400 livestock. The village will provide labour, our project partner SLF will provide materials. In March supplies were purchased by SLF.

Handicraft orders were collected from Mongolia, Kyrgyzstan and Pakistan and over 35,000 handicrafts were shipped to SLT during YR 1. Annex 1.6 includes a list of communities SLCF met with, number of products collected, and amount paid to herder. Annex 1.7 show customs shipping reports from Mongolia, Kyrgyzstan and Pakistan. Activity 1.4, disbursement of seed funding, is delayed as our partner SLCF is waiting on information from insurance communities prior to releasing funds into community accounts; this is now expected to happen in April 2016. No claims have yet been filed for insurance programmes in Pakistan as there have, as of yet, been no livestock losses to predation during the nascent beginnings of the programme.

- Annex 1.1-SLF Pakistan Annual Report 2015-Summary of community meetings highlighted in yellow on page 9, list of meetings/community begin on page 11, communities relevant to this project highlighted in yellow. Note, this is an excerpt from a larger 38-page report, pages not relevant at this time removed.
- Annex 1.2a&b - Sample of a renewed contract from Mongolia, from September 7, 2015 (Annex 1.2a in Mongolian and Annex 1.2b in English); sample of 1 community provided for reference, contracts from all SLE communities in Mongolia available upon request.
- Annex 1.3- Ongoing livestock insurance contract for Mori Payeen village in Chitral, Pakistan; sample of 1 community provided for reference, contracts from all insurance communities in Pakistan available upon request
- Annex 1.4 - Receipts from Pakistan for purchase of corral materials for Shimshal (pending—see note for Annex 1.5 below)
- Annex 1.5 - Conservation contract for construction of corral in Shimshal (pending--a proxy sample from Chitral is attached). Contracts and receipts from Shimshal pending due to severe floods in Gilgit-Baltistan that have knocked out communications; they will be sent as soon as communications are back online: <http://dunyanews.tv/en/Pakistan/330603-Rain-devastation-Death-toll-in-KP-GilgitBaltist>; in the meantime, the sample corral contract attached is from a previous corral build in 2013).
- Annex 1.6 – SLCF Handicraft purchase data 2015 showing communities visited, # handicrafts purchased, amounts paid
- Annex 1.7 – SLT Handicrafts Received-Quickbooks 2015, shows number of handicrafts received in US by SLT, top page contains summary, back pages are QB reports specific to each shipment

Towards Output 2 - Effectiveness of single and multiple conservation initiatives on livestock losses, household income and attitudes towards interventions, predators and ungulates is understood, including regional and gender effects:

Activities towards this output involve baseline data collection to understand socio-economic changes as a result of program uptake. An initial partner start-up meeting was held between UoA, SLT and CEH on April 16, 2015. Project Leader and Partners met over Skype to review the goals and activities of the project, assess data needs, and assign tasks. Following this meeting, they collected data from our partner NGOs in Mongolia, Pakistan, and Kyrgyzstan in order to review the current state of their programs, e.g. what communities they were working in, which communities were managing which programs, current participation rates, etc. The results were summarized in a Project Initiation Dataset (Annex 2.1).

Following this meeting, UoA and SLT worked collaboratively to develop protocols (including sample size) and forms for field surveys. These forms and protocols were reviewed with CEH and with field teams in Mongolia, Pakistan and Kyrgyzstan. They were finalized and shared back with the field for translation into local dialects. Final survey formats, with protocols, are in Annex 3.1, Field Implementer Toolkit; community survey forms start on page 26.

These survey forms were then implemented by field teams in Pakistan, Mongolia and Kyrgyzstan to collect socio-economic (livestock losses, income and attitudes) baseline data from a sample of representative (actively participating in programme models) and control communities (not involved in snow leopard conservation). We completed surveys and collated data from a total of 40 communities (all representative communities; some controls have been surveyed, but data not collated or analysed yet). Moving forward, Mongolia has yet to collect data from communities with more than one programme, and needs to expand to cover a larger control group. This will be completed in June 2016. Kyrgyzstan is currently in the process of collecting their data from representative and control communities (scheduled for April 15).

Annex 2.1 - Project Initiation Dataset.

Annex 2.3 – Socio-Economic Survey data summary—summary data from all three countries

Towards Output 3 - Training delivered for field implementers and meetings held with community champions:

Young at CEH, with support from SLT and UoA, created a toolkit for field implementers based on a document called 'PARTNERS Principles for Community Engagement.' This document, written by Mishra of SLT, is a summary of best practices in community-based conservation based on over 20 years of experience. The full document was shared with partner NGOs in Mongolia, Pakistan and Kyrgyzstan at the beginning of the project. At the heart of the toolkit is a training course developed by Young of CEH. The course is also adapted from the PARTNERS Principles document into a practical and interactive module. The goal of the training course is to provide participants the opportunities to share their own experiences of community engagement and, as a group, evaluate successes and shortcomings and how to deal with challenges in the future. The course aims to be participatory, self-reflecting and constructive. The course consists of input from the trainer based on his/her experience and the PARTNERS principles, and is structured around six training exercises (also in the toolkit) and seven group exercises. The aim is that the toolkit and follow-up workshops will provide confidence, knowledge, support and new skills to field implementers. Field Implementers Toolkit is Annex 3.1 and original PARTNERS Principles are Annex 3.2.

Using the toolkit, three training courses were provided to field implementers. The first 'pilot' training course was held in Mongolia from June 2-4 (8 participants). A number of changes to the toolkit and training course agenda were made after the Mongolia training course, based on the feedback from the questionnaire and the course organisers. The participants in the Mongolia training course stressed the need for more discussion and sharing of experiences. This resulted in a major change in the toolkit and resulted in including individual exercises where the focus is on building skills (e.g. self-reflection, listening skills, and negotiation skills) and group exercises, where the focus is on group discussion and sharing of experiences. From September 3-8, a second training course was held in Kyrgyzstan for our joint Kyrgyzstan and Pakistan teams from SLFK and SLF (10 total participants). Although India is not part of this project it's important to note that the course has since been replicated for our colleagues in India as well, showing the applicability across countries. Overall, feedback from all trainings has been positive and shows high degree of learning. Trainees appreciated the opportunity to reflect on past community work and to place this work in perspective of other people's

experiences. This led one participant to remark on the need to *focus on relationships rather than forcing outcomes*. Some participants were surprised that so many lessons could be learned from negative experiences of community engagement—i.e. what could have been done differently. For a number of participants, the workshops provided them with the opportunity to refresh their skills. For those less experienced, the training course allowed them to learn some key skills and build their confidence—Annex 3.3 shows workshops feedback results from Mongolia and Kyrgyzstan. Also a blog post highlighting some of the valuable take-away messages from the training session in Kyrgyzstan is at <http://www.snowleopard.org/your-snow-leopards-are-killing-our-goats>, also reposted on Darwin Initiative Blog.

Another aim of Output 3 was to support basic skills within communities (e.g. wool processing skills, accounting, etc) for improved programme operations and management. In Mongolia, SLCF held training for 87 women from 5 communities involved in handicrafts. This training was meant to improve the quality of wool products, and transition participants from low-selling products to more high-demand products with better quality/saleability. Summary of Mongolia trainings is in Annex 3.4. This includes photos showing samples of the skills participants learned. In Kyrgyzstan, a special workshop was held in June for 26 herders from 3 communities for the same reasons. Accounts from the training are captured in a blog article here: <http://www.snowleopard.org/fresh-product-ideas-to-help-protect-snow-leopards>. A funder report about the workshop is under Annex 3.5. This includes photos of sample products developed during this workshop. In Pakistan, trainings were held for two villages (Goleen and Birir) in Chitral, Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa province that are possible new expansions sites for YR 2 of the project; a field report on the trainings is Annex 3.6. This includes photos showing samples of handicrafts learned.

In Mongolia, a workshop was held by SLCF in June 2015, attended by 20 herder families. As part of this workshop, participants received training on legal aspects of land ownership and rights and responsibilities therein, delivered by Lawyer Dashdemberel. G. The result is that 6 communities are working to legally register their lands. Annex 3.7 shows sample registration.

Finally, through this output we are working to develop ‘community champions’—i.e. internal community advocates for snow leopard conservation. Along with the Field Implementers Toolkit discussed above, a separate but related toolkit was developed for local champions—Annex 3.8. We have identified a total of 32 local champions (16 Mongolia, 6 Kyrgyzstan, 10 Pakistan) across all three project countries—refer back to Annex 2.1, Project Initiation Dataset, columns for Community Champions, champions listed by name. Three types of people have been identified under the term ‘Champion’: 1) Community conservation leader—someone who is elected by the community to act as a bridge between the community and conservation program, and/or elected to officially represent the community in larger discourse. 2) Volunteer ranger—herders with a natural conservation interest and good field skills who are nominated by the community to collect data and patrol in community responsible areas. 3) ‘Influencer’—people who have esteemed status in the community either for knowledge, relative wealth, lineage, etc. See Annex 3.9—for a summary of Support Required to Strengthen Role of Community Champions in Pakistan. Champions have been nominated in large part due to their existing relationship with our project partners—i.e. they have been and continue to be cultivated. However, until now interactions have been informal; we are working on methods to track interactions and activities of champions more rigorously, and have amended our timeline to push forward Activity 3.7.

Annex 3.1 – Toolkit for Field Implementers

Annex 3.2 - PARTNERS Principles document used as basis for Field Implementers Toolkit

Annex 3.3 – Training for field implementers-process and responses—includes workshop feedback from participants

Annex 3.3a—Roster of trainees—all people who attended workshops training for field implementers

Annex 3.4 – SLCF handicraft training report 2015—a summary of all handicraft training in Mongolia with participant numbers, photos of handicrafts, and participant stories.

Annex 3.5 -- Kyrgyzstan Design Workshop training report 2015—a donor report prepared by SLT for Rufford Foundation, who funded the workshop.

Annex 3.6 - SLF handicraft training report Birir and Goleen 2016—showing training for two communities in Chitral, Pakistan that will prepare them for inclusion into project in YR2.

Annex 3.7 - CRA Certificate – Saalithuren. Community in Mongolia that gained official certification as a Community Responsible Area (CRA) by the government; sample, more available upon request.

Annex 3.8 – Toolkit for champions

Annex 3.9 -- Support Required to Strengthen Role of Community Champions in Pakistan—this includes a list of Champions from Pakistan (pages 1-2) and information on tools/resources needed starting on page 3.

Towards Output 4 - Impact of conservation initiatives on abundance of wild ungulates and snow leopards understood:

To assess snow leopard abundance, we are using camera trap surveys and comparing results between representative and control communities. In Mongolia, camera surveys were completed in representative landscapes (Tost-Toson Bumba Mountains). We initially planned trap camera surveys in Noyon- Bayasakh in 2015. However extenuating circumstances (discussed in Section 11 below) delayed our plans. We will therefore rely on existing camera surveys completed in Noyon-Bayasakh in 2013/2014 for our control data, and complete one more year of comparative data for robust baselines. Next round of surveys is now slated for November 2016. A GIS map showing placement of cameras in 2013/2014 in Annex 4.5.

In Kyrgyzstan, one camera survey is currently running in an existing conservation landscape. We were late initiating due to high water levels in the rivers prohibiting safe access. For the control site (Kooluu Vally), we were not able to access a neighbouring hunting concession before December (active hunters moving around with loaded guns and ammunition), and then had to work around other commitments. The control surveys are scheduled for May 2016.

In Pakistan, camera trapping in control landscape (Terichmir valley) was completed by Dec 2015. Cameras have been placed in the representative landscape (Hoper-Hisper valleys) and collected in April 2016.

Thus far, we have completed a total of 319 trap camera days and collected 392 snow leopard encounters. A summary of camera trap survey activity is in Annexes 4.1 and 4.1a.

Reports on poaching have been collected from in and around 40 communities currently engaged in conservation initiatives. In Mongolia, SLCF also received reports from 4 PAs and 4 environmental agencies. Most communities SLCF works with are around PAs, and they rely on PA reports of poaching. For communities not around PAs, they rely on reports from environmental agencies that collect data on a provincial level. No poaching was found in 2015—Annex 4.2 a&b show a sample report in Mongolian and English from Munkhkhairhan National Park. In Kyrgyzstan, there was evidence of possible poaching in the national park adjacent to our three representative communities. Cameras set out for research picked up images of poachers entering the park—photo in Annex 4.4. Follow-up visits are planned by SLFK to discuss the situation and determine next steps (e.g. reporting to authorities) and future solutions (e.g. better signage around protected area). Currently, this is anecdotal as the SLFK director is in the field right now dealing with this recent issue; official reports will be generated later for evidence and proper accounting. In Pakistan, there two cases of poaching of wild prey reported in Chitral during YR 1 of this project (in Tooshi-Kuju Payeen and Gahirate). Highly likely they affect the communities involved with project programmes; see Annex 4.3, 4.3a&b. As part of the community surveys discussed in Output 2, we collected assessments at a community level as to local knowledge of poaching issues. We have the raw data and it is being collated currently. Sample of the form used to collect data is in Annex 2.1, Field Implementer Toolkit, page 27.

Annex 4.1—Trap camera survey summary; trap # and trap nights for Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia and Pakistan, where available

Annex 4.1a—Camera trapping report of Hoper Hisper, Pakistan

Annex 4.1b-e—Sample trap camera photos from Tost, Mongolia (4.1b&c) and Sarychat Ertash, Kyrgyzstan, 2015 (4.1d&e)

Annex 4.2 a&b – Munkhkhairkhan park letter 2015 (4.2b in Mongolian and 4.2a in English)-- examples of reports on poaching; samples, more available upon request

Annex 4.3 Pakistan poaching in Chitral District, a short Excel sheet account from Pakistan.
 Annex 4.3a—Chitral Times report on poaching--Gahirate
 Annex 4.3b—Chitral Times report on poaching—Tooshi-Kuju Payeen
 Annex 4.4 – Kyrgyzstan-photo of poachers entering PA Oct2015
 Annex 4.5 – Trap camera placement Noyon Baisakh, Mongolia—GIS map showing placement of trap cameras for control landscape in Mongolia

3.2 Progress towards project outputs

Output 1:	Conservation contracts signed with 47 communities through participatory methods, with >20 communities engaged in multiple programmes.		Comments (if necessary)
	Progress/Current status by 2016	Source of evidence	
Indicator 1.1 >15 additional corrals predator-proofed, protecting up to 5,600 additional livestock by yr 3, over baseline of 14 corrals protecting 5,400 livestock	Purchase of materials to construct 1 additional corral over baseline, taking place in Shimshal Valley, Gilgit-Baltistan Province, Pakistan; will protect 300-400 livestock.	Annex 1.4 and 1.5	Strong interest for at least 17 more corrals in YR2 (7 Mongolia, 5 Pakistan, 5 Kyrgyzstan).
Indicator 1.2 6 additional communities insure up to 10,000 additional livestock by yr 3, over baseline of 7 insuring 5000 livestock	No new insurance programmes. Project Initiation Dataset shows revised baseline of 8 insurance communities in YR1 (3 Mongolia, 5 Pakistan)		15 HH's from 1 existing handicraft community in Mongolia interested to join insurance in YR2.
Indicator 1.3 433 households in 38 communities expected to engage in handicrafts by yr 3, over baseline of 315 households in 35 communities	Project Initiation Dataset shows revised baseline: 32 communities, 324 HH (209 Mongolia, 69 Pakistan, 46 Kyrgyzstan).	Output 2, Annex 2.1, project initiation dataset	6 communities slated to join programme in YR 2 (4 Mongolia, 2 Pakistan)
Indicator 1.4 Nine new and 38 updated conservation contracts signed for 47 communities, by yr 2	28 handicraft contracts renewed, Mongolia 1 new contract for corral, Shimshal Pakistan	Annex 1.2a&b, Annex 1.5	10 new contracts slated for YR 2 (3 Mongolia, 7 Pakistan, 1 Kyrgyzstan)
Indicator 1.5 >20 communities engaged in multiple programmes by 2018	7 communities (4 Mongolia, 3 Pakistan) engaged in multiple programs	Output 2, Annex 2.1, project initiation dataset	At least 2 more communities slated to be engaged in multiple programs in YR 2. There is some concern we have about meeting this Indicator, regarding possible slow uptake of insurance programs. See discussion in Section 11 below.

Output 2:	An assessment of the effectiveness of conservation initiatives on livestock losses, household income and attitudes towards interventions, predators and ungulates, including regional and gender effects.		Comments (if necessary)
	Progress/Current status by 2016	Source of evidence	
Indicator 1.1 Effectiveness of predator-proofed corrals on livestock losses analysed in yr 3.	Baselines predation rates collected as part of community socio-economic surveys in YR 1, data currently being analysed.	Annex 2.2, Final survey format and protocols	
Indicator 1.2 Effectiveness of livestock insurance programmes on payouts and household income analysed in yr 3.	<p>Claims paid in YR1: Mongolia- In late June 2015, claims were reviewed and paid for the period June 2014-June 2015. Premium rates were MNT1,000 (\$0.63) for small, MNT10,000 (\$5.26) for large livestock. A total of 5 large and 26 small livestock were predated by snow leopard during this time for total payout of \$42.68. In January 2016 claims were reviewed for the period July 2015-December 2015. Premium rates remained the same. 41 small, 7 big animals were depredated by predators during this time for total payout of \$62.65.</p> <p>No claims paid yet for Pakistan. No insurance programmes in Kyrgyzstan.</p>	Annex— AA-SLCF 2015 field report excerpt specific to insurance.	
Indicator 1.3 Effectiveness of handicraft scheme on household income analysed in yr 3.	<p>Handicraft payments in YR1: Mongolia-\$37,121 paid to 227 herders, average income ~\$164/participant. 20% Bonus paid for conservation contracts: \$7,440; averaged among participants: ~\$33/participant. Total paid to herders: \$197/participant</p> <p>Kyrgyzstan-\$11,610 paid to 43 herders, average income ~\$270/participant. (Bonuses for 2015 not paid yet).</p> <p>Pakistan-\$1840 paid to 77 herders, average income ~\$24/participant. (Model does not provide bonuses).</p>	<p>Annex 1.6—SLCF Handicraft purchase data: total from columns I and J, bonus amount on column K</p> <p>Annex AA1-- SLF Pakistan Annual Report 2015 handicraft information excerpt, specific information highlighted</p>	

		in green Annex AA2-SLFK Kyrgyzstan Annual Report 2015- excerpt for handicraft, specific information highlighted in yellow	
Indicator 1.4 Effectiveness of interventions on attitudes towards interventions, wild ungulates and snow leopards by men and women in communities analysed in yr 3	Baseline attitude survey data collected and collated for 40 communities	Annex 2.3— Socio-Economic Survey data summary	

Output 3:	Training delivered for field implementers and meetings held with community champions		Comments (if necessary)
	Progress/Current status by 2016	Source of evidence	
Indicator 1.1 Training of 13 field implementers from SLCF, SLFP and SLFK in negotiation and community engagement skills increased sensitivity towards respectful community engagement and retention of information in yr 3	18 field implementers introduced to Partners Principles and trained in best practices for community engagement and community-based conservation based on Partners Principles. Field implements report	Annex 3.1, 3.3 and 3.3a	
Indicator 1.2 47 respected community conservation champions are actively engaged in dialogue with communities by end of yr 2	32 champions identified for further engagement.	Output 2, Annex 2, 1, Columns for community champions	Activities of champions will be recorded in YR 2.

Output 4:	An assessment of the impact of conservation initiatives on abundance of wild ungulates and snow leopards.		Comments (if necessary)
	Progress/Current status by 2016	Source of evidence	
Indicator 1.1 Attitudes towards predators and wild herbivores will be more positive in participating households and communities by yr 3	Baseline attitude survey data collected and collated for 40 communities	Output 2, Annex 2.3	
Indicator 1.2 Triangulated reports indicate that killing of wild ungulates and snow leopards stops in communities with conservation contracts by yr 3.	Killings reported in YR1: Mongolia-none Kyrgyzstan-none, but violation of hunters entering PA illegally Pakistan-2 cases of wild ungulate poaching in Chitral	Annex 4.2a&b, 4.3, 4.3a&b	
Indicator 1.3 Indices of abundance of snow leopards in the sampled programme landscapes are	Baseline snow leopard abundance surveys in	Annex 4.1, 4.1a	

stable or higher in yr 3 than yr1 and higher compared to estimates from control landscapes in yr 3	representative landscapes completed for all landscapes; baseline surveys in control landscapes completed in Pakistan and Mongolia. Baseline surveys in Kyrgyzstan underway in May.		
--	--	--	--

Output 5:	Communication with Snow Leopard network, CBD and GSLEP representatives and the wider conservation community.		Comments (if necessary)
	Progress/Current status by 2016	Source of evidence	
Indicator 1.1 Working paper outlining effectiveness of interventions on losses, income and attitudes incorporated into SLCF, SLFP, SLFK strategic planning and distributed to Snow Leopard Network and appropriate CBD and GLSEP contacts by yr 3	Data collection in progress. To be completed in YR 3.		
Indicator 1.2 Peer review paper on effectiveness of interventions on losses, income and attitudes submitted for publication by yr 3	Data collection in progress. To be completed in YR 3.		
Indicator 1.3 Best practice in conservation interventions shared with international field teams yr 3	Data collection in progress. To be completed in YR 3.		

3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

Outcome:	Participatory interventions in 47 communities reduce livestock losses, insure against predation, increase household income and improve attitudes, leading to stable/increased snow leopard abundance and improved understanding for conflict management.		Comments (if necessary)
	Baseline	Change by 2016	Source of evidence
Indicator 1.1 By 2018, at least 15 new corrals will be predator-proofed, protecting up to 5,600 additional livestock from predation for a total of at least 29 corrals and up to 11,000 livestock protected.	14 corrals protecting 5400 livestock	One new corral under construction for 300-400 livestock	See annex listed above
Indicator 1.2 By 2018, at least 6 new insurance programmes will insure up to 10,000 additional livestock to compensate for losses to carnivore predation, for a total of 13 insurance programmes.	7 insurance programmes	One new insurance program	See annex listed above
Indicator 1.3 By 2018, at least 3 new community handicraft schemes will be developed, increasing average	315 HH in 35 communities, earning up to \$230/HH	324 HH in 32 communities earning up to \$270	See annex listed above

income of up to 118 new participating households by up to US\$440 pa for a total of 38 communities.				
Indicator 1.4 By 2018, attitudinal surveys will indicate that both men and women will be more positive towards interventions, predators and wild ungulates in communities with conservation contracts compared to communities with no interventions, and in communities with multiple interventions compared to single ones.	Baselines being collected		See annex listed above	
Indicator 1.5 By 2018, evidence will indicate that illegal killing of wild ungulates and snow leopards in communities with interventions will stop.	See	Ongoing monitoring taking place	See annex listed above	
Indicator 1.6 By 2018, abundance of wild ungulates and snow leopards will be higher in 3 landscapes with participating communities relative to 3 paired control landscapes.	Baselines being collected	Ongoing monitoring taking place	See annex listed above	
Indicator 1.7 By 2018, the impact of conservation interventions on income, attitudes and snow leopards will be assessed and shared the wider community.	Baselines being collected	Ongoing monitoring taking place	See annex listed above	

3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

Outcome assumptions:

Assumption 1	Communities remain willing to engage in collaborative, multi-pronged conservation management initiatives	Still holds true. Interest on behalf of households and communities to engage in programmes moving forward in YR 2 is captured in Output 2, Annex 1.2-- columns marked 'Potential new...'-- communities/households interested to join the programmes in YR2. Additional HH is a good indicator, because they want to join likely due to positive feedback from other communities and households.
---------------------	--	---

Assumption 2	US and online markets for handicrafts and livestock products remain sustainable	<p>Still holds true. US/online sales are maintaining. SLT handicraft sales in 2015: \$85,750. In 2016, FY Q1 sales in handicrafts have exceeded Q1 sales from FY2015.</p> <p>Annex BB- SLT Handicraft sales revenue-2015 estimate—shows 2015 sales revenue from 'SLE'—name of SLT's handicraft programme</p> <p>Annex BB1-SLT Handicraft sales revenue-2016 Q1 estimate—shows sales Jan-Mar 2016 from 'SLE'—name of SLT's handicraft programme</p> <p>Sales revenue is estimated since SLT independent financial audit is still pending.</p>
Assumption 3	There is no severe socio-political unrest that prevents work with communities in the host countries. In our experience, access to some of the communities in Pakistan can get restricted for varying periods. Based on experience and our sustained field presence, we expect occasional delays but not a cessation of our work. We don't anticipate such issues in the other two countries.	Still holds true. Work in partner host countries was not stopped or restricted by political unrest in YR1.
Assumption 4	There are no new external threats to pastoral livelihoods and environments, such as damaging land uses (e.g. mining). In Mongolia where this is an issue, as a separate initiative with independent funding, we have been assisting the communities to negotiate with local governments to protect their areas from large-scale and illegal mining.	This assumption should be amended to account for severe weather as an external threat. In 2015 and now again in 2016 communities in host countries (particularly Pakistan) have experienced severe flooding, avalanche, and concomitant destruction to power, communication and travel infrastructure. In 2015 program operations in Gilgit-Baltistan were overshadowed by flooding and post-flooding recovery. The same is currently true in Gilgit-Baltistan due to similar weather. See Output 1, Annex 1.5 for news articles on Pakistan flooding.

Output assumptions:

Assumption 1	Results of project are clear and incorporated into policies/strategies	Yet to be determined.
Assumption 2	Field implementers will remain with their respective organizations for long enough to make training worthwhile	Still holds true. Thus far partner NGOs have not permanently lost any field implementers trained in YR1 due to job change (two have taken personal leave but plan to return). We did lose one researchers due to unexpected death. Output 3 Annex 3.3a Roster of trainees, columns G and H.
Assumption 3	We will be able to find effective community champions within a reasonable amount of time	Still holds true. Thus far we have been able to define and identify champions—Output 2, Annex 2.1, champions columns.

Assumption 4	Communities remain interested in corrals, handicrafts and insurance as good options for mitigating conflicts and leadership within community remains cohesive enough to manage multi-pronged programmes	This holds true for corrals and handicrafts, same as Output Assumption 1 above. There is more limited interest in insurance since uptake is more involved and requires an outlay of HH funds. Leadership within communities remains strong; as mentioned above, there has been no programmatic attrition, including attrition due to weak leadership.
--------------	---	---

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

Our impact to poverty alleviation is currently achieved through all three programmes: livestock insurance (financial repayment for livestock lost to predation), predator-proof corrals (reduction of livestock losses), and conservation handicrafts (payment for sales of wool products). In YR1 we provided these programs to 40 communities (Annex 2.1—Project Initiation Dataset). Earnings and compensation rates are clearly outlined under above under Output indicators 1.2 and 1.3, and Outcome indicator 1.3. These show the direct cash amounts paid out as part of programme participation.

SLT maintained distribution channels across 204 outlets and an online store to support sales income to herders (Annex A, retail outlet list). SLT provided training to women in the handicraft program to ensure high quality wool processing to maintain sales and profitability (Annex 3.4, 3.5, 3.6). In addition, partner SLCF provided 7.5 million MNT (£2560) in low-interest micro-credit loans to 13 herders for equipment and other privations to boost production capacity and livelihood stability (AnnexB, SLCF microcredit loan tracking, and Annex C, SLCF microcredit loan report).

The third conservation initiative under this project—predator-proof corrals—will also have impacts towards poverty alleviation, namely reducing loss of livestock; initiation of one corral has begun in YR1 (see Output 1, Indicator 1.1). More significant progress is slated for YR2.

Towards biodiversity conservation, the significant impact of our project in YR1 is adherence to conservation contracts, including cessation of poaching and retribution killing, by majority of communities engaged in conservation initiatives—refer to Output Indicator 1.2.

Stepwise, we have also established baselines against which to measure significant social and biological threat indicators. More significant impact will be achieved later in this project once we can analyse comparative results and make conclusions/recommendations for improving community-based conservation programs to better protect snow leopards and associated biodiversity.

Annex A – Retail outlet list, link to SLT online list:
<http://www.snowleopard.org/give/partners/retail-partners>

Annex B – SCLF microcredit loan tracking, column A shows # of participants, column D the amount loaned in MNT

Annex C – SLCF microcredit loan report, a review of the microcredit program

4. Contribution to SDGs

-SDG 1-End poverty in all its forms everywhere
 See section 3.5 above.

-SDG-5-Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
 See section 7 below. An external review was performed on SLCF’s handicraft model as it was developing. The review showed it contributes to female empowerment in numerous ways including increasing women’s sense of pride, well-being, and status within family and community. See Section 7, Annex D. This model is being applied in Pakistan and Kyrgyzstan.

-SDG-15-Protect, restore, and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably managed forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss.

Specifically targets 15.4 and 15.5. We have completed first steps towards understanding drivers of poaching and retribution killing that lead to biodiversity loss.

5. Project support to the Conventions, Treaties or Agreements)

Our project relates most directly to Articles 8 & 11 within the CBD (In-situ conservation & Incentive measure). We seek to support CBD through: (i) the protection of viable populations of snow leopard and wild ungulates (blue sheep, argali, ibex); (ii) the promotion of environmentally sound sustainable development through livelihood incentive programmes for managing snow leopard-human conflicts, and (iii) the development of conservation objectives and initiatives that are informed by science, and within the context of existing social frameworks, thereby being locally relevant and socially acceptable.

On a general level, SLT and partner organisations continue to be in close contact with CBD focal points in each country. This includes Mr. Sabir Atadjanov, Director State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry, Kyrgyzstan and CBD focal point for Kyrgyzstan; Mr. Dorjgurkhem Batbold, former CBD focal point for Mongolia and now director of WWF Mongolia; and Mr. Syed Mahmood Nasir, Inspector General of Forests Ministry of Climate Change, Pakistan and CBD focal point for Pakistan. Mr. Atadjanov, Mr. Batbold, and Mr. Nasir have been integrally involved in the ongoing Global Snow Leopard Forum and the Global Snow Leopard Ecosystem Protection Program, and remain aware of activities of SLCF, SLF and SLFK. Although it is too early for us to formally share any findings with them directly related to this Darwin project, their close association with SLT and partners means they are attuned to the various community-based programs we are working on.

The following links show examples of the ways in which SLT and partners regularly interact with CBD focal points:

Blog link showing Mr. Atadjanov and SLFK presenting awards to rangers in Kyrgyzstan:
<http://www.snowleopard.org/anti-poaching-heroes-honored-on-world-wildlife-day>

Article link showing quotes from Mr. Nasir and Mr. Atadjanov in attendance at Global Snow Leopard Ecosystem Protection Programme meeting in Paris, held in relation to COP21, co-hosted by SLT:

<http://www.globalsnowleopard.org/blog/2015/12/09/snow-leopard-and-climate-change/>

6. Project support to poverty alleviation

As discussed in Section 3.5. Our project aims to improve livelihoods of c16,000 people in 47 pastoralist communities in Mongolia, Kyrgyzstan and Pakistan. We are already working with 40 communities to build corrals, insure livestock or support handicrafts and these schemes reduce losses of livestock and improve levels of income. We fully expect our partnership approach to have long-lasting effects on poverty alleviation and well-being.

7. Project support to Gender equity issues

Direct beneficiaries of the handicraft program are currently 100% female in Mongolia, 100% female in Pakistan, and 98% female in Kyrgyzstan. Thus far we know that 5 women Champions have been selected for Pakistan and Kyrgyzstan (Output 2, Annex 2.1 Project Initiation Dataset, columns for female champions); we suspect a high number of champions from Mongolia are women, but have yet to parse out this information.

11 of the 18 field implementers received training under Output 3 were women—Annex 3.3a, column c.

Also during the project 162 women (87 Mongolia, 25 Kyrgyzstan, 50 Pakistan) handicrafts skill-building training (Annex 3.4, 3.5, 3.6). This training enables them to have better earning potential through handicraft programs. In turn, this earning potential is important towards their overall feelings of empowerment and social equality—see Annex D for an impact review of the handicraft program in Mongolia in 2006 in which the reviewer discussed program contributions to women. Statement from review: “*Female empowerment is a significant achievement of the program. This is expressed quantitatively through increased income generation and higher level training, and qualitatively through direct engagement in environmental decision-making, an innovative development in Mongolia.*”

- Annex D: Review of Snow Leopard Enterprises handicraft program in Mongolia 2006, conclusions begin on page 33, excerpt above highlighted in yellow.

8. Monitoring and evaluation

We have made no significant changes to the M+E plan, which is working well. Numerous international meetings were held online (see section 2), roughly once per quarter, to bring all project partners together to develop project plans, refine understanding and agreement towards project objectives/methods, discuss progress, and review data. UoA, CEH and SLT have met more frequently to track progress and address logistical issues.

Field reports have been provided by all partners. We have put in place a dedicated database to house all project data and allow for robust analysis. Surveys have been designed, risk assessments and ethics agreements finalised.

We have made minor logistical improvements to our tracking for Output Indicator 1.2 that will allow for more explicit and quantifiable tracking of interactions with community Champions and Champion activities.

9. Lessons learnt

During the year, management and collaboration on the project worked well between all partners. There was a good level of communication, consensus, and insight. That said, time has been the most limiting factor. Working across three counties with very different cultures and geographic factors has necessitated more time for proper discussion, execution of activities, and collation of data than anticipated. While SLT has worked closely with SLCF, SLF and SLFK on multiple projects, this is the first discrete project where all three have been so intimately involved in planning and implementation on such a large scale. We will review the timetable and try to anticipate where activities in YR2 and 3 need more time.

We also found a need to record evidence of impact, e.g. not just evidence that meetings or trainings happened but also what participants took away from these activities. During the course of normal field work, often field teams get consumed by planning and implementation—which creates positive outcomes—however if we cannot measure and share outcomes then it is difficult to explain the importance of the activity. This is something we will work to build into YR2 where needed.

We would highly recommend that other Darwin Initiative projects carefully review reporting and evidence-based impact assessments while developing their proposal, so steps to obtaining proper reporting are achieved.

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

NA

11. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

There have been no major changes to the design of the project over the year.

However, we faced some unexpected challenges. In Mongolia, a young colleague at SLCF passed away unexpectedly in November 2015. Due to his history working in snow leopard habitat, and controversy over his death, there was a great deal of public media and government inquiry SLCF had to deal with, on top of their mourning and logistical adjustments. An article about his death is here: <http://thediplomat.com/2016/02/mining-licenses-snow-leopards-and-a-mysterious-death/>. Directly following his death, Government of Mongolia renewed interest in an ongoing application, supported by SLCF, to upgrade Tost Mountains (southern part of our Darwin project site in Mongolia) into a state Nature Reserve. SLCF increased their advocacy and meetings with the Government. In April 2016, more staff was hired to support SLCF capacity and the proposal for Tost Nature Reserve was approved. However, between the loss of their colleague and the increased lobbying workload, there were some delays to all SLCF projects/programmes, including some of the activities of this grant.

Especially difficult weather conditions in Pakistan and Kyrgyzstan has also been a factor. In Kyrgyzstan, roads have been closed due to avalanche or regions have been unattainable due to ice. In Pakistan, floods in April knocked out most infrastructure and connectivity with snow leopard habitat in Khuber-Pakhtunkhwa and Gilgit-Baltistan. Links to articles about floods in Pakistan were included above in Section 3.1, Output 1.

As much as possible, we have made necessary adjustments to the timeline via change requests (October 2015 and April 2016).

Finally, we would like to note that uptake of insurance programs could be slower than anticipated. Field staff at SLCF and SLF express concern that communities might be more hesitant to uptake insurance because of initial outlay of cash, and lack of understanding or familiarity with program norms. Initiative like handicrafts and corrals require either no initial outlay of cash, and/or are more familiar/understandable to them. On the other hand, communities are very interested in handicrafts and corrals, which could make expansion of these programmes easier. This is something we will continue to discuss and monitor with partners in the beginning of YR2.

12. Sustainability and legacy

There is high interest within partner countries to increase community-based conservation towards snow leopard protection—recognition towards the rights and needs of local people endorsed by all snow leopard range counties during the signing of the Bishkek Declaration in for the Protection of the Endangered Snow Leopard in 2013, and a key component of the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Program (GSLEP) as developed in 2014. In Pakistan, Ministry for Climate Change, which is the nodal contact for GSLEP, endorsed a GEF6 proposal with SLF as implementing partner that has community-based conservation as a prime component. Government of Kyrgyzstan has a 10-year MoU with SLFK and SLT for snow leopard conservation projects that include community-based conservation. Mongolia's national snow leopard strategy, facilitated and informed by SLCF, ratified under GSLEP, prioritizes community-based conservation. This shows high-level recognition and interest for community-based conservation, as well as reliance on SLCF, SLFK, and SLF for continuation and expansion of programs and activities. Through ongoing contact, SLCF, SLFK and SLF have kept officials in Government informed about significant progress of community-based conservation programmes.

As stated above, we have not yet formally shared Darwin findings with respective government contacts—as shown in our timetable, most dissemination activities (publications, working papers, meetings) are scheduled for YR3.

Towards our exit strategy, to achieve a stable end point during the life of our project, we aimed to developing a sustainable legacy through training staff to support communities and training champions and empowering communities to take ownership of their corrals, insurance and handicraft programmes. Our partner organizations will continue to have a long-term presence

and support the communities in the delivery of these schemes into the foreseeable future. This strategy remains valid, and we will continue our monitoring of these efforts in YR2 and YR3.

13. Darwin Identity

- Publicising the Darwin Initiative

Darwin logo included in the Field Implementers Toolkit, Champions Toolkit, PowerPoint for training.

Darwin Initiative credited in blog posting related to the project (see final point below).

Darwin Initiative credited in SLT Winter 2015 newsletter article about field implementer trainings:

<http://www.snowleopard.org/downloads/2015%20Winter%20SLT%20Newsletter.pdf>

- UK Government's contribution to project

On our outputs we have used the statement: "[publication] made possible by a grant aided by the Darwin Initiative through UK Government funding"

- A distinct project

Yes, we have only credited Darwin Initiative Funding to stories recognizing discrete and distinct aspects of this project.

- Understanding of the Darwin Initiative

There is high level of understanding among partners SLCF, SLF, and SLFK, which are prominent NGOs within their respective countries. Darwin Initiative has been explained to their primary staff during the field implementer trainings.

- Twitter/Instagram/Flickr/Blog/YouTube and links to the Darwin account?

The following article was published on SLT's blog and reposted on Darwin Initiative Blog: <http://www.snowleopard.org/your-snow-leopards-are-killing-our-goats>. We also have a dedicated website to share links/news & relevant findings so it can be more easily accessed and shared: <http://www.snowleopard.org/learn/monitoring-our-impact/darwin-initiative>

14. Project Expenditure

Table 1 Project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016)

Project spend (indicative) since last annual report	2015/16 Grant (£)	2015/16 Total actual Darwin Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain any variance)
Staff costs (from Section 5)			0.3	Actual cost less than budget
Consultancy Costs				
Overhead Costs			0.7	
Travel and subsistence			13	Travel was cheaper originally forecast
Operating Costs			16	
Capital items (from Section 7)			4	Spent less than budget
Others (from Section 8)			1	Spend slightly more than budget
Audit costs	0.00	0.00		

		Claimed So Far	Claim for this period	Surrender Amount
TOTAL	A	B	C	E

Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2015-2016

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2015 - March 2016	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Impact</p> <p>Poverty of rural herders and threats to biodiversity are reduced in snow leopard regions of Mongolia, Pakistan and Kyrgyzstan through collaborative conservation programmes.</p>		<p>Through our project we are working towards improving the livelihoods of households in 47 communities, and supporting them to coexist with large predators, so that threats to snow leopards decrease.</p>	
<p>Outcome Participatory interventions in 47 communities reduce livestock losses, insure against predation, increase household income and improve attitudes, leading to stable/increased snow leopard abundance and improved understanding for conflict management.</p>	<p>Indicator 1: By 2018, at least 15 new corrals will be predator-proofed, protecting up to 5,600 additional livestock from predation for a total of at least 29 corrals and up to 11,000 livestock protected.</p> <p>Indicator 2: By 2018, at least 6 new insurance programmes will insure up to 10,000 additional livestock to compensate for losses to carnivore predation, for a total of 13 insurance programmes.</p> <p>Indicator 3: By 2018, at least 3 new community handicraft schemes will be developed, increasing average income of up to 118 new participating households by up to US\$440 pa for a total of 38 communities.</p> <p>Indicator 4: By 2018, attitudinal surveys will indicate that both men and women will be more positive towards interventions, predators and wild ungulates in communities with conservation contracts compared to communities with no interventions, and in communities with multiple interventions compared to single ones.</p>	<p>Currently 14 active corrals (for 5400 livestock). Materials have been purchased for 1 new corral in Pakistan (for 300-400 livestock).</p> <p>Currently 8 active insurance programmes. No new insurance communities in YR1.</p> <p>Currently 32 communities active in handicrafts. No new handicrafts communities in YR1, but 9 additional households involved.</p> <p>Completed attitudinal surveys in 40 communities</p>	<p>Complete current discussions for 17+ additional corrals for YR 2</p> <p>Continue discussions with communities to develop new insurance programmes</p> <p>Continue discussions for 6 communities interested in joining in YR 2.</p> <p>Baseline data collection completed, Data collated and analysed. Next surveys planned for 2018</p>

	<p>Indicator 5: By 2018, evidence will indicate that illegal killing of wild ungulates and snow leopards in communities with interventions will stop.</p> <p>Indicator 6: By 2018, abundance of wild ungulates and snow leopards will be higher in 3 landscapes with participating communities relative to 3 paired control landscapes.</p> <p>Indicator 7: By 2018, the impact of conservation interventions on income, attitudes and snow leopards will be assessed and shared the wider community.</p>	<p>Assessments completed for all communities. No evidence of SL poaching. 2 cases ungulate poaching.</p> <p>Camera trap data collected for 3 treatment landscapes and 2 control landscapes.</p> <p>Baseline data collected</p>	<p>Annual report repeated for each community</p> <p>1 control landscape to be completed in May 2016, additional year of data for 1 control landscape in Nov 2016</p> <p>Analysis to be completed in 2018</p>
<p>Output 1. Conservation contracts signed with 47 communities through participatory methods, with >20 communities engaged in multiple programmes.</p>	<p>Indicator 1: >15 additional corrals predator-proofed, protecting up to 5,600 additional livestock by yr 3, over baseline of 14 corrals protecting 5,400 livestock</p> <p>Indicator 2: >6 additional communities insure up to 10,000 additional livestock by yr 3, over baseline of 7 insuring 5000 livestock</p> <p>Indicator 3: 433 households in 38 communities expected to engage in handicrafts by yr 3, over baseline of 315 households in 35 communities</p> <p>Indicator 4: Nine new and 38 updated conservation contracts signed for 47 communities, by yr 2</p> <p>Indicator 5: >20 communities expected to be engaged in multiple programmes by 2018</p>	<p>See above for progress. Indicator expected to be achieved</p> <p>See above for progress. Indicator to be discussed with partners and reassessed in YR2.</p> <p>See above for progress. Indicator expected to be achieved</p> <p>1 new, 28 renewed, 3 pending renewal, 8 don't need reviewing. Engaged with 6 new communities</p> <p>7 communities now engaged in multiple programmes. Indicator to be discussed with partners and reassessed in YR2.</p> <p>Report completed or progress on activities that contribute toward achieving this output), and what will be carried out in the next period</p>	

Activity 1.1	Field implementers attend council meetings in each community	Field implementers attended meetings with 40 communities
Activity 1.2	Field implementers work with community leaders to agree on suite of conservation programmes, sign new/update existing conservation contracts	Field implementers agreed programmes and signed or continued current contracts with 40 communities.
Activity 1.3	Field implementers secure materials, communities secure labour and corrals constructed in relevant communities	Construction of 1 new corral instigated.
Activity 1.4	SLCF, SLFK and SLGP distribute seed money into community fund to jumpstart insurance schemes in relevant communities	Partners oversaw insurance schemes in 8 communities. No new schemes started.
Activity 1.5	Orders for handicrafts placed by SLT via field implementers; field implementers collect products twice/yr and bring to SLCF, SLFK, SLFP headquarters to ship to SLT for distribution	>35,000 handicrafts shipped to SLT.
Output 2. An assessment of the effectiveness of conservation initiatives on livestock losses, household income and attitudes towards interventions, predators and ungulates, including regional and gender effects.	<p>Indicator 1: Effectiveness of predator-proofed corrals on livestock losses analysed in yr 3.</p> <p>Indicator 2: Effectiveness of livestock insurance programmes on payouts and household income analysed in yr 3.</p> <p>Indicator 3: Effectiveness of handicraft scheme on household income analysed in yr 3.</p> <p>Indicator 4: Effectiveness of interventions on attitudes towards interventions, wild ungulates and snow leopards by men and women in communities analysed in yr 3</p>	<p>We have collected baseline data which will contribute to the analyses in YR 3.</p> <p>Claims and claims payments reviewed and distributed for insurance programs in Mongolia; no livestock predation/claims paid in Pakistan.</p> <p>Herders paid for handicraft orders in Mongolia, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan.</p> <p>Baseline data collected that will contribute to the analyses in YR3.</p>
Activity 2.1	UoA and SLT collate and review existing information	We have created a database that collates existing information on corrals, insurance and handicraft schemes.
Activity 2.2	UoA, SLT and CEH agree protocols for surveys at partner start-up meetings	Survey protocols agreed with partners.
Activity 2.3	Baseline (yr 1) and final yr (yr 3) survey data collected in sample of communities on livestock losses, income and attitudes	Baseline data collected and collated from 40 communities.
Output 3. Training delivered for field implementers and meetings	Indicator 1: Training of 13 field implementers from SLCF, SLFP and SLFK in negotiation and community	Training delivered to 18 field implementers.

held with community champions	engagement skills increased sensitivity towards respectful community engagement and retention of information in yr 3 Indicator 2: 47 respected community conservation champions are actively engaged in dialogue with communities by end of yr 2	32 champions identified for engagement. Champions are already engaged informally with the project partners.
Activity 3.1	Toolkits prepared for field implementers by UoA, SLT and CEH	Toolkits prepared
Activity 3.2	Training workshop for field implementers delivered, based on negotiation theory and PARTNERS Principles, and SLT's field monitoring manual	Training delivered
Activity 3.3	Field implementers hold meetings for community representatives to convey skills in and discuss programme management/implementation (accounting, wool processing, sales and marketing)	Trainings held in Mongolia, Pakistan and Kyrgyzstan for handicraft skills
Activity 3.4	Toolkits for local champions developed by UoA, SLT and CEH	Toolkit developed
Activity 3.5	Local champions are identified and sensitized in programme communities through meetings with SLCF, SLFK and SLFP field implementers and toolkit	Champions identified and informally engaged with.
Activity 3.6	Sustained interaction with local champions, including documentation by SLCF, SLFK, SLFP field implementers of their conservation awareness activities.	Interaction informal currently. We have identified a need to track interactions and activities of champions more formally.
Output 4 - Impact of conservation initiatives on abundance of wild ungulates and snow leopards understood.	Indicator 1: Attitudes towards predators and wild herbivores will be more positive in participating households and communities by yr 3. Indicator 2: Triangulated reports indicate that killing of wild ungulates and snow leopards stops in communities with conservation	We have collected baseline data on attitudes. We have collected reports on illegal activity from government and communities (latter still needs to be collated and analyzed)

	contracts by yr 3. Indicator 3: Indices of abundance of snow leopards in the sampled programme landscapes are stable or higher in yr 3 than yr1 and higher compared to estimates from control landscapes in yr 3	We have camera trap data on 3 representative landscapes and 2 control landscapes
Activity 4.1	Any killing of snow leopards and wild ungulates recorded Yrs1-3	Reports collected.
Activity 4.2	Snow leopard abundance surveys in representative programme and control landscapes undertaken in Yr 1 and Yr 3 through camera trapping	Surveys complete in 3 representative landscapes and 2 control landscapes. Last control due May 2016.
Activity 4.3	Wild ungulate surveys undertaken in representative habitats in programme and control landscapes in Yrs 2 & 3 through double observer techniques	Yr 2 activity
Activity 4.4	Photo-identification, data compilation and analyses by partners	Taking place now
Output 5: Communication with Snow Leopard network, CBD and GSLEP representatives and the wider conservation community.	Indicator 1: Working paper outlining effectiveness of interventions on losses, income and attitudes incorporated into SLCF, SLFP, SLFK strategic planning and distributed to Snow Leopard Network and appropriate CBD and GLSEP contacts by yr 3 Indicator 2: Peer review paper on effectiveness of interventions on losses, income and attitudes submitted for publication by yr 3 Indicator 3: Best practice in conservation interventions shared with international field teams yr 3	These are yr 3 activities, but baseline data collected that will contribute to analyses.
Activity 5.1	Working paper outlining effectiveness of interventions on losses, income and attitudes completed and shared with partners, Snow Leopard Network and appropriate CBD and GLSEP contacts	Yr 3 activity

Activity 5.2 Peer review paper on effectiveness of interventions on losses, income and attitudes submitted for publication	Yr 3 activity
Activity 5.3 Meeting with international field teams to discuss 3 best practice in conservation interventions	Yr 3 activity

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

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Impact: Effective contribution in support of the implementation of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (CMS), as well as related targets set by countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources.</p>			
<p>Outcome: Participatory interventions in 47 communities reduce livestock losses, insure against predation, increase household income and improve attitudes, leading to stable/increased snow leopard abundance and improved understanding for conflict management.</p>	<p>Indicator 1: By 2018, at least 15 new corrals will be predator-proofed, protecting up to 5,600 additional livestock from predation for a total of at least 29 corrals and up to 11,000 livestock protected.</p> <p>Indicator 2: By 2018, at least 6 new insurance programmes will insure up to 10,000 additional livestock to compensate for losses to carnivore predation, for a total of 13 insurance programmes.</p> <p>Indicator 3: By 2018, at least 3 new community handicraft schemes will be developed, increasing average income of up to 118 new participating households by up to US\$440 pa for a total of 38 communities.</p> <p>Indicator 4: By 2018, attitudinal surveys will indicate that both men and women will be more positive towards interventions, predators and wild ungulates in communities with conservation contracts compared to communities with no interventions, and in communities with multiple interventions compared to single ones. Indicator 5: By 2018, evidence will indicate that illegal killing of wild ungulates and snow leopards in communities with interventions will stop.</p>	<p>Indicator 1: Annual report summary indicating the numbers of livestock killed at each household with predator proof corrals.</p> <p>Indicator 2: Annual reports from each country reporting on premium and pay out rates and the value of different livestock for all communities in insurance programmes.</p> <p>Indicator 3: Reports on handicraft programme from each country, reporting on numbers of participants, household income, handicraft sales and price received.</p> <p>Indicator 4: Reports of baseline and final surveys for sample households in sample communities measuring attitudes towards interventions, snow leopards and wild ungulates.</p> <p>Indicator 5: Annual reports from each country summarising evidence of illegal activity in all communities as estimated from various reports and interviews.</p>	<p>Assumption 1: Communities remain willing to engage in collaborative, multi-pronged conservation management initiatives</p> <p>Assumption 2: US and online markets for handicrafts and livestock products remain sustainable</p> <p>Assumption 3: There is no severe socio-political unrest that prevents work with communities in the host countries. In our experience, access to some of the communities in Pakistan can get restricted for varying periods. Based on experience and our sustained field presence, we expect occasional delays but not a cessation of our work. We don't anticipate such issues in the other two countries.</p> <p>Assumption 4: There are no new external threats to pastoral livelihoods and environments, such as damaging land uses (e.g. mining). In Mongolia where this is an issue, as a separate initiative with independent funding, we have been assisting the communities to negotiate with local governments to protect their areas from large-scale and illegal mining.</p>

	<p>Indicator 6: By 2018, abundance of wild ungulates and snow leopards will be higher in 3 landscapes with participating communities relative to 3 paired control landscapes.</p> <p>Indicator 7: By 2018, the impact of conservation interventions on income, attitudes and snow leopards will be assessed and shared the wider community.</p>	<p>Indicator 6: Reports from six landscape-scale, wildlife surveys of wild ungulate and snow leopard abundance.</p> <p>Indicator 7: Evidence of communication with Snow Leopard Network, CBD representatives and GSLEP officials via emails, reports and talks; and articles submitted to conservation journals.</p>	
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. Conservation contracts signed with 47 communities through participatory methods, with >20 communities engaged in multiple programmes.</p>	<p>1a. >15 additional corrals predator-proofed, protecting up to 5,600 additional livestock by yr 3, over baseline of 14 corrals protecting 5,400 livestock</p> <p>1b. >6 additional communities insure up to 10,000 additional livestock by yr 3, over baseline of 7 insuring 5000 livestock</p> <p>1c. 433 households in 38 communities expected to engage in handicrafts by yr 3, over baseline of 315 households in 35 communities</p> <p>1d. Nine new and 38 updated conservation contracts signed for 47 communities, by yr 2</p> <p>1.e. >20 communities expected to be engaged in multiple programmes by 2018</p>	<p>Indicator 1 – Project notes of training delivered to field implementation teams</p>	<p>Assumption 1: Results of project are clear and incorporated into policies/strategies</p>
<p>2. An assessment of the effectiveness of conservation initiatives on livestock losses, household income and attitudes towards interventions, predators and ungulates, including regional and gender effects.</p>	<p>2a. Effectiveness of predator-proofed corrals on livestock losses analysed in yr 2</p> <p>2b. Effectiveness of livestock insurance programmes on payouts and household income analysed in yr 3.</p> <p>2.c. Effectiveness of handicraft scheme on household income analysed in yr 3.</p> <p>2.d. Effectiveness of interventions on</p>	<p>Indicator 2: Programme data, stories, field reports and receipts collected by SLCF, SLFP, SLFK to monitor corral building, insurance scheme progress and handicraft production and purchases.</p>	

	attitudes towards interventions, wild ungulates and snow leopards by men and women in communities analysed in yr 3		
3. Training delivered for field implementers and meetings held with community champions	<p>3.a, Training of 13 field implementers from SLCF, SLFP and SLFK in negotiation and community engagement skills increased sensitivity towards respectful community engagement and retention of information in yr 3</p> <p>3.b. 47 respected community conservation champions are actively engaged in dialogue with communities by end of yr 2</p>	Indicator 3: Field implementer meetings with conservation champions to keep record of their involvement in community discussions	<p>Assumption 2: Field implementers will remain with their respective organizations for long enough to make training worthwhile</p> <p>Assumption 3: We will be able to find effective community champions within a reasonable amount of time</p>
4. An assessment of the impact of conservation initiatives on abundance of wild ungulates and snow leopards	<p>4a. Attitudes towards predators and wild herbivores will be more positive in participating households and communities by yr 3</p> <p>4b. Triangulated reports indicate that killing of wild ungulates and snow leopards stops in communities with conservation contracts by yr 3.</p> <p>4c. Indices of abundance of snow leopards in the sampled programme landscapes are stable or higher in yr 3 than yr1 and higher compared to estimates from control landscapes in yr 3</p>	<p>Indicator 4: Surveys of losses, household income, attitudes and killing of snow leopards and wild ungulates</p> <p>Indicator 5: Reports from wild ungulate and snow leopard surveys by partner organisation staff/researchers.</p>	Assumption 4: Communities remain interested in corrals, handicrafts and insurance as good options for mitigating conflicts and leadership within community remains cohesive enough to manage multi-pronged programmes
5. Communication with Snow Leopard network, CBD and GSLEP representatives and the wider conservation community.	<p>5a. Working paper outlining effectiveness of interventions on losses, income and attitudes incorporated into SLCF, SLFP, SLFK strategic planning and distributed to Snow Leopard Network and appropriate CBD and GLSEP contacts by yr 3</p> <p>5b. Working paper analysing impact of conservation interventions shared with Snow Leopard Network and appropriate CBD and GSLEP contacts by yr 3</p>	<p>Indicator 6: Snow Leopard Network, GSLEP & CBD contact communications and submitted manuscripts.</p> <p>Indicator 7: SLCF, SLFP, SLFK Strategic Plans</p> <p>Indicator 8: Post-training response forms from field staff</p>	

	5c. Best practice in conservation interventions shared with international field teams yr 3		
--	--	--	--

Activities (each activity is numbered according to the output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1)			
Activity 1.1	Field implementers attend council meetings in each community		
Activity 1.2	Field implementers work with community leaders to agree on suite of conservation programmes, sign new/update existing conservation contracts		
Activity 1.3	Field implementers secure materials, communities secure labour and corrals constructed in relevant communities		
Activity 1.4	SLCF, SLFK and SLGP distribute seed money into community fund to jumpstart insurance schemes in relevant communities		
Activity 1.5	Orders for handicrafts placed by SLT via field implementers; field implementers collect products twice/yr and bring to SLCF, SLFK, SLFP headquarters to ship to SLT for distribution		
Activity 2.1	UoA and SLT collate and review existing information		
Activity 2.2	UoA, SLT and CEH agree protocols for surveys at partner start-up meetings		
Activity 2.3	Baseline (yr 1) and final yr (yr 3) survey data collected in sample of communities on livestock losses, income and attitudes		
Activity 3.1	Toolkits prepared for field implementers by UoA, SLT and CEH		
Activity 3.2	Training workshop for field implementers delivered, based on negotiation theory and PARTNERS Principles, and SLT's field monitoring manual		
Activity 3.3	Field implementers hold meetings for community representatives to convey skills in and discuss programme management/implementation (accounting, wool processing, sales and marketing)		
Activity 3.4	Toolkits for local champions developed by UoA, SLT and CEH		
Activity 3.5	Local champions are identified and sensitized in programme communities through meetings with SLCF, SLFK and SLFP field implementers and toolkit		
Activity 3.6	Sustained interaction with local champions, including documentation by SLCF, SLFK, SLFP field implementers of their conservation awareness activities.		
Activity 4.1	Any killing of snow leopards and wild ungulates recorded Yrs1-3		
Activity 4.2	Snow leopard abundance surveys in representative programme and control landscapes undertaken in Yr 1 and Yr 3 through camera trapping		
Activity 4.3	Wild ungulate surveys undertaken in representative habitats in programme and control landscapes in Yrs 2 & 3 through double observer		

	techniques
Activity 4.4	Photo-identification, data compilation and analyses by partners
Activity 5.1	Working paper outlining effectiveness of interventions on losses, income and attitudes completed and shared with partners, Snow Leopard Network and appropriate CBD and GLSEP contacts
Activity 5.2	Peer review paper on effectiveness of conservation interventions submitted
Activity 5.3	Meeting with international field teams to discuss 3 best practice in conservation interventions

Annex 3 Standard Measures

Table 1 Project Standard Output Measures

Code No.	Description	Gender of people (if relevant)	Nationality of people (if relevant)	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
Established codes								
6A	Number of people to receive other forms of education/training (which does not fall into categories 1-5 above) *	11 women	Mongolia, Pakistan, Kyrgyzstan	18			18	13
7	Number of (e.g., different types - not volume - of material produced) training materials to be produced for use by host country		N/A	2			2	2
11b	Number of papers to be submitted to peer reviewed journals					1	0	1
12a	Number of computer based databases to be established and handed over to the host country			1			1	1
23	Value of resources raised from other sources (e.g., in addition to Darwin funding) for project work			£93,659	£98,320	£103233		£295,212

Table 2 **Publications**

Title	Type (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (authors, year)	Gender of Lead Author	Nationality of Lead Author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. weblink or publisher if not available online)
Community engagement toolkit for field implementers and staff. A toolkit for collaborative conflict management for community livelihoods and snow leopard conservation.	manual	(2016) Young, J.C., Mishra, C., Snell Rullman, J., Suryawanshi, K.S., Redpath., S.R.	female	UK	n/a	http://www.snowleopard.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Toolkit-for-Field-Implementers-and-Staff-Final.pdf
Toolkit for Champions – community livelihoods and snow leopard conservation	manual	(2016) Young, J.C., Mishra, C., Snell Rullman, J., Suryawanshi, K.S., Redpath., S.R.	female	UK	n/a	http://www.snowleopard.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Toolkit-for-Field-Implementers-and-Staff-Final.pdf