

## The Rufford Foundation Final Report

---

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford Foundation.

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. The Final Report must be sent in **word format** and not PDF format or any other format. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work. Please be as honest as you can in answering the questions – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please complete the form in English and be as clear and concise as you can. Please note that the information may be edited for clarity. We will ask for further information if required. If you have any other materials produced by the project, particularly a few relevant photographs, please send these to us separately.

Please submit your final report to [jane@rufford.org](mailto:jane@rufford.org).

Thank you for your help.

**Josh Cole, Grants Director**

---

Grant Recipient Details	
<b>Your name</b>	Sapai Min
<b>Project title</b>	Investigation of Wildlife Trade in Myanmar-Thailand Border Cities under Growing Trans-boundary Economic Trade
<b>RSG reference</b>	19203-2
<b>Reporting period</b>	March 2016 to March 2017
<b>Amount of grant</b>	£5,000
<b>Your email address</b>	jassie.jasmine@gmail.com
<b>Date of this report</b>	24 March 2017

**1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.**

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
to investigate which wildlife species are being traded,				A total of 35 species; 19 species of mammals, 12 species of birds and four reptile species were recorded as the traded species in Tachileik markets. Out of these, 33 species were found in the list of globally threatened categories. This finding may be assumed that the most of traded wildlife species in the study site are mainly consisted under globally threatened categories
to assess the status of protection level of traded species and				Altogether 94% of traded species were listed under wildlife protection categories. According to the results obtained from nationally and/or globally threatened categories; six endangered species, four vulnerable species, nine near-threatened species and 13 least concern species were recorded in trade in IUCN Red List (2017); 11, five and one species observed were listed Appendix I, II and III under CITES (2017) and 14 completely protected species, 10 normally protected species and three seasonal protected species in MWPL (1994) were recorded. The implication of this investigation may have positive impact on wildlife trade law enforcement.
to investigate trade routes under growing trans-boundary economic trade				According to interviews with local traders and from direct observations, most of wildlife species were brought by middlemen from everywhere of Myanmar, wildlife from Tachileik is traded not only to Thailand by using illegal route avoid the Myanmar-

				Thailand checkpoint but also to China through Mong La , the border town as the destination of traded wildlife species. Wildlife parts were seen for sale in all border towns apart from Myawaddy, where trade is locally prohibited.
--	--	--	--	--

**2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled (if relevant).**

During the project, only unforeseen difficulties that I found were language barrier and difficult to take the photos because of the nature of wildlife trade and under control of central government. That is why, I prepared to solve these problem I hired two local people for language barrier in each sites, Tachilieik and Myawaddy, and I installed spy software in my phone to take the photos. For formal interview was cannot conduct. Most are not accept questions concerning on wildlife trade. In this case, local informants helped to get wildlife trade information.

**3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.**

According to project results, following are three most important outcomes;

1. Traded species and status are clearly classified.
2. Could share information of wildlife trade and situation to law enforcement agencies such as Forest Department, Custom Department and police.
3. Determine that Tachilieik and Myawaddy areas are under control of central government authorities. Therefore, these areas were easier to implement law enforcement than Mong La area that I did by the first Rufford Small Grant.

**4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefited from the project (if relevant).**

The local communities are not my target audience in this project. Nevertheless, based on the outcomes of the project, future conservation activities and public awareness could be extended to participate with local communities in and around the study site.

**5. Are there any plans to continue this work?**

Yes, I have a plan to continue extending wildlife trade survey in Myanmar, not only Tachileik, Myawaddy on the border with Thailand but also other cities from

Tanintharyi Region, lower part of Myanmar along the border with Thailand. It is my intent to apply for a Booster Grant programme.

**6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?**

I will be expected my findings to share and collaborate with law enforcement agencies including Forest Department, police and customs. And it will also provide to academic institution as well as government departments to integrate in their planning and strategy. And also plan to publish.

**7. Timescale: Over what period was The Rufford Foundation grant used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?**

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Rufford Small Grant were used since late the month of March 2016 to March 2017. Even though the grant were submitted on January, 2016, the project started on March 2016 due to delay in receiving fund. Therefore, the grant was used 12 month since the late of March 2016 instead of January, 2016.

**8. Budget: Please provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used.**

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Transportation (Air fare + Bus fare)	2000	1347+316=1663	337	It was used for 12 months
Accommodation	1000	1326	-326	
Food	1000	1105	-105	
Two local informants	500	1263	-763	
Others	500	26	474	
<b>Total</b>	5000	5383	-383	

**9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?**

The important next steps will be:

After submitting this final report to the Rufford Foundation I will prepare a proposal for a Booster Grant to continue wildlife trade survey in Tanintharyi Region, lower part of Myanmar especially along the border of Thailand.

**10. Did you use The Rufford Foundation logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?**

I will use The Rufford Foundation logo in my presentations future in seminars where national and international events.

**11. Any other comments?**

I am deeply grateful to the Rufford Foundation for the financial support which made possible for this project to achieve its valuable results. Without its support, I could not do to implement my vision concerning with wildlife trade in Tachileik and Myawaddy on the border of Thailand. I believe there was a strong need to continue this project in a long range.



