

The Rufford Small Grants Foundation

Final Report

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

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. 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. 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.

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

Grant Recipient Details	
Your name	Van Chieu Hoang
Project title	Enhancing protected area management in the northeast of Vietnam through cooperation among protected area authorities and local communities.
RSG reference	48.01.08
Reporting period	7 March 2008 – 10 March 2009
Amount of grant	£5,990
Your email address	chieu.hoang@anu.edu.au
Date of this report	22 April 2009

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 identify and develop the incentives which encourage and support the cooperation among protected area managers and local people in the management of the protected areas.			Yes.	Since the incentives as identified and proposed are related to and depend on higher policy making levels (ministry and central government levels), they can only be fully implemented with support of the legal policies introduced by these higher decision making levels.
<p>The research found that the major incentive for local people to take part in cooperative arrangements with the Protected area authorities is the security of people's rights to sustainably and legally access non-timber forest products and retain their ancestors' farmland in the protected areas. In addition, people need to be protected from violence from poachers while being involved in the protected area management activities.</p> <p>However, the incentives for protected area authorities and staff to carry out cooperation activities involve different aspects. They need to have legal frameworks to ensure that their job is secured in case the cooperation activities do not result in the good outcomes, and to strongly enforce commitment of local people to resource management.</p>				
To collect primary data for the PhD research.			Yes.	All local interviewees are ethnic people (Tay, Nung, Dao, H'Mong ethnic groups) and many of them, especially women have low literacy levels and cannot communicate in the national language (Vietnamese). Therefore, sometimes I had to use the Tay language (the most commonly used language in the area, and which all Tay, Nung, Dao and H'Mong people, and I can speak) in the interviews and discussions. As a result, the research progressed more slowly than expected.
<p>The fieldwork conducted from March 2008 to March 2009 to collect primary data for my PhD research was the main component of the project funded by RSGF. The essential data were adequately collected by methods including interviewing, group discussions, participant observation, and accessing documented data from relevant offices and agencies in the research areas.</p>				

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

Due to shortage of electricity, blackouts were frequent (normally 3 days per week) in the research areas during the research period, especially from April 2008 to September 2008. This affected the schedules for interviewing local people, of which some were planned to be carried out in the

evenings as people had to work on their farms during the day. To catch up with the research plan, some ad hoc meetings and interviews with local people were conducted such as meeting with people in the fields where they were working.

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

1. The major threats to the conservation of the biological values in the protected areas where the project was conducted were identified and examined. The threats include uncontrolled logging in the protected areas for commercial purposes, which has degraded the natural values in some locations; and unplanned expansion of farming areas which has caused a reduction in habitat of wildlife.
2. The needs of local people for using the protected area resources for livelihoods were determined. People wish to sustainably use resources from the protected areas for subsistence needs. They also advise that there should be guidelines and procedures to enable them to legally and sustainably benefit from the protected areas.
3. Some possibilities for successful cooperation between the Protected Area Authorities and local people to manage the protected area resources were indicated. Local people proposed that in order to ensure effective cooperation there needs to be equality between local people and the Protected Area Authorities in finalising the management decisions which recognise the rights and roles of people to the protected area resources.

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

Local people were involved in the research processes through participation in interviews and discussions with the researcher and the team members. Among those people who were involved in the research, the representatives of age groups, social groups (those who made their income entirely from farming; farmers holding positions in local civil societies such as women association, youth union, veteran association; etc), gender and ethnicity were considered and balanced.

Through their involvement in the research project, local people have learnt the necessity for sustainable management of the protected area resources to meet the needs and objectives of various stakeholders. In addition, local people had the opportunity to voice their concerns related to their rights to benefit from the protected area resources and related management activities. Such concerns of people will be introduced in my thesis and copies of my thesis and a summary of key recommendations will be sent to relevant management authorities. As a result, local people's voices will be heard and hopefully officials will respond.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes - I plan that after my PhD study is completed, I will continue research on the aspects related to strengthening the cooperation between the Protected Area Authorities and the Local governments in conservation of the protected areas in the north of Vietnam.

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

The result from this project will be written up in my PhD thesis, of which some copies will be made available to the authorities of the Protected Areas where this project was conducted. I will also make available to these authorities a Vietnamese summary of my key findings and recommendations. In this way the results of the project, especially the recommendations can be widely disseminated among the people whose works are related to the conservation activities at those Protected Areas.

In addition, at the end of my PhD study, I will organise a seminar in the research sites to present my research findings to my colleagues and interested people. So, the results from this project will be broadly shared.

7. Timescale: Over what period was the RSG used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

This RSG-supported project was carried out from early March 2008 to early March 2009. This period was exactly the same as the planned schedule.

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. The local exchange rate used, in March 2008: £1 = 31,500 VND (Vietnam Dong)

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Stationery (Papers, blank CDs, markers)	300	285.71	14.29	The amount of the items needed was less than estimated.
Books, scientific journals, official reports.	340	365.08	-25.08	The number of essential materials was greater than anticipated.
Photocopying, printing questionnaire sheets and other fieldwork documents.	200	152.38	47.62	The amount of the items needed was less than estimated.
Organising focus group discussions (Rent meeting rooms and facilities, snacks, drinks)	1000	952.38	47.62	The expenditure on snacks and drinks for informants was less than estimated.
Organising 1 one-day final workshop (Rent meeting room and facilities, snacks, drinks)	650	349.21	300.79	The expenditure on renting facilities, snacks and drinks was less than estimated.
Renting vehicles travelling in the research sites (cars and motorbikes, petrol)	1000	1,287.30	-287.30	The petrol price in Vietnam suddenly increased by 30% from July 2008.
Accommodation at the research sites.	1300	1,371.43	-71.43	As a consequence of a high inflation in Vietnam in 2008, over 20%, the cost of accommodation was higher than anticipated.
Foods and drinks in the fields for the research team.	1200	1,257.14	-57.14	Similar to accommodation, the high inflation rate in Vietnam in 2008 pushed the food price up higher than anticipated.
TOTAL	5,990	6,020.63	- 30.63	This difference was supplemented by the budget allocation from the Australian National University.

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

From this project I have learned that there needs to be more research on how to involve local governments (at Commune and District levels) in the protected area conservation agendas. At present, the Protected Areas are struggling to conserve the biological resources, especially to counter the negative impacts from local people, while the roles of the local governments in solving such problems have not been clearly defined.

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

Except the project updates sent to Rufford (3 updated reports), there has not been any other materials produced in relation to this project. Therefore, the RSGF logo has not yet been used in any materials. I will acknowledge RSGF support in my thesis and use the RSGF logo in any subsequent publications arising from my doctoral research.

11. Any other comments?

RSGF has provided great support for my PhD study, especially for the data collection activities for which I am very grateful. In the future I will apply for financial funding again from Rufford for other conservation projects.