Darwin Initiative Main & Extra Annual Report

To be completed with reference to the "Project Reporting Information Note":
(https://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/resources/information-notes/)

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

Submission Deadline: 30th April 2025

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

Darwin Initiative Project Information

Scheme (Main or Extra)	Main
Project reference	30-003
Project title	Developing a sustainable model for human-elephant coexistence in Thailand
Country/ies	Thailand
Lead Organisation	Zoological Society of London (ZSL)
Project partner(s)	EcoExist Society (Formerly Human Elephant Voices Network)
Darwin Initiative grant value	**£ 533,655**
Start/end dates of project	April 2023 – March 2026
Reporting period (e.g. Apr 2024 – Mar 2025) and number (e.g. Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	Apr 2024 – Mar 2025 Annual Report 2
Project Leader name	May Moe Wah
Project website/blog/social media	ZSL Thailand (Facebook), humanelephantvoices.org
Report author(s) and date	Juliana Masseloux, April 2025 Riawphai Chantarachit, April 2025

1. Project summary

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

Despite its middle-income country status, Thailand has one of the highest income inequality rates in the East Asia and Pacific region, largely split between urban and rural populations. Indigenous peoples, such as the Karen and Mon in rural western Thailand, are among the poorest of Thailand's populations. Many lack legal recognition and thus access to land rights and basic social services including education, health care, information, and justice. Impoverished rural communities living near protected areas do not have

financial mechanisms to offset elephant damage or knowledge and capacity to trial and scale-up viable elephant friendly livelihood options. Economic monocrops such as cassava and sugarcane, most-prone to elephant damage, are widely promoted by government programs but no corporate social responsibility (CSR) or government insurance program currently exists, and existing compensation programs are widely considered insufficient by HEC-affected communities. Lower-income farming households in the landscape have expressed less supportive attitudes towards conservation and coexistence due in large part to the socio-economic and wellbeing costs of living near elephants. The consequence is that HEC remains a serious problem in Thailand leading to retaliatory killing of elephants, reduced support for conservation, and substantial socio-economic costs typically affecting the poorest members of society.

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

2. Project stakeholders/ partners

The strength of this project lies in multistakeholder engagement and participatory collaboration between CSOs, government agencies, local communities, and the private sector. ZSL has drawn on 17 years of experience in elephant conservation in Thailand and international expertise to lead key activities, including the mitigation methods review and assessments of insurance and resilient livelihoods. EcoExist Society (ECS), building on strong networks across elephant range regions, has led logistics and implementation of regional meetings and agroforestry community engagement in the sWEFCOM. Close collaboration and capacity sharing between ZSL and ECS have ensured timely delivery of Year 2 outputs.

Public Sector: The Department of National Parks (DNP) has provided critical national-level support for activities such as the best-practice guide and insurance assessment. High-level DNP representatives contributed to Outputs 1 and 2, while local officials are engaged in forest complex-level meetings. Decentralization of elephant management emerged as a key priority in Year 1, and over Year 2, we worked with local authorities to build capacity for budget and technical support for local HECx efforts. DNP has committed to reviewing and endorsing the best-practice guide in Year 3.

Private Sector: The insurance and diversified livelihoods components of this project has spurred engagement of the private sector, particularly companies involved in cash crop agriculture, which have previously not been engaged or educated around the human-elephant conflict situation. We engaged representatives from the Thai General Insurance Association (TGIA), re-insurance companies including AON and Munich Re, and the Thai Sugar Miller's Cooperative (TSMC) in discussions around equitable and risk-mitigating financial compensation schemes (Annex 1). We have also worked with sugarcane factory representatives to identify pathways for supporting HEC afflicted farmers.

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

Research Institutions: We have engaged with expert faculty in mechanical and software engineering and programming from Suranaree University of Technology (SUT) to support piloting of innovative solutions to human-elephant conflict, which was identified as a priority in 60% of forest complexes in Year 1. In addition, we have hired an ecology and agroforestry expert consultant from Prince Songhkla University, Dr. Sara Bumrungsri, to support with farmer engagement and the planning of demonstration farms in sWEFCOM.

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

3. Project progress

3.1 Progress in carrying out project Activities

Progress in carrying out project Activities

Output 1.

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

Baseline capacity was assessed in Y1 to identify capacity gaps and priorities. However, in Year 2, regional meeting agendas have shifted from standardized capacity-building workshops to supporting local priorities via tailored trainings, knowledge-exchanges, discussions, and workshops. Attendance and

stakeholders involved year-to-year have also shifted as relevant (for example, workshops for elephant response teams only include protected area staff and community members involved in these teams, while workshops on decentralization mainly include local government and community representatives). Thus, capacity changes via pre-post surveys are no longer viable indicators of success, so a case-study report for each region on progress towards key priorities has been proposed as a more accurate and feasible indicator.

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

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

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

During Year 2, the team conducted numerous meetings, knowledge-exchange workshops, and focus groups with key experts in each forest complex to develop the best practice guidelines. We selected 10 tools to focus on, with case studies for each tool, as well as sections that include how to assess and evaluate an HEC situation, select the most relevant tool, and how to protect property and persons from elephants. Two versions of the guide will be developed – one simplified manual for local communities, and one more detailed version for decision-makers (including local government and DNP). We have set up a multistakeholder committee of elephant and policy experts to review and refine the drafted guide before sharing with DNP and communities for feedback. We have also hired a local artist to add informative infographics of elephant behavior and tool implementation similar to Lucy King's Human-Elephant Coexistence toolkit. We anticipate completing a draft of the guide by end of Y2Q1 and disseminating for feedback, with the final toolkit printed and shared nationally by the end of Y3.

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

On March 11, 2025, ZSL and ECS hosted an online webinar event with representatives from six HEC-afflicted forest complexes to review the HEC situation across Thailand, share knowledge, and foster cross-regional discussions (Annex 8). Talking points included an overview of the situation, brainstorming strategies to address common challenges, and proactive management. Key challenges included elephants increasingly residing outside of protected areas, conflict between communities and ERRUs, limited funds for supporting ERRUs, and difficulties accessing compensation. Suggestions for overcoming these challenges included building strong community networks, ERRU capacity and coordination, prioritizing non-violent management strategies, understanding elephant behavior, adaptive management, and ensuring collective agreement over where and how to push elephants. Proactive management strategies, such as community safety training, habitat management, and elephant-friendly tourism were also discussed. A larger Thai Elephant Day meeting is scheduled for Year 3.

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

We coordinated nine regional meetings in 2024-2025 in six forest complexes to continue support of regional HEC management priorities, engaging a total of 412 participants (270 men, 85 women, 7 unspecified) from government, NGOs/CSOs, academia, and local communities. Activities targeted decision-makers (protected area and local government) with key representatives from local communities to drive actionable change. Workshop topics included ERRU trainings, decentralization, peace talks, agroforestry, and integrated wild elephant management. Meetings were smaller but more frequent in response to feedback from Y1 engagement.

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

This activity is on track for Year 3.

Output 2

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

The situation analysis of HEC has been drafted and will be integrated into the feasibility assessment with planned completion in Y3.

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

In Year 2, 142 farmers (37% women, 5% indigenous) across 9 provinces were interviewed, with a focus on sWEFCOM (58%) to develop a strong case study. Interviews covered HWC impacts, insurance perceptions, financial coping strategies, and willingness to pay (WTP). While 87% expressed WTP for agricultural insurance, 67% required more information. Only 18% had ever received wildlife damage compensation. Many farmers struggled to estimate premiums, noting WTP would depend on scheme parameters. A full analysis is ongoing and will inform the Y3 insurance feasibility report.

2.3 Interviews/meetings with plantation companies in Bangkok to assesses feasibility/acceptability of monitoring compliance

In 2024, ZSL and ECS engaged the TSMC and sugarcane factories sourcing from HEC-affected smallholders. A follow-up focus group with KSL factory and farmers in Kanchanaburi mapped conflict zones and drafted short-, medium-, and long-term elephant management plans (e.g., early warning systems, elephant-resistant crops, and corridor development). Surveys with 25 farmers found 44% received no factory support, while 20% had some compensation. Interest in insurance was moderate (56%), though most felt the factory should cover premiums. We will continue to work with the farmers and factories to develop a proposal to finance these priorities through the Sugarcane Fund in Y3.

2.4 Interviews/meetings with insurance agencies to assess buy-in and feasibility of various insurance schemes

A November 2024 multistakeholder forum convened government, private sector, and CSOs to discuss HEC insurance. We discovered that TGIA and OIC had already estimated premiums for an HEC insurance scheme and presented to DNP, but costs were considered too high and no regulatory framework exists. DNP is committed to improving the compensation scheme over adopting insurance. Micro-insurance schemes would need high community buy-in and are unlikely to be sustainable in the long term as many communities believe that elephants are the responsibility of the government. Attendees instead co-designed a PPP model blending insurance, compensation, and ESG approaches, and mapped future stakeholder engagement. These insights are informing the revised Year 3 workplan and feasibility assessment.

2.5 Assessment supported by IIED identifies feasible HEC insurance schemes. Insurance product designed with insurance agencies.

A feasibility assessment suggests insurance is unlikely to be viable for Thailand due to limited insurance penetration, low DNP buy-in, and sustainability issues seen in other case study countries. Preliminary findings from interviews and forums indicate major barriers, including low insurance uptake and lack of co-financing. Instead, the project is pivoting to support DNP in strengthening its compensation scheme, aligning with its current priorities. This includes integrating the co-developed PPP model, identifying funding sources (e.g., decentralization, HWC bonds, CSR), and reducing moral hazards by rewarding farmer-led risk mitigation. A revised workplan will be co-developed with DNP in Year 3.

2.6 Pilot schemes established in Y3Q1 with technical support for implementation from IIED

Following the results of the assessment, this is no longer planned. However, we will aim to develop an alternative scheme for piloting in sWEFCOM by end of Y3.

2.7 Monitoring and reviewing of insurance scheme by end of Y3

See above.

Output 3

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

Completed in Y1

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

Completed in Y2. We have identified 3 demonstration farms (one in each agroclimatic zone) and are working closely to develop tailored planting models and secure seed funding.

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

A market specialist advisor has supported follow-up engagement and development of communications materials from the business plan for sharing with the communities and assessing interest for future scaling. Using agroclimatic data and financial modelling, the team identified pepper, pomelo, and coffee as viable crops for HEC resilience. Value chain analyses have been completed for coffee, pomelo, and pepper, and a business plan (Annex 2) has been drafted integrating elephant-resilient planting models for 3 agroclimatic zones. We are currently evaluating and assessing potential markets including the Royal Forestry project as well as specialty markets (i.e. for high-grade coffee) vs. factory markets (i.e. for low-grade coffee).

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

ECS is currently partnering with a Thai tech company to store and manage the resiliency map and data (including crop suitability and soil maps from Activities 3.1-3.3 and business plan (Annex 2) for sWEFCOM). The map is currently being developed and will be translated into an appropriate format for online publication on the website

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

Focus groups were conducted in 17 communities in sWEFCOM with 369 participants (13% IPLC, 46% women). These focus groups assessed existing agricultural activities and interest in and barriers to adoption of agroforestry. Current crops like cassava, maize, rubber, and sugarcane are profitable but vulnerable to elephant raids, leading to potential crop loss. Primary challenges to agroforestry adoption include water scarcity, land tenure insecurity, factory indebtedness, and limited market access. Market linkages, post-harvest infrastructure, and organic fertilizers could mitigate these issues while enhancing income stability.

Output 4

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

On 10 February 2025, Chang Yim Coffee was officially registered as a community enterprise with the Thong Pha Phum District Agricultural Office—progressing from an informal steering committee formed in Year 1. The enterprise now includes 35 households (over 60 individuals, including women and indigenous members), with plans to expand. Monthly meetings with researchers continue to strengthen coordination and decision-making. Members also visited Chumphon to learn from established community enterprises about supply chain integration and accessing government support.

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

Following registration, the group focused on developing a business plan targeting two markets: commercial-grade and Fine Robusta coffee. While commercial-grade coffee is easier to scale, Fine Robusta demands precise processing but offers higher returns in niche markets. Some members sell green beans; others pursue roasting and finished products. One-on-one support is provided to help members manage risks, fill capacity gaps, and align with their business goals.

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

CBO members regularly report HEC incidents via LINE, such as elephant crop raids. A centralized online platform is being developed to improve data sharing among DNP, local agriculture offices, and communities. Members are increasingly adopting non-violent deterrents, such as planting biodiversity-friendly crops that naturally deter elephants. Insights and updates on HEC management practices are shared regularly during monthly meetings, strengthening community response capacity and resilience.

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

In 2024/2025, workshops aimed to improve the quality and market value of locally produced Robusta coffee. Farmers were trained in post-harvest techniques—Natural, Semi-Wine, and Fermentation—and experimented with yeast strains like Intenso and Koji to enhance flavor. They also received hands-on training in cupping, roasting, and fermentation. Quality assessments showed that moisture content and defect levels met Fine Robusta standards. To support ongoing quality control, the project provided tools such as moisture meters and manual grinders for basic on-farm evaluations. As a result, seven

households produced Fine Robusta coffee. The project also facilitated sample exchanges and shared learning materials with other groups to encourage collaboration. One member opened a coffee shop near a tourist cave, showcasing value-added business potential. A 3.5-rai model farm earned ~£9,100 from coffee and an additional £900 from intercropped konjac. These outcomes highlight how diversified, elephant-friendly farming can boost livelihoods and support conservation.

4.5 Business operations and management workshops conducted in two additional HEC zones (Thamanao and Mae Plasoi)

This activity remains scheduled for Year 3.

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

Due to earlier delays in formal registration and variability in workshop attendance among members, a comprehensive post-training capacity assessment survey—evaluating business management skills, production strategies, and market readiness—is scheduled for Y3Q2. The survey results will be critical for tailoring future capacity-building activities and ensuring that the business model aligns with member goals and market realities.

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

The baseline household income assessment is scheduled for April–May 2025. Preliminary observations indicate a positive trend in income among participating members, attributed to increased coffee quality, premium pricing for Fine Robusta, and improved access to broader markets. These early signs suggest that the project's livelihood enhancement strategies are beginning to yield tangible economic benefits, which will be validated through formal data collection in the upcoming survey.

3.2 Progress towards project Outputs

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

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

- **Baseline condition**: 0 systematic map/reviews
- **Change recorded to date:** Drafted systematic map/review delayed to Y3Q1 and being developed alongside best-practice guide. **Evidence**: N/A

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

- **Baseline condition**: No collated data for informing best practice guidelines
- **Change recorded to date:** Data on HEC strategies and case studies collected during regional meetings and interviews/focus groups with regional elephant experts. **Evidence**: Activity reports from regional workshops and key informant interviews

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

- **Baseline condition**: 0 guidelines
- **Change recorded to date:** Data and activity reports collated, best practice HEC committee has been established and drafting of guidelines is ongoing. **Evidence**: Activity reports from regional workshops and key informant interviews

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

Planned for Y3

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

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

- **Baseline condition:** No HEC data collated and analyzed
- **Change recorded to date:** Data on financial impact of HEC from sWEFCOM and Khao Yai collected by ZSL and ECS. Data was analysed to develop risk maps by a University of College London student and contributed to the feasibility assessment. **Evidence:** Risk Mapping (Annex 3), Multistakeholder Insurance Forum (Annex 1), Insurance Feasibility Assessment (In Prep)

Indicator 2.2 *Willingness to pay (WTP) premiums and linking premiums and eligibility for insurance to crop protection and 'riskiness' of crop type established by end of Q2Y2 via focus groups and interviews in 5 HEC regions (~250 individuals, 30% women and indigenous).*

- **Baseline condition:** 0 farmers interviewed to assess HEC rates, interest in insurance, and WTP
- **Change recorded to date:** 142 farmers interviewed (37% women, 63% men). **Evidence:** Insurance interview data sheets and excel database, insurance feasibility assessment (in prep)

Indicator 2.3 Feasibility of crop protection compliance and payments monitoring systems established by end of Y2. **[DI-C19]**

- This is being assessed as part of the feasibility assessment. Feasible options for managing risk to reduce moral hazards in existing compensation schemes will be identified in Y3.

Output Indicator 2.4 Insurance companies' interest in and ability to insure against HEC established (including viability of meeting the industries' risk management and re-insurance standards) by end of Y2. **[DI-C19]**

- **Baseline condition:** Limited knowledge and awareness of HEC within the insurance sector
- **Change recorded to date:** Re-insurance companies engaged in one-on-one meetings and the multistakeholder insurance forum expressed interest and willingness in covering HEC damage. These reinsurance companies already support and mitigate risks for existing agricultural experience, though these schemes are limited to 1-2 crops and have minimal penetration within Thailand. TGIA and OIC have co-developed an HEC insurance scheme which demonstrates interest and ability to insure HEC, but lack of buy-in from the government for co-financing due to high premiums was a key challenge. **Evidence:** Multistakeholder insurance forum outputs (Annex 1), meeting notes. photos

Indicator 2.5 *Feasibility of alternatives to commercial insurance (government schemes, companies' CSR, community based micro-finance) established by end of Y2.* ***[DI-C19]***

- **Baseline condition:** No feasibility assessment
- **Change recorded to date:** Feasibility assessment is currently being drafted with input from insurance interviews, private sector and government engagement in Y2 with planned completion in Y3. **Evidence:** N/A

Indicator 2.6 Feasible pilot schemes are established and evaluated in Y3. **[DI-B12]**

- This may no longer be feasible due to lack of government buy in and secured budget for a pilot. ZSL and ECS are currently co-developing an alternative proposal to inform and improve the existing compensation scheme building on the benefits of insurance.

Indicator 2.7 *Insurance feasibility case studies (Thailand, Sri Lanka, Kenya, and Malaysia) shared with other elephant range countries via public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3. [DI-C13]*

- Three knowledge-exchange discussions have been conducted with representatives from other elephant range countries to share developments and lessons learned around HEC insurance. A broader webinar is still planned for Y3.

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

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

- **Baseline condition:** No elephant-resilient mapping framework or business plan

Change recorded to date: Data from soil surveys, farm mapping, agroclimatic data, VCAs, and focus groups have contributed to the development of a comprehensive business plan for sWEFCOM. **Evidence:** Agroforestry Business Plan (Annex 2)

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

- **Baseline condition:** The market analysis was completed in Y1 and integrated into the sWEFCOM agroforestry business plan.
- **Change recorded to date:** The business plan was pitched to investors at an NbS showcase in London with feedback indicating strong interest in the project's community-led design, biodiversity co-benefits, and early signs of market viability through premium coffee sales. Investors highlighted that the model is promising but emphasized the need for further scaling to landscape level, robust ROI projections, and structured blended finance mechanisms to attract future investment. Overall, the project was positively received as an emerging, high-integrity NbS investment opportunity with good potential for future financial partnerships. **Evidence:** NbS Case Study (Annex 4), showcase notes, photos

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

- **Baseline condition**: No assessment of community receptiveness and barriers to adoption of elephant resilient alternative livelihoods.
- **Change recorded to date:** Focus group discussions were completed in May 2024 and engaged a total of 369 farmers (46% women, 13% IPLC) across 17 communities in sWEFCOM. One assessment of community receptiveness and barriers to adoption was produced with key information integrated into the business plan. **Evidence:** Agroforestry FGD analysis (Annex 5) and Business Plan (Annex 2).

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

- **Baseline condition**: No resilience framework
- **Change recorded to date:** The framework map is currently being reconstructed based on data from the paper report. It will then be translated into an appropriate format for online publication on the website. **Evidence:** N/A

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

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

- **Baseline condition:** 0 members. Among coffee farmers, 0% are not formally organized or registered with the government, limiting their ability to receive support or access financial resources.
- **Change recorded to date:** The community-based organization "Chang Yim Coffee" has now been officially registered and has expanded its membership to 35 families (over 60 individuals). The CBO has developed an inclusive governance structure and actively engages in monthly meetings and regional exchanges. **Evidence:** CBO Registration document (Annex 6), membership list

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

- **Baseline condition:** Year 1, the coffee exhibited a high presence of primary defects. The quality was very low and did not pass the physical assessment, making it ineligible to proceed to the scoring stage. No chemical residue testing was conducted during this period.
- **Change recorded to date:** Significant improvements have been made in coffee production quality and monitoring practices. Seven farms successfully produced Fine Robusta coffee, with samples scoring between 82 and 84 points on the SCA coffee value assessment scale. Moisture content and defect levels are now regularly analyzed, ensuring alignment with health and safety standards, and chemical residue testing was conducted for the first time. All coffee samples passed at non-detectable levels, with the exception of one sample, which showed trace amounts of cypermethrin, well below the national safety threshold. The community has also initiated the development of a localized monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework to track and document continuous quality improvements. **Evidence:** Cupping scores, chemical residue inspection report

Indicator 4.3 *Sustainable finance model established for CBO by end of Y2 to support investments in scaling livelihood pilot (coffee production) and HEC mitigation beyond life of the project, where CBO has sufficient resources, capacity and self-resilience to independently manage/operate sustainable business model by end of Y3.*

- **Baseline condition:** No sustainable finance model, limited capacity and self-resilience
- **Change recorded to date:** The CBO has established an inclusive governance structure and conducts monthly meetings and regional exchanges, building internal capacity for independent management. The CBO has enhanced its value chain connections, contributing to a scalable livelihood model centered on coffee production. Capacity evaluations are planned for Y3. **Evidence:** CBO meeting notes, photos

Indicator 4.4 *CBO members (60 HH) connected with national 'elephant friendly' product network in 3 additional HEC regions, product-specific market systems and suppliers (e.g., transportation of goods, marketing) by end of Y2, and high-value national markets (e.g., Royal Thai Foundation, Phufa Products) by end of Y3.*

- **Baseline**: No elephant-friendly product network or standard in Thailand, and no established market channel for the fine Robusta produced by the Chang Yim group.
- **Change recorded to date**: At present, we are co-developing the parameters of an elephant-friendly standard which will connect coffee production to elephant conservation and add value to Fine Robusta coffee products. The initial implementation will be adopted by the Chang Yim group, and the "Chang Yim Standard" logo will be displayed on their coffee packaging. Efforts are also underway to identify and connect this initiative with high-value domestic markets in human-elephant conflict (HEC) areas or nearby regions. The Chang Yim group has already established a link to the fine Robusta green bean market, which is a highly specific niche. The first lot of fine Robusta green beans has been delivered, and the second lot is scheduled to be auctioned in June. **Evidence**: Chang Yim standards (in development), Chang Yim product sales

Indicator 4.5 *CBO business model results in a 30% increase in sales value of goods against Y1 baseline for coffee-producing CBO households (10 HH) by end of Y3.*

- **Baseline condition:** In Year 1 the commercial grade price was 60-80 baht/kg. No fine robusta production in the area.
- **Change recorded to date:** Fine Robusta quality coffees produced by farmers as a result of the trainings were successfully sold at prices ranging from 350 to 1200 THB/kg, representing a 300% increase compared to the Year 1 baseline price. **Evidence:** Coffee price, sale receipts

Indicator 4.6 *Agroforestry/Livelihood, market, and insurance feasibility assessments inform two additional HEC resilient livelihood business models in high-conflict zones in sWEFCOM (Thamanao and Mai Plasoi, ~160 HH) by end of Y2, with two business model workshops and reports delivered by end of Y3.*

- **Baseline condition:** 0 business model reports and workshops
- **Change recorded to date:** The business plan integrates 3 agroclimatic zones including southeast WEFCOM (Tha Manao and Mai Plasoi). Workshops and engagement have been conducted with farmers in all 3 zones for identifying and implementing model farms. **Evidence:** Agroforestry Business plan (Annex 2)

Output Indicator 4.7 *Roadshow of resiliency mapping framework and successful elephant friendly business models (from TPP and three additional CBOs in elephant friendly product national network) share lessons learned across 16 HEC zones around 9 protected areas in sWEFCOM (~270 people*

benefitting ca. 8,000 HH) and 4 other HEC regions (~960 people benefitting ca. 27,000 HH) by end of Y3.

- Planned for Y3

3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

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

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

- **Baseline condition:** Capacity and needs assessed in Y1 to inform workshop priorities; Y1 regional case studies report.
- **Change recorded to date**: Post-training assessments to be conducted in Y3. Due to several regional meetings being scheduled in Y2Q4, the case study report for Y2 is being drafted and will be shared with the Half-Year 3 Darwin report. **Evidence:** Regional meeting activity reports, case study report (in prep), attendance sheets, photos

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

- **Baseline condition:** No existing national HEC mitigation best-practice and standardized M&E guidelines
- **Change recorded to date:** Preliminary draft of best-practice guidelines for review by expert committee and DNP is planned for early Y3. A committee has been formed to review the guidelines currently made up of professors from 3 universities, elephant experts from 9 conservation NGOs, 4 community representatives, and a high-level DNP representative, with potential for additional members. The drafted guide will be reviewed by regional DNP representatives as well. **Evidence:** Regional meeting activity reports and meeting notes from targeted focus groups/informant interviews, establishment of an HEC best practice committee

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

- **Baseline condition:** No existing national HEC insurance feasibility assessment
- **Change recorded to date:** Draft of feasibility assessment in progress with expected completion by Y3. **Evidence:** N/A

Outcome 0.4 *Improved capacity of CBO members in business and product development, assessed annually (60 HH) to ensure they are progressing in Output 4.*

- **Baseline condition:** No members achieving Fine Robusta quality coffee scores.
- **Change recorded to date:** Seven members achieved scores qualifying as Fine Robusta. A cupping and quality training course was conducted by a Q Grader, with 13 representative members of each village enrolled. These initiatives reflect measurable growth in knowledge, skills, and business orientation among members. **Evidence:** CBO registration document and cupping scores

Outcome 0.5 *Increase in subjective and relational aspects of wellbeing among 70% of sWEFCOM households engaged in elephant-friendly community business market chain (total 60 HH, 30% women and indigenous) by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline.*

- **Baseline condition:** Farmers faced livelihood insecurity, fear from human-elephant conflict, and low confidence in market access. Social cohesion was weak, with limited participation of women and indigenous groups in collective business management and decision-making.
- **Change recorded to date: 0.5.1** Community members reported greater confidence in handling HEC incidents due to training in non-violent deterrence methods and real-time communication through LINE groups. Although quantitative data collection is planned for Q2 2025, regular

engagement with CBO members has indicated reduced fear and faster response to elephant activity in agricultural areas. **Evidence**: Regular stakeholder engagement

- **0.5.2** The formal registration of the Chang Yim CBO and inclusive decision-making processes have fostered stronger social cohesion. Women (52% of members) actively participate in governance and exchange visits. **Evidence**: Regular stakeholder engagement

- **0.5.3** Higher coffee prices and alternative income from intercropping (e.g., konjac) have improved financial resilience. Members are less reliant on unstable market channels and more capable of absorbing economic shocks from elephant-related damage, especially through collaborative sales and new product development. Formal data to assess perceived vulnerability will be gathered with the wellbeing surveys. **Evidence**: coffee prices.

Outcome 0.6 *70% of sWEFCOM households engaged in elephant-friendly community business market chain (60 HH) report improved attitudes toward elephants and protected areas by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, as a result of effective mitigation via elephant-friendly livelihoods.*

- **Baseline condition:** most farmers perceived elephants primarily as a threat to their safety and crops, with little awareness of or engagement in coexistence strategies. Attitudes toward protected areas were often negative, shaped by conflict experiences and limited perceived benefit from conservation efforts.
- **Change recorded to date:** Preliminary feedback from Chang Yim members indicates a shift toward more positive attitudes regarding elephants and protected areas. This change is attributed to improved understanding of coexistence strategies and the economic benefits gained from elephant-friendly coffee production. Farmers who previously viewed elephants as threats now report seeing value in non-violent deterrence and recognize that sustainable, wildlife-compatible livelihoods can enhance community wellbeing. A formal attitude assessment is scheduled for mid-2025 as part of the wellbeing and income survey. **Evidence**: Preliminary feedback and engagement

3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

Output 1:

Assumption 1*: The proposed HECx model (mitigation and monitoring best practice, feasible insurance schemes and alternative livelihoods) is able to prove its value to the Department of National Parks, Wildlife, and Plants and other stakeholders across the landscape, including elephant conservation NGOs/CBOs, through improved outcomes and post-project sustainability. As a result, the model is adopted by relevant stakeholders across the country:* This project has continued its participatory approach to advancing regional priorities (e.g. decentralization and ERRU training). Consistent support, even outside of annual meetings, has increased trust and willingness to engaged in activities and discussions. Peace talks organized by ECS between conflicting stakeholder groups in high-HEC zones mediated by third parties have helped secure collaborative agreements for implementing HECx solutions.

Assumption 2: *Communities are interested in and willing to shift away from current livelihoods and mitigation methods:* Initial focus groups in Y1 indicated some resistance to shifting away from current livelihoods due to concerns over the water and labor requirements of agroforestry and lack of knowledge around market and infrastructure. In addition, many farmers rent land or do not have formal land tenure documentation, which poses additional challenges to adoption of slow-growing crops. These challenges have been integrated into the business plan Theory of Change and MEL plan, though some of the barriers will require policy-level changes to address (e.g. land tenue, water rights). By identifying and supporting demonstration farms with interested and committed farmers, we aim to secure interest through proof of concept and local learning.

Assumption 3: *Improved income and wellbeing of local communities, resulting from declining HEC and enhanced livelihoods, reflects reduced costs of living with wildlife and coupled with regular outreach that reinforces that these benefits are dependent on supporting wildlife conservation:* Community FGDs in sWEFCOM and 5 forest complex regions have assessed costs of living with wildlife for long-term impact assessment. Regular engagement with CBOs will evaluate changes in income and wellbeing as a result of project activities to ensure success and validate scaling.

Assumption 4: *Sufficient data made available from partners for a meaningful review of the effectiveness of mitigation and monitoring strategies:* Due to difficulties obtaining quantitative data from government partners, we have arranged regular meetings and consultations with relevant representatives in each forest complex to assess existing strategies including strengths and weaknesses to inform the review

and best practice guide. The systematic map will use predominantly qualitative information and focus on case studies rather than quantitative synthesis due to lack of published studies and available data.

Assumption 5*: Willingness of all partners including DNP to co-develop Guidelines and to attend capacity-building workshops:* DNP and other partners have demonstrated willingness to attend and participate in regional meetings. A multistakeholder expert committee has been appointed to co-develop the best-practice guide and project outputs. Central DNP representatives have agreed to review the drafted guide to ensure alignment with priorities and knowledge.

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

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

Assumption 8*: Insurance companies are willing to partner on the project and suitable compromises are developed so that insurance companies are willing and able to insure high-risk HEC-afflicted farmers at reasonable premiums:* While some re-insurance companies have expressed interest in insuring HEC, the lack of buy-in from government for co-financing has complicated adoption of insurance. We are identifying alternative avenues for compensation that may build on mechanisms from the private sector.

Assumption 9: *Proposed insurance schemes meet IIED's requirements for successful and sustainable implementation (cost effective insurance administration, timely and fair insurance payments, incentives for damage prevention, financial sustainability of premium payments) based on successful models and lessons learned in Kenya and Sri Lanka (DI 25-004). IIED will be a consulting partner for Output 2 and ensure best-practice delivery:* IIED has been consistently involved and consulted during project implementation, including during the multistakeholder insurance forum. Consultations with IIED and other relevant experts in other range states identified key challenges in insurance and are supporting development of alternative avenues more suitable for Thailand.

Assumption 10: *Partners in other elephant range countries (e.g., range country government agencies, other NGOs/CSOs, Elephant Conservation Group, IUCN Asian Elephant Specialist Group) see value insurance assessment and pilot scheme results, adapting them for their own purposes:* Ongoing engagement with partners in other elephant range states interested in or piloting insurance has supported this assumption and provided learning opportunities.

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

Assumption 12*: Agroforestry crops identified by the project are elephant–friendly and improve farmer income, with market prices remaining relatively stable and competitive:* Market prices of proposed crops integrated in the business plan have been closely monitored by the team. Domestic robusta coffee prices have increased due to global coffee shortages, which may increase interest by local communities for adoption. Other crops that have been identified to improve income from surveys with farmers from the 3 different agroclimatic zones include: tumeric, rubber, rambutan, petai, avocado, taro and other medicinal and timber species.

Assumption 13: *Proposed elephant-friendly business models and livelihood plans are considered sufficiently viable and attractive by communities. Financial mechanisms are suitable in scope and scale to support initial investment into proposed elephant friendly business models: O*ur business plan involves tapping into concessional financing; loans from the Agricultural Bank of Thailand can be offered to implement and consolidate cooperative membership models like this one at subsidised interest rates. Accessing this finance would allow us to reduce our fees to farmers utilising the cooperatives equipment and services, and invest more in equipment and market facilitation. This would be our preferred option recognising the risk to livelihood incomes that occurs when farmers move from monocrop farming methods to agroforestry in those initial years. Once the cooperative is up and running there is potential to

bring in further investment at market rates, recognising though that this will increase costs and therefore could impact ability to scale if done too early.

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

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

Assumption 16: *Elephants do not shift to consuming the alternative crop or raiding households:* By selecting elephant unpalatable crops, training communities in ethical elephant deterrence, and continuously monitoring HEC, the shifting of elephants to consuming alternative crops can be monitored and mitigated. Of the proposed crops, none experience significant rates of elephant depredation, though some damage to watering infrastructure does occur.

Assumption 17: *Communities are interested in and willing to consider alternative livelihood scenarios, engage in surveys and livelihood pilots, and invest in financial support schemes:* Communities have demonstrated some reluctance to shifting livelihoods, but continued participatory development of the agroforestry model and knowledge-sharing among communities has increased interest and willingness to consider alternative livelihoods. Planned strengthening or establishment of 3 model farms will provide a learning platform and increase engagement via demonstration of viability for local farmers.

Assumption 18: *Community members understand that alternative livelihoods and CBO activities are directly linked to their engagement in conservation and human-elephant coexistence. This includes community members who are not direct beneficiaries, through word of mouth from community leaders and fellow community neighbours:* Communities engaged in FGDs and workshops relating to alternative livelihoods are made aware of the benefits in relation to human-elephant coexistence, especially as high-conflict areas have been prioritized for engagement.

Assumption 19: *Successful livelihoods existing and developed under the community business represent a viable business case for investment by the financial schemes, as seen in previous ZSL work in Kenya (DI 26-006) and the Philippines (DI 21-020 & 24-016):* Close collaboration with WWF's Nature-based Solutions team and ZSL's sustainable business team is ensuring the alternative livelihood model is ready for financial investment by project end. The business plan was pitched to investors at the NbS Showcase Event in London, with feedback indicating strong interest in the project's community-led design, biodiversity co-benefits, and early signs of market viability through premium coffee sales. Investors highlighted that the model is promising but emphasized the need for further scaling to landscape level, robust ROI projections, and structured blended finance mechanisms to attract future investment. Overall, the project was positively received as an emerging, high-integrity NbS investment opportunity with good potential for future financial partnerships. Apart from looking for concessional funding to set up three demonstration farms for the three agroclimatic zones, we are developing the country's first Outcome Bond that has the potential to enable financing of further training, capacity building and market facilitation for farmers within this model. Focused on supporting outcomes of reduced human elephant conflict, the Outcome Bond would follow the design of ZSL's Rhino Bond which as an example, issued by the World Bank in 2022 has an effective return of approximately 9% over five years if outcomes of rhino population growth are successfully achieved.

Assumption 20: *Aimed-for levels of female and indigenous participation are achieved based on pre-project understanding of community socioeconomics and demographics and results from previous/ongoing CBO implementation in the area:* Project activities with communities in sWEFCOM have made a concerted effort to ensure sufficient female and indigenous participation and engagement (at least 30%). These goals have been met or exceeded in community-level activities (i.e. focus groups, interviews, agroforestry workshops) but regional meetings have largely engaged government representatives, ERRUs, and protected area staff which are dominated by men. However, it is notable to point out that many of the female attendees hold high-level roles i.e. as decision makers or community leaders. Verifying indigenous participation is challenged by lack of self-identification, but knowledge of ethnic make-up of the communities being engaged has ensured aimed-for levels of engagement of indigenous communities.

Assumption 21: *The CBO network engages necessary and sufficient community buy-in, social cohesion, and access to financial services (savings and loans) to be sustainable, competitive, and profitable:* Expanding the coffee business without building resilience to change may lead to negative

impacts, despite increased capital inflow. Workshops will aim to mitigate these impact by building capacity, collaborative local networks, a sustainable financial model, and access to high-value markets.

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

Assumption 23*: Access to enhanced and diversified livelihoods (in conjunction with financial schemes and mitigation interventions if appropriate) will reduce the need to engage in illegal, environmentally-damaging activities for income supplementation:* We are working closely with farmers to ensure that capital inflow does not unintentionally result in illegal land expansion. Most farmers are still practicing monoculture and adopting coffee in tandem, but demonstratable benefits (increase income, resilience to HEC) should encourage an eventual shift away from monoculture towards agroforestry. Regular chemical testing will ensure levels remain low. In addition, Fine Robusta plays an indirect role in mitigating human-elephant conflict (HEC). As farmers increase Fine Robusta production, they need to dedicate more time and effort to coffee cultivation. An optimal area for maintaining both care and quality is around 3–5 rai per family, versus conventional coffee which can be planted in much larger areas.

Assumption 24*: Coffee production knowledge, skills and assets developed by the project are sufficient in the event of any repeated extreme weather conditions over the life of the project:* While coffee farms and agroforestry models supported by the project are not exempt from extreme weather conditions, they are more resilient to drought and flooding than most monocrops grown in these areas. The importance of diversification for resiliency in the face of climate change is a key component of engagement and trainings.

Assumption 25: *Economies of scale gained through establishing/supporting/strengthening the CBO gain sufficient market share to lead to profit for producers despite externalities in the market during the life of the project:* The Specialty Coffee Association (SCA) recently took over Coffee Quality Institute (CQI), which no longer includes Fine Robusta in its evaluation criteria, has discontinued the cupping form specific to Fine Robusta, and has cancelled Q Robusta Grader licenses. As the largest authority in the specialty coffee industry, it leaves a significant gap. The team is currently identifying a mitigation strategy to address the risks to farmer livelihoods created by this change.

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

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

The activities and outputs of this project are designed to develop a holistic model for human-elephant coexistence. This includes national participatory co-development of best-practice guidelines that facilitate prioritization and effective implementation of mitigation tools that reduce human-elephant conflict. Regional meetings helped identify and focus regionally appropriate priority strategies for HEC mitigation, such as decentralization of elephant management, alternative livelihoods, and support for ERRUs. ZSL and ECS have collaborated with DNP and other regional partners to support tailored workshops and trainings to advance these priority strategies. Lessons learned and local experts will contribute to development of the guidelines for scaling of these strategies to other areas with less knowledge and capacity.

Prior to the project, there was very little knowledge or interest in alternative financing scheme for HEC damage mostly due to frustration with existing compensation schemes and scepticism around the feasibility of insurance. The co-development of a sustainable and fair compensation mechanism has significant potential for poverty alleviation for HEC afflicted farmers and promote greater support for conservation.

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

4. Project support to the Conventions, Treaties or Agreements

Convention on Biological Biodiversity-Aichi Goal C Target 12 and Goal E Target 19: This project has contributed to Goal C by promoting effective mitigation measures through capacity building workshops and best-

practice guidelines development (Output 1) and supporting livelihoods that reduce threats to elephants such as habitat destruction and harmful mitigation practices and support conservation initiatives (Output 3 and 4, Annex 2). The regional workshops are also continuing to address Strategic Goal E by supporting knowledge sharing and participatory co-development of coexistence strategies.

Thailand Regional Elephant Action Plans: This project is supporting Thailand's regional sWEFCOM action plan Goal 2 by co-developing best-practice mitigation protocol for reducing damage to livelihoods by elephants. The project has also supported Goal 3 by assessing current practices and capacity of community and DNP ERRUs and supporting knowledge-sharing and trainings. This project has also focused on goal 4 (providing financial relief to people affected by wild elephants) by promoting and building capacity for alternative elephant-resilient livelihoods in sWEFCOM (Output 3 and 4) and supporting development of fair financial compensation strategies (Output 2).

CMS: The project has supported CMS Goal 4 by building community capacity for alternative livelihoods which directly support the coexistence of humans and elephants (e.g., coffee; Annex 2 and 6), and Goal 6 through capacity building and knowledge-sharing regional and national meetings.

Sustainable Development Goals: In line with Goals 8 and 13, the proposed agroforestry models are considering climate change and sustainable, resilient livelihoods (Annex 2). Community engagement activities, including agroforestry capacity building trainings, have supported and elevated participation of women to ensure gender equality and agency (Goal 5). Finally, threats to elephants and biodiversity (Goal 15) are being addressed by tying project outputs to elephant conservation and assessing changes in attitudes and capacity for communities to coexist with elephants (Output 1).

5. Project support for multidimensional poverty reduction

This project is directly engaging communities, government officials, private sector representatives, academics, and CSOs across Thailand. These stakeholders will be empowered to co-develop and select best-practice mitigation strategies for implementation which are contextually appropriate and cost-effective, reducing the risk of sinking money into ineffective mitigation tools. For example, decentralization would allow local subdistrict governments to utilize funds for elephant management strategies more rapidly and effectively than the central government and increase local governance over elephant management. However, despite approval from the central government, local governments currently lack the knowledge and capacity to properly and legally utilize their funds, so we have provided targeted support and a case study for effective decentralization in sWEFCOM, which has resulted in three other areas requesting our support. 10 trainings for ERRUs engaging 199 community members across Thailand have also increased the safety and effectiveness of Thailand's HEC first responders.

Current government compensation schemes (through central government and DNP) for crops and property/life are currently largely considered insufficient and ineffective by local communities and stymied by complex and incongruent requirements. Though we have encountered equally challenging barriers for adoption of an insurance scheme, we will continue to work closely with the DNP and relevant stakeholders to improve the existing scheme so that it is able to provide financial relief for farmers affected by HEC while incentivising risk management. In combination with the best-practice guide safety standards, this will ultimately mitigate the risk to lives and livelihoods for local farmers.

ZSL and ECS are currently seeking additional funding to support model farms in the landscape and disseminate the assessment results and suggested planting models to interested communities via training workshops. ZSL is also identifying pathways for sustainable financing, including private sector investment and development of green bonds. Ongoing community coffee business trainings in Thong Pha Phum are supporting existing and new coffee growers to transition to coffee agroforestry and/or improve quality, yield, and sustainability to increase income and biodiversity-friendly farming practices. Farmers engaged in agroforestry trainings and reaching Fine Robusta standards have seen up to 300% increases in income compared to Y1 baselines, providing proof of concept for coffee agroforestry as a pathway towards poverty reduction.

6. Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI)

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

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

The ZSL team has been receiving training to implement ZSL's FAIRER framework through a series of workshops led by ZSL's Environmental and Social Safeguarding Specialist. This has included consideration of power, privilege and positionality, development of an environmental and social safeguarding plan as part of the sWEFCOM agroforestry project, stepwise engagement, and FPIC plan, obtaining approval from the ZSL Human Ethics Committee prior to community engagement activities, and development of a locally appropriate grievance mechanism. Data analysis will be disaggregated by gender and ethnicity (where possible) to assess and identify potential gender-based barriers and risks. Additional FAIRER and GESI trainings are planned in Year 3 with the project team led by a newly hired in-country Safeguarding and ESMS officer.

Community engagement (agroforestry FGDs, CBO trainings, and insurance interviews) have met or exceeded our gender-based goals. At this year's regional meetings, the percentage of women attendees increased from 20% to 24%, but it is still below the target of 30%, likely due to the fact that these meetings targeted representatives from local government, DNP, and ERRUs who are predominantly men. We aim to address this by working closely with our regional partners to ensure equal representation of women at the meeting. However, it is worth noting that many of the women attending hold senior positions in local government, DNP, and CSOs and as community leaders. For example, we have worked closely with the female-led Nong Ped ERRU, encouraging the team to participate in regional meetings and capacity-building workshops.

Obtaining information on indigenous peoples is more challenging, as many self-identify as Thai upon receiving citizenship cards for legal reasons or refuse to divulge ethnic identity (70% opted out of answering during FGDs). However, regular engagement with multiethnic communities where relevant suggests we are likely to have met these goals. In addition, ECS has 3 indigenous staff (Karen and Mon) who have been supporting engagement with local communities in Thong Pha Phum and providing translation into local languages as necessary.

7. Monitoring and evaluation

A detailed workplan and monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) framework was developed for this project early in year 1 and has been used to monitor progress against project activities and indicators. Integrating the "Learning" part of MEL, we have submitted revised SMARTer and more appropriate and feasible indicators utilizing Darwin's updated indicator guidance menu to guide future monitoring and evaluation in response to factors outside our control affecting project implementation and internal consultations. For example, several of the indicators were originally formatted as activities – these have been adjusted to be more indicative of progress towards the outputs and outcomes.

Project achievements and contribution to the project outcome are monitored as changes in stakeholder capacity, wellbeing, and attitudes over the course of the project, follow-up initiatives, evidence of scaling, and progress against regional priorities as a result of project activities. Key deliverables include reports, manuals, and publications disseminated to and endorsed by relevant stakeholders. The project workplan is reviewed and monitored regularly by the project manager and M&E specialist to ensure timely follow-up of activities and outputs and flag delays or changes in activities during bi-weekly project team meetings, which include implementation staff from both ZSL and ECS. The project team is planning to meet in early May to reflect on Y2 activities, address any ongoing challenges or changes to the project activities, and co-develop a Y3 workplan and timeline.

8. Lessons learnt

Overall, progress towards the project objectives has been largely positive. Project activities in Year 2 built off successes and lessons learned from Year 1, strengthening partnerships and addressing needs and barriers more swiftly and efficiently. Key successes included:

- Legal registration of the Chang Pa elephant-friendly coffee group
- Agroforestry business plan drafted and pitched to investors generating interest and positive feedback
- Three model farms representing different agroclimatic zones in sWEFCOM identified and commitment secured

- Demonstratable steps towards achieving regional priorities including decentralization and ERRU capacity and coordination

Key challenges included:

- Delays scheduling regional meetings for reasons beyond our control (scheduling issues, political reshuffling, natural disasters)
- Low government buy-in for HEC insurance as well as challenges in other implementing countries
- Aligning coffee group training activities with harvest schedules

Regional priorities and best practice: Shifting to smaller, more frequent meetings with select stakeholders has improved progress on regional priorities and built trust with beneficiaries. These targeted meetings are easier to organize amid scheduling challenges and external disruptions (e.g. political changes, natural disasters), ensuring goals are advanced efficiently. Some meetings moved online, while others benefited from more frequent in-person engagement.

Insurance: The multistakeholder forum identified key challenges and opportunities for HEC insurance. Knowledge exchanges with Kenyan and Nepali counterparts prompted a reassessment to ensure the scheme's feasibility and stakeholder appeal. Year 3 will focus on aligning strategies with government priorities to enhance financing prospects while retaining strategic advantages over compensation models.

Agroforestry and coffee CBO: Despite delays, Year 2 targets were largely met. Chang Pa coffee group membership is steadily growing (3–5 new members/month). Dissemination of the agroforestry business plan to 17 communities in Y3 is expected to boost interest. Three households have committed to demonstration farms, which will provide proof of concept in each agroclimatic zone. Due to diverse farmer capacities and locations, training has shifted from group to one-on-one sessions, requiring more time but building trust. Future engagement will remain flexible and aligned with planting and harvest calendars.

We have submitted a change request reflecting adjustments to the workplan and planned outputs and are awaiting feedback.

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

Comments from last year's annual report were addressed in the 2024 half-year report.

10. Risk Management

A social safeguarding concern (detailed in section 13) resulted in the resignation of the project manager. A mandatory safeguarding and HR workshop was conducted in June 2024 for all ZSL staff and a new manager for year 2 was promptly appointed, closely overseen by the Project Coordinator. Flooding in the south resulted in delays planning and implementing the southern regional meeting, but the meeting was rescheduled to Y2Q4. No other major risks that would affect project implementation have arisen.

11. Scalability and durability

The project involves multi-stakeholder collaboration between the DNP, local subdistrict governments, local communities, universities, and NGOs/CSOs across Thailand. The regional and national meetings have elevated the project's profile and increased potential for scaling methods to other elephant range forest complexes. Knowledge-exchange trips and meetings on topics including decentralization, ERRUs, ecotourism, and fence maintenance have promoted cross-sector collaboration, building in-country capacity and sustainable partnerships. While regional priorities are often unique, there are overlapping priorities including ERRU capacity and decentralization that have offered opportunities for shared learning. Successful case studies – as in the case of Nong Ped subdistrict for decentralization – have garnered genuine interest for adoption in other areas of sWEFCOM, Eastern Forest Complex, and Hala Bala forest complex.

All knowledge products are co-developed with input from relevant stakeholders and expert committees and sensitized with target audiences. Regular stakeholder engagement provides ample opportunities for feedback throughout the project, and has guided changes in methodologies and activities as needed to ensure alignment with strategic and stakeholder priorities and retain support.

Part of the existing exit strategy is to ensure the methodologies, knowledge, and resources from this project are available after project completion. Generalized HEC and agronomic suitability data for sWEFCOM compiled and mapped by the project will be publicly available via the resiliency framework on the ECS website. All knowledge products – including the agroforestry business plan, HEC mitigation

systematic review and best-practice guide, and feasibility assessment of HEC insurance – will be translated into Thai, sensitized, and disseminated to target audiences to ensure knowledge retention.

The project has planned various strategies to ensure a sustained legacy across social, economic, ecological, and technical dimensions. The project has established multi-stakeholder workshops and participatory activities to engage communities and stakeholders in conservation efforts, enhancing community capacity and ownership of the project outcomes. The project is supporting livelihoods aimed at reducing the economic dependency on high-risk crops that attract elephants, thereby fostering more sustainable local economies. We have developed a comprehensive business plan which is being pitched to potential investors for financing the initial conversion costs from cash crops to agroforestry, ensuring that farmers are not overburdened by loans or disincentivised by the high startup costs. Ongoing MEL and adaptive management helps in making timely adjustments to conservation strategies (adaptive management) based on the latest data and community feedback.

12. Darwin Initiative identity

The Darwin initiative has been recognized as the primary funding body for this project at all meetings and engagement activities. The logo is displayed prominently on all project presentations and posters, including during the livestreamed Thai Elephant Day events and Hackathon launch. Darwin is also recognized on ECS's website (humanelephantvoices.org) and ZSL Thailand's facebook page in project-related posts and on social media, which sees regular engagement. Many INGOs in-country are familiar with Darwin, as are some smaller local CSOs. We have also supported our in-country implementation partner, ECS, to lead on their own Darwin proposals.

13. Safeguarding

14. Project expenditure

Table 1: Project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025)

Project spend (indicative) since last Annual Report	**2024/25 Grant (£)**	**2024/25 Total Darwin Costs (£)**	**Variance %**	**Comments (please explain significant variances)**
Staff costs (see below)				
Consultancy costs				
Overhead Costs				
Travel and subsistence				
Operating Costs				
Capital items (see below)				
Others (see below)				
TOTAL	176,829.73			

Table 2: Project mobilised or matched funding during the reporting period (1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025)

	Secured to date	Expected by end of project	Sources
Matched funding leveraged by the partners to deliver the project (£)			WWF Nature-based Solutions Accelerator
Total additional finance mobilised for new activities occurring outside of the project, building on evidence, best practices and the project (£)			Secured: ISPF, UK PACT, Outcomes Accelerator

15. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

An additional output of the Darwin has been the co-design and launch of a Hackathon competition event (Annex 7) organized by ZSL, EcoExist, Thai PBS and DNP. This competition invites university students, educators, and conservationists to collaborate on developing innovative solutions that promote the coexistence of Thailand's elephant population with local communities. The competition was officially launched on March 31, 2025 through an in-person and online session where elephant experts from NGOs, Universities, and DNP provided an overview of the HEC problem and outlined needs and challenges to guide projects. Six universities across Thailand were invited to participate based on their proximity to HEC-prone areas and potential to deliver innovative solutions. Students will be invited to submit their projects over the coming year, with selected winners announced during the Year 3 Thai Elephant Day event. We are currently working with ThaiPBS to identify potential sponsors for the winning projects.

In addition, some adjustments have been made to project activities:

Output 1: Due to delays in scheduling regional meetings—stemming from internal political shifts and slow communication with regional partners—we adjusted our regional engagement approach. We have added smaller, frequent workshops with key groups (e.g., ERRUs, DNP, and local government) to co-develop the best-practice guide and support regional priorities throughout the year. Annual meetings are now focused on broader knowledge-sharing. These adjustments ensure regular follow-up without impacting project outcomes or budget.

Output 4: During coffee farmer engagement, we faced several challenges including low participation in cupping events, scarcity of coffee in the market which promoted production of quantity over quality, and confusion over grading and quality. Tailored workshops and follow-up engagement have been conducted to address these challenges. We are also working closely with implementing partners to identify mitigation strategies for the recent dissolution of the SCA and Fine Robusta standard including diversified markets and alternative value-added avenues.

We have submitted a change request with revised indicators to be SMARTer and more in line with Darwin standard indicators.

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

I agree for the Biodiversity Challenge Funds to edit and use the following for various promotional purposes (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here).

File Type (Image / Video / Graphic)	File Name or File Location	Caption including description, country and credit	Social media accounts and websites to be tagged (leave blank if none)	Consent of subjects received (delete as necessary)
Webpage	ZSL Official Website – Saving Elephants and Helping Farmers	Feature article on ZSL and ECS's human-elephant conflict mitigation efforts through sustainable livelihoods and agroforestry, Thailand. Credit: ZSL	@OfficialZSL (Twitter/X), @officialzsl (Instagram), ZSL LinkedIn, www.zsl.org www.humanelephantvoices.org	Not applicable
Document (Presentation)	Case study - Addressing Human-Elephant conflict in Thailand	Presentation for the NbS Showcase Event showcasing ZSL Thailand, work in human-elephant coexistence and agroforestry innovation. Credit: ZSL Thailand	@OfficialZSL (Twitter/X), @officialzsl (Instagram), ZSL LinkedIn, www.zsl.org www.humanelephantvoices.org	Not applicable

Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against logframe for Financial Year 2024-2025

Project summary	Progress and Achievements April 2024 - March 2025	Actions required/planned for next period
Impact A sustainable model for human-elephant coexistence based on effective HEC mitigation strategies that enhance human wellbeing and reduce threats to elephants has been adopted across Thailand benefitting all elephant populations	Regional meetings have supported progress towards regional priorities such as ERRU capacity and decentralization of elephant management which will empower local communities and increase timeliness and effectiveness of interventions. An NbS business plan and engagement activities are supporting transition towards livelihoods that promote coexistence between communities and elephants.	
Outcome An evidence-based model for human-elephant coexistence in Thailand increases country-wide capacity for HWC mitigation, including insurance and elephant-friendly livelihoods, improving human wellbeing and attitudes toward elephants and protected areas.		
Outcome Indicator 0.1 Improved capacity and capability of 23 organizations and communities in 5 regions (~1,000 people, 30% women and indigenous, benefitting ca. 30,000 HEC-afflicted HH) working in elephant conservation in Thailand (including DNP, NGOs, and universities) to assess, implement, and monitor suitable, sustainable, cost-effective HEC mitigation measures by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, with midline surveys conducted in Y2. **[DI-A03]**	Due to several regional meetings being scheduled in Y2Q4, the case study report for Y2 is being drafted and will be shared with the Half-Year 3 Darwin report. **Evidence:** Regional meeting activity reports, case study report (in prep), attendance sheets, photos	Post-training assessments to be conducted in Y3.
Outcome Indicator 0.2 HEC mitigation best practice and standardized M&E co-developed and adopted into DNP elephant NAP and implemented by 70% (n = 16) of partner organizations by project end **[DI-C01]**	A multistakeholder committee has been formed to review and co-develop the HEC best practice guide. The drafted guide will be reviewed and approved by DNP prior to final publication. **Evidence:** Regional meeting activity reports and meeting notes from targeted focus groups/informant interviews, establishment of an HEC best practice committee	Preliminary draft of best-practice guidelines for review by expert committee and DNP is planned for early Y3.
Outcome Indicator 0.3 National HEC insurance feasibility assessment, including costs and benefits, informs government and community-level options to offset elephant damages by the end of Y2 and, where appropriate, pilot schemes are in place by end of Y3. **[DI-C01]**	Data for integrating into feasibility assessment is being collated from farmer interviews, insurance and re-insurance sector engagement, meetings with sugarcane industry, experts, and DNP.	Draft of feasibility assessment in progress with expected completion by Y3.
Outcome Indicator 0.4 Improved capacity of CBO members in business and product development, assessed annually (60 HH) to ensure they are progressing in Output 4. **[DI-A04]**	Seven members achieved scores qualifying as Fine Robusta. A cupping and quality training course was conducted by a Q Grader, with 13 representative members of each village enrolled. These initiatives reflect measurable growth in knowledge, skills, and business orientation among members. **Evidence**: CBO registration document (Annex 6) and cupping scores	

Outcome Indicator 0.5 Increase in subjective and relational aspects of wellbeing among 70% of sWEFCOM households engaged in elephant-friendly community business market chain (total 60 HH, 30% women and indigenous) by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, assessed as: **0.5.1** Improved perceived security (e.g., safety from elephant injury) as a result of training workshops in effective, nonviolent deterrence methods and reduced HEC rates **0.5.2** Improved dimensions of social capital (community relations, dignity, ability to help others), particularly for women and indigenous people, achieved via development of more participatory and collaborative community business structure that ensures representative governance and connection to a broader elephant-friendly business support network. **0.5.3** Reduced perceived vulnerability to human-elephant conflict (e.g., effects on savings and capital) as a result of community business financial support mechanism and competitive products. **[DI-D16]**	Community members reported greater confidence in handling HEC incidents due to training in non-violent deterrence methods and real-time communication through LINE groups. Regular engagement with CBO members has indicated reduced fear and faster response to elephant activity in agricultural areas. The formal registration of the Chang Yim CBO and inclusive decision-making processes have fostered stronger social cohesion. Women (52% of members) actively participate in governance and exchange visits. Higher coffee prices and alternative income from intercropping (e.g., konjac) have improved financial resilience. Members are less reliant on unstable market channels and more capable of absorbing economic shocks from elephant-related damage, especially through collaborative sales and new product development. **Evidence**: Regular stakeholder engagement and feedback, 1-on-1 trainings, coffee prices	Quantitative data collection of HEC will be initiated in Y3 as part of the co-developed M&E framework. Surveys to assess attitude changes towards elephants, perceived vulnerability, and dimensions of social and financial capital will be conducted in Y3.
Outcome Indicator 0.6 70% of sWEFCOM households engaged in elephant-friendly community business market chain (60 HH) report improved attitudes toward elephants and protected areas by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, as a result of effective mitigation via elephant-friendly livelihoods.	Preliminary feedback from CBO members indicates a shift toward more positive attitudes regarding elephants and protected areas. This change is attributed to improved understanding of coexistence strategies and the economic benefits gained from elephant-friendly coffee production. Farmers who previously viewed elephants as threats now see value in non-violent deterrence and recognize that sustainable, wildlife-compatible livelihoods can enhance community wellbeing. The establishment of the Chang Yim CBO, linked to conservation values, has helped reinforce this mindset**. Evidence:** Farmer feedback and engagement	A formal attitude assessment is scheduled for mid-2025 as part of the wellbeing and income survey.
Output 1. A country-wide systematic review of all human-elephant conflict mitigation projects in Thailand identifies effectiveness of mitigation tools trialed, and informs best practice and M&E guidelines that are promoted across 5 HEC regions of Thailand		
Output Indicator 1.1 Data on mitigation methods and assessment collated from partners across Thailand, systematically reviewed and analysed in Y1. Report written with participatory input from all partners including DNP at end of Y1 and a paper submitted for publication in a relevant peer-reviewed journal by the end of Y2. **[DI-C18]**	Systematic map/review is being drafted and developed alongside best-practice guide with participatory and multi-stakeholder input.	Finalization of Systematic map/review planned for Y1Q2
Output Indicator 1.2 Best practice guidelines for HEC mitigation tools, including suitability, requirements, risks, and cost-analyses co-developed by end of Y1. **[DI-C01]**	Data on HEC strategies and case studies collected during regional meetings and interviews/focus groups with regional elephant	Data collection completed by end of Y1Q4

	experts. **Evidence**: Activity reports from regional workshops and key informant interviews.	
Output Indicator 1.3 Best practice guidelines for locally appropriate, systematic and adaptive monitoring and evaluation of HEC mitigation methods co-developed by end of Y1. **[DI-C01]**	Data and activity reports collated, best practice HEC committee has been established and drafting of guidelines is ongoing. **Evidence**: Activity reports from regional workshops and key informant interviews.	Best practice guide finalized and reviewed by HEC best practice committee by end of Y1Q2 with final review by DNP by end of Y1Q3
Output Indicator 1.4 Best practice guidelines for HEC mitigation, monitoring and evaluation framework, and lessons learned disseminated to: **1.4.1** DNP and all partners (n=23) from 5 regions via HECx national capacity-building workshops in Y3; **1.4.2** Communities across 5 regions (~1,000 people, 30% women and indigenous, benefitting ca. 30,000 HEC-afflicted HH) via community-level HECx capacity building workshops in Y2 and Y3; **1.4.3** Other elephant range States via public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3. **[DI-A01]**	This is still planned for Y3	N/A
Output 2 Assessment of the feasibility of human-elephant conflict insurance schemes (including commercial, corporate CSR and community-based) for supporting long-term human-elephant coexistence across Thailand.		
Output Indicator 2.1 Data on financial impact of HEC (crop damage including damage to plantation crops; damage to infrastructure) collated from partners and analysed, and additional data collected as needed from representative areas across Thailand and analysed, by end of Q4Y1. **[DI-C19]**	Data on financial impact of HEC from sWEFCOM and Khao Yai collected by ZSL and ECS. Locational data was analysed to develop risk maps by a University of College London student and will contribute to the feasibility assessment. **Evidence**: Risk Mapping (Annex 3), Multistakeholder Insurance Forum (Annex 1), Insurance Feasibility Assessment (In Prep)	Data will be integrated into insurance feasibility assessment in Y3
Output Indicator 2.2 Willingness to pay (WTP) premiums and linking premiums and eligibility for insurance to crop protection and 'riskiness' of crop type established by end of Q2Y2 via focus groups and interviews in 5 HEC regions (~250 individuals, 30% women and indigenous). **[DI-C19]**	Insurance interviews conducted with 142 farmers (37% women, 63% men) to assessed HEC situation, perceptions of elephants and effects on wellbeing, mitigation strategies, existing financial support mechanisms, and interest in and willingness to pay for insurance. **Evidence**: Insurance interview data sheets and excel database, insurance feasibility assessment (in prep)	A full analysis of the data is ongoing and will be added to the insurance feasibility assessment report for dissemination in Year 3.
Output Indicator 2.3 Feasibility of crop protection compliance and payments monitoring systems established by end of Y2. **[DI-C19]**	This is being assessed as part of the feasibility assessment. **Evidence**: N/A	Feasible options for managing risk to reduce moral hazards in existing compensation schemes will be identified in Y3.

Output Indicator 2.4 Insurance companies' interest in and ability to insure against HEC established (including viability of meeting the industries' risk management and re-insurance standards) by end of Y2. **[DI-C19]**	Re-insurance companies engaged in one-on-one meetings and the multistakeholder insurance forum expressed interest and willingness in HEC insurance. TGIA and OIC have co-developed an HEC insurance scheme which demonstrates interest and ability to insure HEC, but lack of buy-in from the government for co-financing due to high premiums was a key challenge. **Evidence**: Multistakeholder insurance forum outputs (Annex 1), meeting notes	Alternative options for engaging insurance companies will be evaluated in Y3.
Output Indicator 2.5 Feasibility of alternatives to commercial insurance (government schemes, companies' CSR, community based micro-finance) established by end of Y2. **[DI-C19]**	Feasibility assessment is currently being drafted with input from insurance interviews, private sector and government engagement in Y2. **Evidence**: N/A	Feasibility assessment planned for completion in Y3
Output Indicator 2.6 Feasible pilot schemes are established and evaluated in Y3. **[DI-B12]**	This may no longer be feasible due to lack of government buy in and secured budget for a pilot.	We are currently co-developing an alternative proposal to inform and improve the existing compensation scheme building on the benefits of insurance.
Output Indicator 2.7 Insurance feasibility case studies (Thailand, Sri Lanka, Kenya, and Malaysia) shared with other elephant range countries via public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3. **[DI-C13]**	Three knowledge-exchange discussions have been conducted with representatives from other elephant range countries to share developments and lessons learned around HEC insurance. **Evidence**: Meeting notes and transcription	A broader webinar is still planned for Y3.
Output 3. Identification of alternative and/or enhanced livelihoods (e.g., agroforestry, elephant-resilient crops) that promote human-elephant coexistence in sWEFCOM informs future forward climate and HEC resilient livelihoods that promotes HECx.		
Output Indicator 3.1 Agroforestry/livelihood systems (based on existing coffee agroforestry model) builds scalable elephant and crop resiliency mapping framework, embedded within national ECS network, to assess crop suitability across the sWEFCOM landscape (ca. 2,000 km^2), identifying climate and HEC resilient options, and modelling areas prone to HEC by end of Y1. **[DI-B04]**	Data from soil surveys, farm mapping, agroclimatic data, VCAs, and focus groups have contributed to the development of a comprehensive business plan for sWEFCOM. **Evidence**: Agroforestry business plan (Annex 2)	N/A
Output Indicator 3.2 Market analysis identifies and prioritizes suitable 'elephant friendly' products, cost-to-convert ratios, and sustainable financial mechanisms (e.g. community-based microfinance, CBO, CSR, insurance) for economically viable and inclusive livelihood enhancement promoting HECx across 16 HEC zones (~8,000 HH) in the sWEFCOM landscape by end of Y1. **[DI-C19]**	The market analysis was completed in Y1 and integrated into the sWEFCOM agroforestry business plan. The business plan was pitched to investors at an NbS showcase in London with feedback indicating strong interest in the project's community-led design, biodiversity co-benefits, and early signs of market viability through premium coffee sales. Investors highlighted that the model is promising but emphasized the need for further scaling to landscape level, robust ROI projections, and structured blended finance mechanisms to attract future investment.	The business plan will continue to be revisited and improved with feedback from investors and communities

Output Indicator 3.3 Community-led focus groups in 16 HEC conflict zones across the sWEFCOM (ca. 160 HH) assesses farmer receptiveness to viable elephant friendly alternative and/or enhanced livelihoods (e.g., agroforestry, organic products, CSR) by Q2Y2; barriers to adoption farther adoption pathways identified e.g., microfinance by Q4 Y2. **[DI-C19]**	Focus group discussions were completed in May 2024 and engaged a total of 369 farmers (46% women, 13% IPLC) across 17 communities in sWEFCOM. One assessment of community receptiveness and barriers to adoption was produced with key information integrated into the business plan. **Evidence**: Agroforestry FGD analysis (Annex 5) and Business Plan (Annex 2).	Communication materials for communities summarizing the business plan outputs have been drafted and will be disseminated to the 17 communities in Y3 to assess interest in next steps and potential for scaling.
Output Indicator 3.4 HEC livelihood resiliency framework incorporates market and insurance cost-benefit ratios and serves as dynamic resource, housed within the ECS network platform to inform and strengthen elephant-friendly livelihoods for: **3.4.1** National HEC conflict zone partners (23 partners from 5 regions) as a scalable model via HECx capacity building workshop by end of Y3; **3.4.2** And other elephant range states through sharing adaptive resiliency mapping framework via a public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3.	The framework map is currently being reconstructed based on data from the paper report. It will then be translated into an appropriate format for online publication on the website. **Evidence**: N/A	Completion and publication of the maps and website expected for Y3
Output 4 Elephant-friendly livelihood and community cooperatives/ business organizations strengthened and scaled to support long-term human-elephant coexistence and provide financial and social resilience for HEC-afflicted communities in sWEFCOM.		
Output Indicator 4.1 An established community cooperative/business organization (CBO) piloting elephant-friendly livelihoods in Thong Pha Phum (TPP) zone (10 HH in 2 communities) in sWEFCOM is reinforced with support in business operations and management for 'Chang Baa' coffee production from source to market by end of Y1, with membership scaled to include 50 new members (20 HH in production and 30 additional HH along chain of production - processing, packaging, transport and marketing), with 30% membership of women and indigenous groups (Hmong and Karen) by end of Y2. **[DI-B10]**	The community-based organization "Chang Yim Coffee" has now been officially registered and has expanded its membership to 35 families (over 60 individuals). The CBO has developed an inclusive governance structure and actively engages in monthly meetings and regional exchanges. **Evidence:** Registration document and application form	Continual outreach and dissemination of outputs will incentivise continued registration and growth of the CBO in Y3.
Output Indicator 4.2 Seed funding supports CBO with assets, inputs, skills and finance to ensure product quality and quantity of coffee production (by end Y1), establishing a scalable M&E framework that meets both national 'elephant friendly' and health and safety standards by end of Y2, where 100% of participating CBO members (60 HH) meet standards by end of Y3. **[DI-A04]**	Seven farms successfully produced Fine Robusta quality coffee. Moisture content, defect levels, and chemical residue testing was conducted and all coffee samples passed national safety standards. The community has also initiated the development of a localized monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework to track and document continuous quality improvements. **Evidence**: Cupping scores, Chemical residue inspection reports	Workshops in Y3 will continue to support training in testing and quality control as needed as well as development of an M&E framework.

Output Indicator 4.3 Sustainable finance model established for CBO by end of Y2 to support investments in scaling livelihood pilot (coffee production) and HEC mitigation beyond life of the project, where CBO has sufficient resources, capacity and self-resilience to independently manage/operate sustainable business model by end of Y3. **[DI-C19]**	The CBO has established an inclusive governance structure and conducts monthly meetings and regional exchanges, building internal capacity for independent management. The CBO has enhanced its value chain connections, contributing to a scalable livelihood model centered on coffee production. The agroforestry business plan was pitched to investors at an NbS showcase in London with feedback indicating strong interest in the project's community-led design, biodiversity co-benefits, and early signs of market viability through premium coffee sales. **Evidence**: NbS case study showcase (Annex 4),	Capacity evaluations are planned for Y3. Adjustments to the business plan based on feedback from the investment showcase will be integrated.
Output Indicator 4.4 CBO members (60 HH) connected with national 'elephant friendly' product network in 3 additional HEC regions, product-specific market systems and suppliers (e.g., transportation of goods, marketing) by end of Y2, and high-value national markets (e.g., Royal Thai Foundation, Phufa Products) by end of Y3. **[DI-A04]**	We are co-developing the parameters of an elephant-friendly standard which will connect coffee production to elephant conservation and add value to Fine Robusta coffee products. The Chang Yim group has already sold to the fine Robusta green bean market, which is a highly specific niche. **Evidence**: Chang Yim standards (in development), Chang Yim product sales	We will continue to co-develop Chang Yim standards and identify diversified and value added market opportunities
Output Indicator 4.5 CBO business model results in a 30% increase in sales value of goods against Y1 baseline for coffee-producing CBO households (10 HH) by end of Y3. **[DI-A11]**	Fine Robusta quality coffees produced by farmers as a result of the trainings were successfully sold at prices ranging from 350 to 1200 THB/kg, representing a 300% increase compared to the Year 1 baseline price. **Evidence**: Coffee price, sale receipts	We will continue to monitor market and value chain opportunities to diversify income opportunities from coffee.
Output Indicator 4.6 Agroforestry/Livelihood, market, and insurance feasibility assessments inform two additional HEC resilient livelihood business models in high-conflict zones in sWEFCOM (Thamanao and Mai Plasoi, ~160 HH) by end of Y2, with two business model workshops and reports delivered by end of Y3. **[DI-B03]**	The current business plan integrates 3 agroclimatic zones including southeast WEFCOM (Tha Manao and Mai Plasoi). Workshops and engagement have been conducted with farmers in all 3 zones for identifying and implementing model farms. **Evidence**: Business plan (Annex 2)	Workshops and targeted engagement to support establishment of model farms sWEFCOM planned for Y3
Output Indicator 4.7 Roadshow of resiliency mapping framework and successful elephant friendly business models (from TPP and three additional CBOs in elephant friendly product national network) share lessons learned across 16 HEC zones around 9 protected areas in sWEFCOM (~270 people benefitting ca. 8,000 HH) and 4 other HEC regions (~960 people benefitting ca. 27,000 HH) by end of Y3.	Planned for Y3.	**N/A**

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

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

	informs government and community-level options to offset elephant damages by the end of Y2 and, where appropriate, pilot schemes are in place by end of Y3. 0.4 Improved capacity of CBO members in business and product development, assessed annually (60 HH) to ensure they are progressing in Output 4. 0.5 Increase in subjective and relational aspects of wellbeing among 70% of sWEFCOM households engaged in elephant-friendly community business market chain (total 60 HH, 30% women and indigenous) by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, assessed as: 0.5.1 Improved perceived security (e.g., safety from elephant injury) as a result of training workshops in effective, nonviolent deterrence methods and reduced HEC rates 0.5.2 Improved dimensions of social capital (community relations, dignity, ability to help others), particularly for women and indigenous people, achieved via	Woodhouse et al., 2015 [22] ('Voices of the Poor' well-being domains and Wellbeing in Developing Countries (WeD) guidelines) 0.6 Baseline and endline socioeconomic surveys collecting data from all sWEFCOM community business members to construct: 0.6.1 Conservation Attitude Index (Ratings and Likert scales, 'willingness to pay' for conservation outcomes, grievances and conflicts with protected area staff and wildlife) 0.6.2 Metric of net benefit perceived from protected areas (Likert and ratings scales on objective and subjective benefits (income, wellbeing, cultural traditions) and costs (access, park, and wildlife conflict).	

	development of more participatory and collaborative community business structure that ensures representative governance and connection to a broader elephant-friendly business support network. 0.5.3 Reduced perceived vulnerability to human-elephant conflict (e.g., effects on savings and capital) as a result of community business financial support mechanism and competitive products. 0.6 70% of sWEFCOM households engaged in elephant-friendly community business market chain (60 HH) report improved attitudes toward elephants and protected areas by end of Y3, compared to Y1 baseline, as a result of effective mitigation via elephant-friendly livelihoods.		
Outputs: **1.** A country-wide systematic review of all human-elephant conflict mitigation projects in Thailand identifies effectiveness of mitigation tools trialed, and informs best practice and M&E guidelines	1.1 Data on mitigation methods and assessment collated from partners across Thailand, systematically reviewed and analysed in Y2. Report written with participatory input from all	1. Final report; publication in peer-reviewed journal 2. Workshop notes and minutes, photographs, guidelines	Sufficient data made available from partners for a meaningful review of the effectiveness of mitigation and monitoring strategies. Willingness of all partners including DNP to co-develop Guidelines and to attend capacity-building workshops.

that are promoted across 5 HEC regions of Thailand	partners including DNP at end of Y2 and a paper submitted for publication in a relevant peer-reviewed journal by the end of Y3. 1.2 Best practice guidelines for HEC mitigation tools, including suitability, requirements, risks, and cost-analyses co-developed by end of Y2. 1.3 Best practice guidelines for locally appropriate, systematic and adaptive monitoring and evaluation of HEC mitigation methods co-developed by end of Y2. 1.4 Best practice guidelines for HEC mitigation, monitoring and evaluation framework, and lessons learned disseminated to: 1.4.1 DNP and all partners (n=23) from 5 regions via HECx national capacity-building workshops in Y3; 1.4.2 Communities across 5 regions (~1,000 people, 30% women and indigenous, benefitting ca. 30,000 HEC-afflicted HH) via community-level HECx capacity building workshops in Y2 and Y3; 1.4.3 Other elephant range States via public HEC	3. Workshop notes and minutes, photographs, guidelines 4. Training curriculum; meeting and workshop notes and minutes, photographs, webinar recording	DNP and national partners see value in implementing evidence-based best practice mitigation measures and monitoring framework for evolving lessons learned the long-term. Partners in other elephant range countries (e.g., range country government agencies, other NGOs/CSOs, Elephant Conservation Group, IUCN Asian Elephant Specialist Group) see value in resulting national assessment and monitoring and evaluation framework.

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

	2.5 Feasibility of alternatives to commercial insurance (government schemes, companies' CSR, community based micro-finance) established by end of Y2. 2.6 Feasible pilot schemes are established and evaluated in Y3. 2.7 Insurance feasibility case studies (Thailand, Sri Lanka, Kenya, and Malaysia) shared with other elephant range countries via public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3.		assessment and pilot scheme results, adapting them for their own purposes.
Outputs: **3**. Identification of alternative and/or enhanced livelihoods (e.g., agroforestry, elephant-resilient crops) that promote human-elephant coexistence in sWEFCOM informs future forward climate and HEC resilient livelihoods that promotes HECx.	3.1 Agroforestry/livelihood systems (based on existing coffee agroforestry model) builds scalable elephant and crop resiliency mapping framework, embedded within national HEVN network, to assess crop suitability across the sWEFCOM landscape (ca. 2,000 km^2), identifying climate and HEC resilient options, and modelling areas prone to HEC by end of Y1. 3.2 Market analysis identifies and prioritizes suitable 'elephant friendly' products, cost-to-convert ratios, and sustainable	3.1 Soil sample tests, agroforestry/livelihood system document, online interactive mapping framework published to HEVN website 3.2 Market analysis report 3.3 Focus group notes, barriers assessment and interventions report 3.4 Alternative agroforestry/livelihoods and farmer adoption pathways report, dissemination of workshop notes, webinar recording	University partners acquire adequate information from existing data sources to build resiliency framework. Elephant-friendly products identified by the project represent a sustainable investment, with market prices remaining relatively stable and competitive. Proposed elephant-friendly business models and livelihood plans are considered sufficiently viable and attractive by communities. Financial mechanisms are suitable in scope and scale to support initial investment into proposed elephant friendly business models. Elephant and crop resiliency framework is built in way that can be scaled and

	financial mechanisms (e.g. community-based microfinance, CBO, CSR, insurance) for economically viable and inclusive livelihood enhancement promoting HECx across 16 HEC zones (~8,000 HH) in the sWEFCOM landscape by end of Y1. 3.3 Community-led focus groups in 16 HEC conflict zones across the sWEFCOM (ca. 160 HH) assesses farmer receptiveness to viable elephant friendly alternative and/or enhanced livelihoods (e.g., agroforestry, organic products, CSR) by Q2Y2; barriers to adoption farther adoption pathways identified e.g., microfinance by Q4 Y2. 3.4 HEC livelihood resiliency framework incorporates market and insurance cost-benefit ratios and serves as dynamic resource, housed within the HEVN network platform to inform and strengthen elephant-friendly livelihoods for: 3.4.1 16 HEC zones in the sWEFCOM (~8,000 HH) via landscape-level workshops by end of Y2;		replicated in both national and international site-based contexts for broad scale application and partners see value in resulting model.

	3.4.2 National HEC conflict zone partners (23 partners from 5 regions) as a scalable model via HECx capacity building workshop by end of Y3; 3.4.3 And other elephant range states through sharing adaptive resiliency mapping framework via a public HEC community of practice webinar in Y3.		
Outputs: **4**. Elephant-friendly livelihood and community cooperatives/ business organizations strengthened and scaled to support long-term human-elephant coexistence and provide financial and social resilience for HEC-afflicted communities in sWEFCOM.	4.1 An established community cooperative/business organization (CBO) piloting elephant-friendly livelihoods in Thong Pha Phum (TPP) zone (10 HH in 2 communities) in sWEFCOM is reinforced with support in business operations and management for 'Chang Baa' coffee production from source to market by end of Y1, with membership scaled to include 50 new members (20 HH in production and 30 additional HH along chain of production - processing, packaging, transport and marketing), with 30% membership of women and indigenous groups (Hmong and Karen) by end of Y2.	4.1 Community business plan, steering committee meeting records and minutes; Community business and membership records 4.2 Management guidelines for processing facility integrated into business plan, certification of standards met 4.3 Financial mechanism formation records, photographs, membership records, Master Plan for Self-Reliance (assessed annually) 4.4 Independent assessment and examination reports (e.g., Organizational Capacity Assessment tool or Conservation Standards) 4.5 Community business records, baseline and endline socio-	No significant annual differences in environmental variables that could alter elephant movement behavior and patterns or significantly affect business members' financial situations. Elephants do not shift to consuming the alternative crop or raiding households. Communities are interested in and willing to consider alternative livelihood scenarios, engage in surveys and livelihood pilots, and invest in financial support schemes. Community members understand that alternative livelihoods and CBO activities are directly linked to their engagement in conservation and human-elephant coexistence. This includes community members who are not direct beneficiaries, through word of mouth from community leaders and fellow community neighbours.

	4.2 Seed funding supports CBO with assets, inputs, skills and finance to ensure product quality and quantity of coffee production (by end Y1), establishing a scalable M&E framework that meets both national 'elephant friendly' and health and safety standards by end of Y2, where 100% of participating CBO members (60 HH) meet standards by end of Y3. 4.3 Sustainable finance model established for CBO by end of Y2 to support investments in scaling livelihood pilot (coffee production) and HEC mitigation beyond life of the project, where CBO has sufficient resources, capacity and self-resilience to independently manage/operate sustainable business model by end of Y3. 4.4 CBO members (60 HH) connected with national 'elephant friendly' product network in 3 additional HEC regions, product-specific market systems and suppliers (e.g., transportation of goods, marketing) by end of Y3, and high-value national markets	economic survey; Crop-raid monitoring data, baseline and endline socio-economic survey 4.6 Feasibility assessment report, dissemination workshop notes; business model workshop agendas, presentations, and reports, dissemination workshop minutes 4.7 Reports including videos of roadshow	Successful livelihoods existing and developed under the community business represent a viable business case for investment by the financial schemes, as seen in previous ZSL work in Kenya (DI 26-006) and the Philippines (DI 21-020 & 24-016). Aimed-for levels of female and indigenous participation are achieved based on pre-project understanding of community socioeconomics and demographics and results from previous/ongoing CBO implementation in the area. The CBO network engages necessary and sufficient community buy-in, social cohesion, and access to financial services (savings and loans) to be sustainable, competitive, and profitable. A supplementary widespread and reliable revenue stream, unimpacted by human-elephant conflict, will partially decouple community wellbeing from HEC, providing a basis for coexistence, with enough knowledge and modelling predicted about HEC incidents (i.e. activities elsewhere do not create new drivers of HEC). Access to enhanced and diversified livelihoods (in conjunction with financial schemes and mitigation interventions if appropriate) will reduce the need to engage in illegal, environmentally-damaging activities for income supplementation.

	(e.g., Royal Thai Foundation, Phufa Products) by end of Y3. 4.5 CBO business model results in a 30% increase in sales value of goods against Y1 baseline for coffee-producing CBO households (10 HH) by end of Y3. 4.6 Agroforestry/Livelihood, market, and insurance feasibility assessments inform two additional HEC resilient livelihood business models in high-conflict zones in sWEFCOM (Thamanao and Mai Plasoi, ~160 HH) by end of Y2, with two business model workshops and reports delivered by end of Y3. 4.7 Roadshow of resiliency mapping framework and successful elephant friendly business models (from TPP and three additional CBOs in elephant friendly product national network) share lessons learned across 16 HEC zones around 9 protected areas in sWEFCOM (~270 people benefitting ca. 8,000 HH) and 4 other HEC regions (~250 people benefitting ca. 8,000 HH) by end of Y3.		Coffee production knowledge, skills and assets developed by the project are sufficient in the event of any repeated extreme weather conditions over the life of the project. Economies of scale gained through establishing/supporting/strengthening the CBO gain sufficient market share to lead to profit for producers despite externalities in the market during the life of the project.

Activities (each activity is numbered according to the output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1. Each activity should start on a new line and be no more than approximately 25 words.)

Output 1

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

Output 2

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

Output 3

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

Output 4

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

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

Checklist for submission

	Check
Different reporting templates have different questions, and it is important you use the correct one. Have you checked you have used the **correct template** (checking fund, scheme, type of report (i.e. Annual or Final), and year) and **deleted the blue guidance text** before submission?	Y
Is the report less than 10MB? If so, please email to BCF-Reports@niras.com putting the project number in the Subject line.	
Is your report more than 10MB? If so, please consider the best way to submit. One zipped file, or a download option, is recommended. We can work with most online options and will be in touch if we have a problem accessing material. If unsure, please discuss with BCF-Reports@niras.com about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	
Have you included means of verification? You should not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	Y
Have you provided an updated risk register? If you have an existing risk register you should provide an updated version alongside your report. If your project was funded prior to this being a requirement, you are encouraged to develop a risk register.	Y
If you are submitting photos for publicity purposes, do these meet the outlined requirements (see Section 16)?	N
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	Y
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	Y
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	