

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

| | |
|--|---|
| Organization Legal Name: | World Wide Fund for Nature |
| Project Title: | Planning and partnership development for conserving freshwater biodiversity and resources along the central section of the Mekong River in Cambodia |
| Date of Report: | 02 March 2010 |
| Report Author and Contact Information | Mr. Gordon Congdon, WWF Cambodia, Freshwater Conservation Manager. Mobile (Gordon): +855-017-558-262 |

CEPF Region: Indo-Burma, CEPF Priority Corridor: “Mekong River and Major Tributaries”. CEPF Priority Site: “Mekong from Kratie to Lao P.D.R”.

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 2: Develop innovative, locally led approaches to sitebased conservation at 28 key biodiversity areas. Sub-direction 2.1 is particularly relevant: “Establish innovative stakeholder-based conservation management and caretaking initiatives at 28 key biodiversity areas.”

Grant Amount: \$4376.25

Project Dates: 11 December 2009 – 11 February 2010

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner): World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Cambodian Rural Development Team (CRDT), and Community Economic Development (CED) are NGOs with offices in Kratie, Cambodia, a small city along the Mekong River. All three organizations had previously submitted LOIs for CEPF funding to implement conservation and sustainable development activities in the Central Section of the Mekong River, one of the priority sites identified in the CEPF Indo-Burma ecosystem profile. CEPF reviewers asked that the three organizations better coordinate their proposed activities and revise their LOIs to clarify how their activities would be coordinated. WWF, CRDT, and CED have met several times over the last three months to discuss and coordinate the revision of the LOIs and the proposed project activities.

WWF was the recipient of a small grant from CEPF to help facilitate the revision of the LOIs. WWF, CRDT, and CED will all receive a portion of the grant funds to pay for staff time and other costs associated with the revision of the LOIs.

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile. This was a small planning grant that will help implement critical management activities in one of 28 priority sites in the CEPF Indo-Burma strategic profile. Specifically it is in CEPF Priority Corridor: “Mekong River and Major Tributaries”. CEPF Priority Site: “Mekong from Kratie to Lao P.D.R”. This is a large and complicated proposal in which WWF, CRDT, and CED plan to work together to implement conservation and sustainable development activities in the Central Section of the Mekong River. This purpose of this grant was to help the three organizations improve and better coordinate their LOIs and planned activities for the project area.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project against the expected results detailed in the approved proposal.

The grant has enabled WWF, CRDT, and CED to revise their LOIs in a coordinated fashion and to better plan for proposed activities in the project area.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: These activities will come in the future.

Species Conserved:

Corridors Created:

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.

The project has achieved its short term objective of giving WWF, CRDT, and CED the chance to revise and coordinate their LOIs.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)? None to date.

Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.

This project is still in the planning stage, but it is clear that WWF, CRDT, and CED should have spent more time coordinating their LOIs from the very beginning. It has been a very useful exercise to work together to revise and coordinate the LOIs, but it would have been even better if we had done more of this a year ago.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

WWF, CRDT, and CED have each submitted, large, complicated proposals that require a lot of staff time and expertise. Each organization also has many other projects underway, The CEPF review process is also complicated and time consuming. The net result is that this already complicated project became even more complicated. Staff members who worked on the project have now gone and new staff have had to become familiar with the project. These delays have been shortcomings. The lesson learned is that all the organizations involved need to make sure they have adequate time and resources to prepare and review LOIs in a timely manner.

Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

Despite the challenges and delays discussed in the previous section, all the entities involved, including CEPF, have remained committed to the project. I think each organization recognizes the importance of this site for biodiversity conservation and therefore everyone has remained committed to the development of a workable project. That is the kind of commitment that is needed to accomplish conservation in Cambodia, where conservation success does not come easily.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

If a great conservation opportunity arises, the conservation community must learn how to act quickly to take advantage of that opportunity.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

| Donor | Type of Funding* | Amount | Notes |
|-------|------------------|--------|-------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

**Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:*

- A Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- C Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Sustainability/Replicability

Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets

(Enter Grant Term)

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

| Project Results | Is this question relevant? | If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period. | Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date. | Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary) |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved. | | | | Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one. |
| 2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement? | | | | Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one. |
| 3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares. | | | | |
| 4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares. | | | | |
| 5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below. | | | | |

If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

None of the questions in the Addendum were relevant because this small grant was for planning purposes only. We have not yet been able to implement any of the proposed actions.

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Gordon Congdon

Organization name: World Wide Fund for Nature - Cambodia

Mailing address: #54, Street 352, Sangkat Beoung, Keng Kang I, Khan Chamkarmorn, P.O. Box 2467, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Tel: +855 017 558 262

Fax:

E-mail: Gordon.Congdon@wwfgreatermekong.org