

FINAL EVALUATION

‘Establishing Sustainable Management at Key Wetlands for Sarus Crane in the Cambodian Lower Mekong’

**Nuy Bora
7/31/2013**

Acknowledgments

The Evaluation Team visited 5 selected target villages out of 23 villages that regular use the floodplain around Along Pring and Boeung Prek Lapouv conservation sites of the respective districts Kompong Trach, Koh Andet and Borey Chulsar of Kampot and Takeo Provinces, during the period from July 16th to 19th 2013. This document was prepared by the Evaluation Team on the basis of the secondary data from WWT, MB, CCK and BL, and primary data collected during mission's work in the field, key informant interviews, with the representatives of MB, CCK, CIRD and WWT.

We wish to extend our sincere thanks to all MB and CCK officers, in particular to Mr. Seng Kim Hout and Mr. Bou Vorsak who greatly facilitated our field and office-based work during the mission.

We wish to acknowledge the valuable inputs of all consulted stakeholders, ranging from households and communities, particularly the representatives from Community Livelihood Development Management Committee, Village Volunteer Committees, Saving Groups, Ecotourism Group, Fishery Communities.

The Evaluation Team:
Mr Nuy Bora and Mrs. Chheung Sreineth

Table of Contents

- Acronyms 3**
- Executive Summary 4**
- A. Introduction 7**
 - 1. Project Overview 7
 - 2. Evaluation Objectives 8
 - 3. Evaluation Methodology 8
- B. Findings 10**
 - 4. Legal Protection and Conservation Planning of the Two Site 10
 - 5. Strengthening Conservation Management of the Two Sites 12
 - 6. Long Term Financing Sustainable Mechanism at the Two Sites 18
 - 7. Project Coordination and Institutional Arrangement 18
 - 7.1. Project Framework and Funding 19
 - 7.2. Partnership with Key Stakeholders 20
- C. Conclusions and Recommendations 21**
 - 8. Conclusions 21
 - 9. Recommendations 21
- D. Glossary of selected terms used 25**
- E. References 26**
- F. List of Annexes 27**

Acronyms and abbreviations used

AP	Anlung Pring Management and Conservation Area for Sarus Crane and Other Birds
BLIIC	BirdLife International in Indochina – Cambodia
BPL	Boeung Prek Lapouv Management and Conservation Area for Sarus Crane and Other Birds
CBETG	Community-based Ecotourism Group
CCK	Chamroen Chiet Khmer
CEPF	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
CFi	Community Fisheries
CI	Confidence Interval
FA	Forestry Administration
FDG	Focus Group Discussion
FiA	Fisheries Administration
Ha	Hectares
HH	Household
IBA	Important Bird Area
LCG	Local Conservation Group
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries
MIST	Management Information System
MP	Management Plan
MEP	Micro-enterprise proposals
NAV	Net Annual Value
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
Sp	Species
UTM	Universal Transverse Mercator
WWT	Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust

Executive Summary

1. This study has been commissioned to evaluate the project “Establishing sustainable management at key wetlands for Sarus Crane in the Cambodian Lower Mekong” that began in October 2010 and ended in June 2013. It assessed if the project has made any difference to the state of the two crane reserves and the lives of local people who use and are dependent upon the two wetlands, BPL and AP. It also assessed if the project changed the way people think about cranes and wetlands. It therefore looked at i) the achievement of the interventions versus the expected results, ii) the outcomes and impacts of the intervention, iii) the relevance of the project intervention, and finally iv) institutional arrangement of the project, in particular the relationship between the four consortium NGOs and the partnership with the FA in the government.
2. The evaluation used a mixture of methods and information sources, including a document review, interviews with consortium members of CEPF’s funded projects including WWT, MB, CIRD and CCK and government staff. Focus group discussion and semi-structured individual interviews with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries were conducted during the field based study at 5 selected villages that mainly use the two wetlands AP and BPL, and covered by CEPF’s funded projects through WWT, MB, CCK and CIRD and ICF project as indicated in Table 1 and explained under the Methodology of the evaluation.

Table 1. Selected Villages and Number of Households use the Crane reserves.

Province	District	Commune	Village Name	# HHs	% HHs use NR	% HH farming	Crane Reserve	NGOs’ project
Kampot	Kg Trach	B.Sala Tbong	Chrees	537	69%	None	Anlung Pring Pring	MB, CIRD, WWT and ICF
		Prek Kreus	Kaoh Tnaot	220	100%	None		
Takeo	Borey Chulsa	Kg Krasang	Sangkum Meanchey	261	82%	29%	Boeung Prek Lapeuv	CCK, WWT
	Koah Andet	Prey Kla	Banteay Slaek	38	100%	100%		
			Banteay Thleay	418	96%	31%		

3. The main findings.

- a. **Legal Protection and Conservation Planning of the Two Sites.** The Prime Ministerial Sub-Decree and map showing boundary as well as the 5 years management plan (MP) of both sites were in place according to plan. The Sub-Decree of each site would be strengthened if it were followed by a Prakas or regulation from MAFF to restrict those activities with negative impacts on the conservation sites. The management plans of both sites were developed with strong participation of all key stakeholders but there remains a need to identify actions to address the issue of Vietnamese people who cross the border to work in shrimp farms or rice fields every dry season.

- b. **Strengthening conservation management actions at BPL and AP.** The peak numbers and usage of the site by Sarus Cranes increased 23% in AP where number of illegal activities declined to zero. At AP, CLDMC involved awareness raising with LCG within 3 years project funding and all households have land tenure compared with BPL, where CCK could involve awareness raising within 1 year project funding and where very few households have land tenure. The habitat for Sarus Cranes surrounding the reserve at AP is at risk of conversion to shrimp farming and rice fields. At BPL, there is a risk of both land encroachment in the buffer zone and conversion of floodplains into rice fields. SHGs organising sustainable agriculture, wildlife-friendly handicraft production and water supply improvement are perceived as promoting sustainable livelihood activities that effectively contribute to the maintenance and improvement of ecosystem services of both sites. However, these activities would be more beneficial if a co-management approach were adopted to promote ownership and commitment of local stakeholders in conservation work. LCGs in both sites had received a range of trainings but because of staff turnover will need to be repeated at regular intervals. They requested refresher training in particular on biodiversity monitoring. Law enforcement patrols were regularly conducted by LCG. Local communities perceived Vietnamese migrants and private land owners to be sometimes acting outside of the law. There was no standardised procedure for handling feedback and complaints of communities; this needs to be rectified in any future project. The community Forums (CF) were well conducted at BPLMCA by LCG and CCK and APMCA by LCG and CLDMC. The prepared questions and answers of CF ensure that the appropriate information is disseminated as well as monitoring the knowledge and awareness of communities. However some questions still need to be clarified and updated as explained in Table 13. The awareness raising at village level by CLDMC and LCG at APLMCA was practical and sustainable considered as assets by the communities.
- c. **Promoting Long term funding mechanism.** Long-term financing mechanisms and 5 year management plans for both sites have been developed but discussions about potential allocation and use of the commune infrastructure planning budgets were not held. This is an opportunity that should be considered in future work.
- d. **Project coordination with other CEPF-funded projects.** The partnership among the four CEPF funded project organizations was well coordinated with clear guidelines and regular bi-monthly PCC meetings. This partnership would be more benefit from the communication approach by joint-decision making process. The frameworks of the 4 CEPF projects were not consolidated into one over-arching framework which might have allowed more effective monitoring and may have led to some constraints in project coordination.

4. The main conclusion and recommendations.

- a) The proposed five year management plan (2014-218) of APMCA and BPLMCA should include activities to ensure that Vietnamese people who cross border to farm (shrimp/ rice f), and collect other wetland produce are integrated into the management activities for the sites. Law enforcement activities undertaken by

LCGs should also take into account the activities of these people as well as local people

- b) The good practice at APMCA that led to the decline number of illegal activities to zero should be developed and replicated.
- c) Co-management approach (as detailed in paragraph 35) should be introduced between implementing partners (MB or CCK) with SHGs (Saving Group, Cow Bank) and other beneficiaries (i.e. shallow well or water tank recipients) to generate their commitment and ownership in the conservation work.
- d) WWT should provide coaching to leaders (Chief/ Vice Chief) of LCG, CLDMC, VVC to enable them conduct bi-annual refresher training to their team members to address the high turnover of their staff member.
- e) WWT, MB and CCK should support LCG and CLDMC or VVC to establish a standard protocol for handling feedback and complaints to encourage communities to participate in law enforcement and other activities at APMCA and BPLMCA.
- f) The prepared questions and answers during the CF should be reviewed and updated to ensure full meaning and sufficient message for interaction with communities as detailed in Table 13.
- g) The good practice in awareness raising on the protection and conservation of wildlife and biodiversity conducted at village level by CLDMC in working with LCG with technical support by MB, or with individual by LCG should be replicated by the different groups in Liaison Panel which is proposed in the next 5 years management plan.
- h) The CBET's infrastructure should be a key focus Commune investment budget plan through consultation meeting and technical support to CC during annual commune investment plan discussions.
- i) The logical frameworks of all implementing partners (WWT, MB, CCK, CIRD), should be consolidated as part of the 5 Years Management Plan and to ensure consistency monitoring and effective coordination.
- j) The bimonthly PCC meeting should be replaced by a quarterly meeting of the Liaison panel at both sites using it as a forum to update on progress, share information and experiences, coordinate activities and take joint decisions.

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Project Overview

5. Establishing sustainable management at key wetlands for Sarus Crane in Boeung Prek Lapouv (BPL) and Anlung Pring (AP) of the Cambodian Lower Mekong, is among the urgent needs to address the global threats to the cranes and other biodiversity. The two sites that are the focus of this project, support significant (over 300 birds, >20% of the regional population collectively) numbers of Sarus Cranes during the dry season. The sites form the Cambodian parts of a small, connected network of trans-boundary sites for the species in the Lower Mekong. However both sites suffer acute human pressure that threatens the cranes and other biodiversity, primarily exploitation of wildlife, agricultural encroachment, agro-chemicals pollution, inappropriate fishing methods, hydrological changes and consequent vegetation changes, use of fire, and invasive alien plants.
6. The project “Establishing sustainable management at key wetlands for Sarus Crane in the Cambodian Lower Mekong” began in October 2010 and ended in June 2013. It was funded by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) and was delivered by Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (WWT) based in the UK who worked in partnership with a consortium of organisations including Chamroen Chiet Khmer (CCK), Mlup Baitong (MB), Cambodian Institute for Research and Rural Development CIRD). The awareness raising, community activities to support protection of the site, livelihood support activities and the support of the establishment of community organisations were delivered by MB at AP for a duration of 33 months and by CCK at BPL for a duration of 12 months. The agricultural improvement and feasibility study of wildlife friendly products to generate income were undertaken by CIRD at AP for period of 12 months. It also worked closely with and built on activities undertaken by BirdLife International – Cambodia Programme, the Forestry Administration, the Department of Wildlife and Biodiversity of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), the Wildlife Conservation Society and the International Crane Foundation (ICF) to develop management and financing solutions that are neutral or beneficial both to local resource users and to biodiversity values of the sites. The consortium members also received separate funding from CEPF to deliver specific and complementary packages of activities for a period of one to three years as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1. CEPF Funded Projects

Consortium of Organisations	Project Duration	Budget in USD	Project Location
CIRD	12 months	x	AP
CCK	12 months: 01 /11/ 2010 - 31/10 2011	19,999	BPL
MB	33 months: 01/10/ 2010 – 30/6/2013	106,341	AP
WWT	33 months: 01/10/ 2010 – 30/6/2013	239,998	AP and BPL

7. The project objective is to fully establish and conserve two protected areas representatives of lower Mekong floodplain wetlands, and contribute to their long term sustainable management, thus securing a priority non-breeding population of Sarus Cranes. To achieve this purpose, the project delivered a programme of four components that embed legal protection and conservation planning, strengthens their conservation management, and promotes financing mechanisms to contribute to their long term sustainable management, as well as coordinating other CEPF-funded projects at the sites as indicated in Table 2.

Table 2. Programme Components

Components	Products / Deliverables
1. Legal protection and embedding conservation planning of BPL and AP.	1.1. Legal protection for AP and strengthened institutional protection for both BPL and AP - sub-decree issued for AP by end 2010 - steering committees representing all stakeholders established end 2010 with meetings held annually - a map showing boundary of AP by end 2010 1.2. Developing and updating management plans for BPL and AP
2. Strengthening conservation management actions at BPL and AP.	2.1. Global biodiversity and other values (food, fuel, water) resulting from management of the sites maintained or improved 2.2. Capacity of site staff to undertake conservation activities increased 2.3. Support for site conservation increased among stakeholders 2.4. Management effectiveness of BPL and AP improved
3. Long-term funding mechanisms promoted.	3.1. Long-term financing mechanisms piloted at the sites 3.2. Mechanisms to promote sustainable financing of the sites advocated with donors and governments
4. Project coordination.	4.1. Projects are delivered in a coordinated way 4.2. Capacity building and support for project partners 4.3. Compliance with CEPF social safeguard policies monitored and semi-annual reports submitted to CEPF 4.4. Raised awareness of site management issues for Sarus Crane conservation

2. Evaluation Objectives

8. As described in the ToR, the overall objective of this evaluation is to assess if the project has made any difference to the state of the two crane reserves and the lives of local people who use and are dependent upon the two wetlands, BPL and AP. It also assessed if the project changed the way people think about cranes and wetlands.
9. The specific objectives of the evaluation are:
- To assess the achievement of the interventions versus the expected results.
 - To assess the outcomes and impacts of the intervention
 - To assess the relevance of the project intervention.
 - The institutional arrangement of the project, in particular the relationship between the four consortium NGOs and the partnership with the FA in the government.

4. Evaluation Methodology

10. The project evaluation is comprised of two elements: (i) desk study of project documents such as project proposal, work plan, logical framework, monthly, field monitoring report, management plan, and other related documents; (ii) participatory approach by interviewing main stakeholders (beneficiaries, and operational partners, at different levels and in different manners, such as focus group discussion, individual interview and key informant interview.
11. Focus group discussion and semi-structured individual interviews with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries were conducted during the field based study at 5 selected villages that mainly use the two wetlands AP and BPL, in three districts of Kompong Trach, Kirivong and Koh Andeth of the respective provinces of Kampot and Takeo. These selected villages were covered by CEPF's funded projects through WWT, MB, CCK and CIRD and ICF project as indicated in Table 1. FGDs, using semi-structured questionnaires for qualitative/ quantitative information with Community Livelihood Development Management Committee (CLDMC), Local Conservation Group (LCG), saving group (SG), Community-based Ecotourism Group (CBETG), Community Fishery and Village Volunteer Committee (VVC). Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), using semi-structured questionnaires for qualitative information were conducted with the head and representatives from MB, CCK, CIRD, WWT, BLI-C and FA with a wider desk review of documentation of WWT, CCK, MB, LCG .

Table 3. Selected target areas, and respondents with data collection method

Stakeholders	Kampot		Takeo		Others		Grand total	
	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women	Total
LCG	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	5
CLDMC	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
CBETG	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
VVC	0	0	3	10	0	0	3	10
Fishery Communities	0	0	8	23	0	0	8	23
Saving Group	7	12	0	0	0	0	7	12
Cattle Bank group	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
Water tank recipient group	0	0	1	14	0	0	1	14
MB	0	1			1	2	1	3
CCK	0	0	2	4	2	4	4	8
CIRD	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
WWT	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
BLI-C	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	7	21	14	56	3	11	24	88

B. Findings

12. In line with the evaluation specific objectives, the findings focus on a program of four components that embed legal protection and conservation planning of the two sites, strengthening their conservation management and promoted long term financing mechanism as well coordinating other CEPF-funded projects at the sites. They firstly examine the achievement of the interventions versus the expected outputs. They then look at the outcomes and the impacts of the interventions in particular on what changes are obtained and how the program affected the state of the two crane reserves as well as the lives and attitudes of local people who use and are dependent upon the two wetlands. They finally look at the project coordination in particular with other CEPF-funded projects at the two sites.

5. Legal Protection and Conservation Planning of the Two Sites

Table 4. Achievement versus expected outputs ‘legal protection and conservation planning’

	Expected Outcomes	Indicators	Achievement
Component 1	1.1. Legal protection for AP and strengthened institutional protection for both BPL and AP	- Sub-decree issued for AP by end 2010	Issued by Jan 2011
		- Steering committees representing all stakeholders established with meetings held annually by end 2010	Bimonthly meeting conducted
		- A map showing boundary of AP by end 2010	Issued by Jan 2011
	1.2. Developing and updating management plans for BPL and AP	- Two management planning (MP) workshops	MP workshops conducted
		- A management plan (MP) for AP and updated management plan for BPL	MPs developed

13. Table 4 summarizes the achievement of the program versus the expected outcomes and outputs indicators of the component 1 ‘Legal Protection and Conservation Planning of the Two Sites’ interventions. The Steering Committees representing all stakeholders was established and regularly held bi-monthly meeting. Its first meeting was holding in April 2011 and its guideline was developed one month later. The Boeung Prek Lapouv (BPL) and Anlung Pring (AP) had legal protection and management plan (MP) for next period (2014-2018).

14. **The Prime Ministerial Decree of both sites might be strengthened if they were followed by a Prakas or MAFF regulations to restrict activities and land use with negative impacts to the conservation sites.** The designation of AP as a “Protected Area for Sarus Crane and other birds” was established by Prime Ministerial Decree (sub decree) in January 2011 covering 217ha. The BPLMCA was established by Prime Ministerial Decree on 15 October 2007, covering the entire 8,305 hectares area (with a core zone of 919 hectares). The CLDMC at AP reported that the former Important Bird Area (IBA) located in the floodplain has now been largely converted to shrimp farm because of the absence of guidelines regulating land use adjacent to AP. This can lead to development which is not compatible with conservation of AP. At BPL, due to lack

of land tenure, local people still claim ownership of unused land in both the buffer and core zones (METTA discussion). The FGD and individual interviews at Sangkum Meanchey village both land encroachment of approximately 200 ha by 90 local households to farm rice in the core zone and the buffer zone of BPL.

15. **The five years management plans for both sites were well developed but would be more beneficial if they clearly defined actions to address the activities of itinerant Vietnamese people.** The management plan (Jan 2014-Dec 2018) of AP was developed and the management plan of BPL was updated at the end of the project (June-July 2013). The FGD and individual interviews indicated representatives from CCK, MB, CIRDC, DoWB and FA/ MAFF, Chair of LCG and community representatives including CLDMC participated in the workshops used to develop the plans. Local CLDMC, SHG and fishery communities expressed serious concerns regarding illegal activities and unsustainable use of both conservation sites from Vietnamese people who crossed the border to farm or collect other wetland produced in particular at the villages surrounding the conservation areas. The MP indicated some management issues related to Vietnamese people leading to illegal land encroachment, unsustainable use of both conservation sites. The FGD with communities and LCGs were reported these Vietnamese groups were out of law. However the MP of both sites was not included specific action plan to address these issues. Table 5 summarizes the intervention approaches and institutional arrangement.

Table 5. Management Plan Project Approach of AP and BPL

Project Approach	AP	BPL
<i>Intervention approaches</i>		
Community-based ecotourism	x	x
Sustainable Agriculture	x	x
Community Fishery		x
Wetland handicrafts	x	
Reserve management or biodiversity and water management	x	x
Floodplain management	x	
Demarcation and land tenure		x
Laws and regulations	x	x
Awareness and capacity building	x	x
<i>Institutional Arrangement</i>		
Implementing management plan: DoWB, FA/ MAFF	x	x
Local administrative and law enforcement groups at provincial, district, commune and village levels, Provincial lines agencies	x	x
International NGO partners: WWT (leading on biodiversity and hydrology management and technical supervision together with BLI-C), fundraising	x	x
Main NGO's partner	MB	CCK
Local communities: CLDMC, CBEG	x	
Local communities: Community fisheries,	x	x
Other partners and independent consultant	x	x

6. Strengthening conservation management actions at BPL and AP.

16. The Table 6 summarizes the achievement of program component 2 ‘Strengthening conservation management’ versus the expected outcomes and outputs indicators. It indicates the followings: the peak numbers and usage of the sites by the Sarus Cranes increased 23% at AP and decreased 18% at BPL.

Table 6. Achievement versus expected outputs ‘Strengthening conservation management’

	Expected Outcomes	Indicators	Achievement
Component 2	2.1. Global biodiversity and other values resulting from management of the sites maintained or improved	- Peak numbers and usage of the site by Sarus Crane increased by 10%	Increased 23% at AP and decreased at 18% at BPL
		- Habitat required for globally threatened bird species maintained at a good quality and increased by 10%.	MCA design is not significantly constraining achievement of objectives, but could be improved.
		- Ecosystem service values to local people maintained improved or replaced by equivalent sustainable livelihood activities.	SHG for livelihood activities (saving group, cattle bank, handicraft), water tanks, open well, CBEG.
	2.2. Capacity of site staff to undertake conservation activities increased	- Local site staff (8 from each site) trained in a range of monitoring and management activities	LCG staff trained but under constraint of high turnover staff.
		- Monthly patrols carried out by LCGs	Regularly carried out
		- Annual reports by LCGs	By Mr. Seng Kimhout
	2.3. Support for site conservation increased among stakeholders	- Increased recognition of the values of the sites and their conservation by 70% of interviewees.	Over 70% by comparing the answers to the question No.6 and 7 during the community forum.
		- Successful coordination of a six-monthly community forum at each site	Six-monthly community forum conducted at BPLMCA during 2011
		- No negative impacts on the values of the site by associated project activities	Shallow wells, hat and matt weaving of associated project activities positively contribute to AP and BPL MCAs.
	2.4. Management effectiveness of BPL and AP improved	- Demonstrated by using Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool	METT conducted (Dec 2010 and Dec 2012)

17. **The peak numbers and usage of the site by Sarus Cranes increased 23% in AP where number of illegal activities declined to zero. At AP, CLDMC involved awareness raising with LCG within 3 years project funding and all households have land tenure compared with BPL, where most households do not have security of tenure.** Table 6 summarizes the peak numbers and usage of the site by Sarus Crane which increased by 23% at AP and decreased 18% at BPL between 2010 and 2013. Table 7 indicates the maximum counts of Sarus Cranes at both conservation sites between 2010 and 2013. It also indicated illegal activities encountered by LCG in both sites. The drop in number of Sarus Crane in 2012 at BPL was reported in METT 2012 due to very severe flooding during the 2011 monsoon and residual high water levels in the early dry season. However the ‘Law Enforcement Summary Report’ from WWT indicated the illegal

activities in AP declined to zero in 2013 compared to BPL where the figure remained at 45% in 2013. At AP, registration of land tenure for the reserve and adjacent land was completed in 2009. The Prime Ministerial Decree together with the land tenure register positively impacted on the conservation site in particular to halt some illegal activities such as land encroachment. LCG at both conservation sites, regularly conducted law enforcement patrols. At AP, with the support from MB, CLDMC could extend awareness-raising activities with LCG during the next project funding period of 3 years. At BPL, local people own their lands but without any land titling certificates, except for Chey Chouk commune where some people have land tenure certificates. The awareness raising activities were undertaken directly by CCK with LCG during the project funding of 1 year. It can also be concluded that the elimination of illegal activities is key factor in the increase of Sarus Cranes complemented by the better hydrological management. In addition, raised awareness and security of land tenure, effectively contributes to the decline of illegal activities.

Table 7. Annual maximum counts of Sarus Cranes and illegal activities encountered per year

Annual comparison	Max. counts Sarus Cranes				Illegal activities encountered			
	BPL Reserve		AP Reserve		BPL Reserve		AP Reserve	
2010	275		277		11		4	
2011 _ 2011/ 2010	304	111%	238	86%	7	64%	1	25%
2012 _ 2012/ 2010	219	80%	329	119%	6	55%	2	50%
2013 _ 2013/2010	225	82%	342	123%	5	45%	0	0%

18. **The habitat for Sarus Cranes at and surrounding AP is at risk of conversion to agricultural land (shrimp farming and rice fields). At BPL, it is at risk of land encroachment in the buffer zone and conversion of floodplains into rice fields.** The APMCA has an area of 217 ha for Sarus Cranes and other birds to feed and roost but lacks a buffer zone. Land tenure registration was completed which helped reduce land encroachment. However, the absence of Prakas or regulation from the mandated MAFF on the land use within the surrounding areas, the former Important Bird Area (IBA) located in a floodplain to the southwest of AP has now been largely converted to shrimp farms. The FGD with ecotourism group at Chres village has reported that many households sold their land to private business in Phnom Penh, Kampot province and Sihanoukville (Kampong Saom province). Shrimp farming is therefore seen to be more likely in the wider floodplain in future as these private businesses then leased their lands to Vietnamese shrimp farmers. As indicated in the APMP, there are concerns that conversion to shrimp farming and other intensive land uses will lead to the ecological degradation of the reserve and remaining semi-natural habitats in the floodplain. This issue was discussed in the Community Forum on several occasions.

At BPL, the key species and habitat conservation site is currently large enough covering an area of 8,305 ha comprising 919 ha of core zone. As described in the BPLMP, there are two main forms of land use in BPL: floodplain wetland (used for collecting a wide variety of natural resources and for biodiversity conservation) and rice cultivation. If it is assumed that areas outside core zone of BPL will have been converted to rice (as suggested by satellite imagery) this represents a decline in wetland area of

approximately 35%. The BPL eco-services system reported 1,853 hectares or around half the total agricultural area is used by other groups, especially by Vietnamese farmers renting land from local people. The FGD with fishery communities and VVC at Sangkum Meanchey reported unsustainable use of the floodplain by Vietnamese farmers such as using pesticide for rice fields, poisoning fish and trapping birds but without any effective response from the LCG.

19. SHGs, sustainable agriculture, wildlife-friendly handicrafts and water supply improvements are perceived as promoting sustainable livelihood activities that will effectively contribute to the maintenance and improvement of ecosystem services of both sites. However, they would be of more benefit if a co-management approach was adopted which would promote “ownership” and commitment of local people to the conservation work. With funding support from CEPF, CCK and MB implemented ‘the community improvement livelihood development projects linked to the protection and conservation of Sarus Cranes and other globally threatened species in BPL and AP’. At AP, MB supported CLDMC to organise 10 SHGs (saving groups) with 121 members in 3 villages closely located near AP. MB, with alternative funding from Asia Resource Collection, provided 35 shallow wells to local households under contract agreement not to disturb Sarus Cranes and its habitat. CIRD through its one year CEPF’s funded project at AP, undertook agricultural improvement and feasibility study of wildlife friendly products to generate income. CIRD provided sustainable agriculture training (including SRI, IPM, composting, chemical pesticides/ fertilizers & impacts, use of natural fertilizer, plot demonstrations of SRI and composting, post harvesting technique) to 98 voluntary farmers (53 women) from 3 villages (Koh Tnoat, Koh Chamkar and Chres villages). CIRD also conducted a ‘rice marketing feasibility study’. The compost and SRI demonstration plots and key farmers in each of the three villages provided key sources of information and practices to enable replication by other households in the village. The community rice forum organized at village level, showed a yield from SRI of about 5 tonnes per hectare, while “normal” rice yielded only 3.7 tonnes. This information will encourage villagers to put SRI techniques into practice. At BPL, CCK supported communities to organize 2 cattle-banks in two villages with total of 57 members including 40 women. The two groups selected 8 beneficiaries to receive 8 cows and 30 beneficiaries to receive water tanks. Each beneficiary agreed to pay 50,000 Riels (for cow recipient beneficiary) and 20,000 Riels (for water tank beneficiary) to SHG’s saving funds. Table 8 summarizes SHGs and water supply system at BPL and AP. The SHGs and water supply improvements were perceived as promoting sustainable livelihood activities and water facilities that effectively contribute to the maintenance and improvement of ecosystem services of both sites. CIRD suggested in the PCC meetings that all trainees should sign agreements not to expand their land into the reserve and to follow all laws and regulations related to the conservation of Anlung Pring. The minute of the CEPF Project Coordination Committee Meeting April 2013, reported ‘all partners urged MB to ensure that people receiving the wells promise in return to protect Anlung Pring and avoid any damage to the wetland and disturbance to the cranes. At BPL, beneficiaries were asked sign agreements that required beneficiaries to support and participate in the conservation of the protected area when receiving plastic water tanks and livestock. This conditionality approach has worked in a limited way, however, in terms of development this approach did not promote value, ownership and sustainability of community participation in the conservation work. The co-management approach would

be more beneficial in establishing a relationship between implementing NGOs and beneficiaries in the conservation work and would be more sustainable in the long-term.

Table 8 summarizes SHGs and water supply system at BPL and AP.

Sites	Cow-banks		Recipients		Saving Group		Saving in USD	Key farmers & Dem. Plots	Handi-craft
	Wo.	Total	Recipients	Well	Water tanks	Wo.			
BPL	40	57	8		30			336	
AP				35		71	121	23,567	6

Table 9. Training received by LCGs of both sites AP and BPL.

Type of training	LCG	CLDMC/ CCK
Using GPS & Mapping (2009)	Received	
Biodiversity survey (2011)	Received	
Soil quality study (2013)	Received	
Law enforcement patrols (2008)	Continuous x	
Impact assessment (2008)	Received	
Bird survey and monitoring (since 2010)	Continuous	
Leadership (2010)		Received
Role and responsibility (2010)		Received
Sarus crane Conservation		Received
Fishing lot boundary		Received
Sub-degree of conservation		Received
Natural resource management and conservation issues		Received
Eco-tourist study visit		Received

20. **LCGs in both sites received a range of trainings but because of high staff turnover this programme needs repeating regularly. They requested refresher training, in particular on biodiversity monitoring.** Focus group discussion and individual interviews were informed that Local Conservation Groups (LCGs) of both sites AP (established in 2004) and BPL (established in 2003) play an important role in education and awareness raising activities, law enforcement patrols, wildlife surveys and monitoring, particularly birds. They were established and financially supported by BirdLife International in Indochina – Cambodia (BLIIC) Programme in collaboration with FA of Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) to work at BPLMCA in 2003 and at APMCA in 2004. Each LCG composes 8 staff from FA, FiA/MAFF, District Police Inspection, District Soldier, Commune Chief and one villager. LCGs in both sites closely work with CLDMC/MB and CCK in education awareness raising at community level and with CLDMC, VVCs (at BPL) in particular in law enforcement patrols. FGD and individual interviews with LCGs were informed that through different trainings received from WWT, BLIIC and in collaboration with NGOs, communities (CLDMC) they were able to conduct education awareness raising through joining with CLDMC at APMCA and with CCK at BPLMCA, law enforcement patrols and bird survey monitoring. They require more refresher trainings in particular on biodiversity monitoring, relevant laws, GPS use, map reading, bird surveys and monitoring because of high turnover of their staff. The FGD with LCGs of both sites informed different training received since 2008, provided by WWT and BLIIC as indicated in Table 9.

21. **Law enforcement patrols were regularly conducted by LCG. Communities perceived Vietnamese migrants and private land owners engage in illegal activities. There was no any standard method established for the LCGs for handling feedback to the communities regarding the outcome of their complaints/concerns.** FGD with LCGs were reported conducting law enforcement patrols 12 times per month at BPL conservation site and 10 to 15 times per month at AP during dry season and 9 times per month during rainy season. The 'Law Enforcement Summary Report' from WWT indicated the number of illegal activities encountered from 2010 to 2013 declined to zero at AP and to 45% at BPL probably as outcomes of law enforcement. FGDs with VVCs and fishery communities in some villages in BPL reported that there was insufficient action taken by LCG on the illegal activities caused by Vietnamese people who migrated across the national border and rented rice fields for cultivation. They also reported that their complaints by phone calls were not responded to by the LCG. To counter this Mr. Seng Vanna LCG Chief for BPLMCA introduced himself as the focal point for dealing with these complaints and provided his phone contact for reporting illegal activities. Whilst a good first step, work remains to be done regarding this matter.
22. **The community Forums (CF) were well-conducted at BPLMCA by LCG and CCK and at AP by LCG and CLDMC. The proformas used at the CF ensured that appropriate information was gathered and disseminated.. However some questions still need to be clarified and updated as explained in Table 13.** CFs were conducted 2 times at each of the 5 target villages located around BPLMCA by CCK in collaborating with LCG and with technical support from WWT on prepared questionnaires and answers as well as monitoring.

Table 10. Community Forum at BPLMCA

Village names	Community Forum (CF)	
	1 st CF	2 nd CF
Sangkum Meanchey	03/2011	08/2011
Dei Leuk	03/2011	08/2011
Banteay Sleuk	04/2011	08/2011
Keo Kampleung	04/2011	08/2011
Banteay Thleay	04/2011	09/ 2011

The CFs provided opportunities for awareness raising on law and biodiversity conservation and to local people to freely express their views to project staff. However, due to the project being only one year in duration, the CFs could only be conducted twice in 2011 in BPLMCA. The prepared questions/ answers still have some gaps that need to be clarified:

- The answer to question No.1 specified illegal activities related to bird hunting methods and was not focused on wildlife in general which includes bird, fish, plants. It can be also translated in another way i.e that birds can be hunted by alternative methods not mentioned in the answer.
- The answer to questions no.3 did not clearly define the contact of the focal person (name, phone number) in the LCG or policemen (to whom reports would be made). There was no question and answer related to service standards for handling feedback and complaints/concerns of villagers. The question referred only to bird hunting and did not consider unsustainable use of the conservation areas.

23. **Different approaches to awareness raising were used and effectively involved stakeholders at all levels. The awareness-raising activities undertaken at village level by CLDMC and LCG at BPLMCA were practical and sustainable.** The different approaches and level of awareness raising employed reached different group of stakeholders. At AP, the awareness raising was conducted at village level, by CLDMC and LCG with technical support by MB and WWT. The capacity of CLDMC was built during the process and is considered an asset for the community to maintain the awareness raising. The awareness raising at provincial, district, commune and school level by CCK and LCG reached different levels of stakeholders but could only be conducted within one year of period funding project. The individual awareness raisings during the law enforcement patrols by LCG were practical and interactive if the key messages were well prepared. Finally the bi-annual Community Forum using prepared questions and answers at village level is an efficient approach to provide opportunity to villagers to interact and seek clarification as described under paragraph 19. They also used this for tracking knowledge of communities related to management of the conservation sites. Other approaches of education awareness raising included sign boards, T-shirts, posters provided concrete information about the conservation sites. However, there was lack of access to information among some communities i.e. FGD in Sangkum Meanchey village reported that the majority of participants were unaware of the sub-decree for BPLMCA even though the sub-decree is available on the signboard displayed during the FGD.

7. Promoting Long term funding mechanisms

Table 11. Achievement versus expected outputs for ‘Long Term Funding Mechanism’

	Expected Outcomes	Indicators	Achievement
Component 3	3.1. Long-term financing mechanisms piloted at the sites.	- A set of ideas for long term financing assessed, a selection proposed and 3 mechanisms piloted.	Various types of fund developed in the proposed sustainable financing mechanism.
	3.2. Mechanisms to promote sustainable financing of the sites advocated with donors and governments.	- Outline projects produced (at least one for each site).	Available in the AP and BPL management plan
		- Potential donors identified and approached.	Available in fundraising technique of the developed sustainable mechanism

24. **Long-term financing mechanism and 5 years management plan of both sites have been developed but commune infrastructure planning budget has not been accessed.** Table 11 summarizes the achievement versus expected outputs on promoting long term funding mechanism. Sustainable financing mechanisms were well developed by WWT. It has investigated and in part put in place various types of funds, both as a sustainable financing tool (endowment funds) and simply as tools to pool and manage financial contributions to the wider conservation initiative. It also highlights various fund raising techniques and sustainable financing mechanisms that include payments for environmental services, fees, taxes and market-based initiatives. At APMCA, one sustainable financial mechanism has been piloted, a community-based ecotourism project (CBEP) by MB. The CBEP can be replicated in BPLMCA. At BPLMCA, a community fishery was partly established and appropriate project activities relating to this were highlighted in the management plan and sustainable financial mechanism.

However the infrastructure budget that used to be available in the commune budget plan was not discussed nor mobilized as part of the sustainable financing mechanism.

8. Project co-ordination

25. Table 12 summarizes project coordination achievements versus expected outputs. Then this section further examines three key elements of partnership among the four CEPF-funded projects including WWT, MB, CCK and CIRD: i) the project framework and funding, ii) the institutional arrangement and iii) communication methods.

Table 12. Achievement versus expected outputs ‘Project Coordination’

	Expected Outcomes	Indicators	Achievement
Component 4	4.1. Projects are delivered in a coordinated way	- Regular NGO steering committee meetings	PCC bimonthly meeting regularly done.
	4.2. Capacity building and support for project partners	- Successful delivery of partner CEPF-funded projects	Partner CEPF-funded NGOs successfully trained
	4.3. Safeguarding process framework followed to ensure no negative impacts on people or the environment	- Quarterly safeguarding process framework review	Safeguarding process framework was quarterly reviewed.
		- No negative impacts on people or the environment	Will investigate in Nov/Dec 2013 damage by Sarus Crane to rice harvest.
	4.4. Raised awareness of site management issues for Sarus Crane conservation	- Raised awareness of the issues related to Sarus	Sub-national level awareness raised (district, commune and village level) through group meetings, individual meetings, community forums, sign-boards, T-shirts

26. **The framework of the four CEPF funded projects was not consolidated into one overall project framework which would have allowed for consistency of monitoring.** This might have led in turn to some constraints in project coordination. The four CEPF-funded projects were respectively implemented by:

- WWT, ‘*Establishing Sustainable Management at Key Wetlands for Sarus Crane in the Cambodian Lower Mekong*’ for a funding period of 33 months. WWT delivered co-ordination of the four projects; directly supported management structures of the other NGOs, carried out out conservation management activities at both sites and built capacity among partners.
- MB ‘*Community Livelihood Development in Support of Sarus Crane Conservation at Kampong Trach, Cambodia*’ for a funding period of 33 months. MB undertook awareness raising, community activities to support protection of the site and livelihood support activities in AP and supported the establishment of community organisations.
- CCK ‘*Community Actions to Improve Livelihoods linked to Protection and Conservation of Sarus Cranes and other globally threatened species in Boeung Prek Lapouv Conservation Area, Cambodia*’ for a funding period of 12 months.

CCK undertook awareness raising, community activities to support protection of the site and livelihood support activities in BPL and supported the establishment of community organisations.

- CIRD undertook support *agricultural improvement activities and undertake a feasibility study* investigating the labelling of wildlife friendly products to generate income to support management of AP for a funding period of 12 months.

27. The four NGOs, WWT, MB, CCK and CIRD separately submitted proposal to CEPF and were directly funded by CEPF. This approach led to efficiency in project implementation. However, the shorter funding period for both CCK and CIRD led to some constraints in project implementation e.g. the illegal activities at BPLMCA remained high since CCK could only undertake awareness raising activities for a limited time (meeting and community forum with LCG). Also, the four CEPF funded projects were not consolidated into one framework for consistency of project monitoring and coordination. Some interventions such as awareness raising and livelihood development activities were indicated in the logframe under the project coordination rather than in conservation management.

28. **The partnership of the four CEPF funded project organizations was well coordinated with clear guidelines and regular bimonthly PCC meetings.** Institutional arrangements for coordinating the four CEPF projects had clear guidelines on the Project Coordination Committee (PCC) Meetings. Co-ordination of the PCC meetings was rotated among consortium members and facilitated by WWT in minute taking. PCC meeting was held on a bi-monthly basis (as indicated in Table 12) and it was a forum for all the four implementing organizations to discuss progress, future work plans and any other business. This system was very effective in establishing a partnership environment especially among members but also community members. However, it would be more benefit to promote the approach of communication at the level of 'join decision. An individual interview with MB officer reported that the proposal for the CBET Centre was not decided in the PCC meeting and was delayed a few months in order to receive final comment from WWT. Another case of shallow well, the PCC minute meeting noted '*other partners urged MB again to try and ensure that people receiving the wells promise in return to protect Anlung Pring and avoid any damage to the wetland and disturbance to the cranes*'. The concept of getting water well users to become involved in the conservation work has been really effective. However the communication approach to urge MB to accept this concept was not based on consensus for making decision together.

C. Conclusions and Recommendations

9. Conclusions

29. WWT's commitment to fully establish sustainable management at the key wetlands for Sarus Crane in AP and BPL conservations in the Cambodian lower Mekong Project are translating well in the great achievement of the four project components through working in partnership with other 3 CEPF funded project organisations (MB, CCK and CIRI) as well as with ICF. The four project components include legal protection and conservation planning, strengthening conservation management actions, promoting long term funding mechanisms and project coordination.
30. Another major achievement has been the strengthening of conservation management at APMCA that led to notable reductions in illegal activities (declining to zero) and increasing the peak numbers and usage of the site by Sarus Crane by 23%. This can be explained by interventions to integrate legal protection and law enforcement, awareness raising, self-help group development, sustainable livelihood and water supply improvement, wildlife friendly handicraft promotion, ecotourism, sustainable agriculture development through working in partnerships with CEPF funded project organisations including MB (for 3 years) , CIRI (for 1 year) and other partners such as ICF. There was highly effective project co-ordination by WWT, through regular bimonthly PCC meetings with excellent minute taking. The project intervention is highly relevant as it was designed at the centre of the urgent needs to address the global treats to the Sarus Cranes and other biodiversity at BPL and AP conservation areas of the Cambodian Lower Mekong. In addition it was well-supported by the Prime Ministerial Decree and other relevant laws of MAFF such as Forestry Law, proclamation of wildlife classification, Fisheries Law.
31. Some of the constraints relate to the improvement and upgrading the level of communication among NGO consortium members and communities to avoid limitation of ownership and commitment in the development works. The consolidation of the frameworks of the four CEPF funded project organisations would have led to more effective coordination in project implementation.

10. Recommendations

32. The followings are recommendations that have been drawn from the above key findings.
33. ***The Prime Ministerial Decrees for both AP and BPL should be followed by Prakas from the mandated MAFF to establish the Management and Conservation Area for Sarus Crane and Other Birds.*** Following the Sub-Decree, the MAFF has legal mandate to manage BPL and AP in collaboration with other concerned ministries and local authorities to ensure the sustainable development of natural resources for local livelihoods in this area. BL and WWT should support MAFF to have Prakas establishing

the Management and Conservation areas for Sarus Crane and other birds to restrict activities with negative impacts to the conservation sites.

34. ***The proposed five year management plan (2014-2118) of APMCA and BPLMCA should include activities to ensure Vietnamese people who cross border to farm (shrimp/ rice field), and collect other wetland produce are involved in the conservation work as well as law enforcement.*** Implementing partners (MB, CCK) should first conduct a PRA to identify the issues and potential solutions related to the Vietnamese people and the activities they undertake. FA/WWT should provide technical support to Commune Chief and District Governor on legal advice and action taken to address with these Vietnamese groups as well as land owners leasing land to Vietnamese groups in order to prevent and address all illegal activities that negatively impact on the conservation sites. Legal and technical support should be extended to implementing partners (MB and CCK) to allow them organise and involve these Vietnamese groups in conservation work and law enforcement.
35. ***The good practice at APMCA that led to the decline in illegal activities should be developed and replicated.*** WWT-MB should support LCG and CLDMC at AP, to develop the good practices that resulted in declining illegal activities and increase of Sarus Crane by 23%. These good practices should be considered as the outcomes of the awareness raising by CLDMC and LCG, the law enforcement patrols by LCG, the project duration of 3 years and the advantage of having land tenures of families living in the areas surrounding AP. These good practices should be extended at APMCA and replicated at BPLMCA for the next 5 years MP.
36. ***The co-management approach should be introduced between implementing partners (MB or CCK) with SHGs (Saving Group, Cow Bank) and other beneficiaries (i.e. water well or water tank recipients) to generate their commitment to and ownership of the conservation work.*** The concept of co-management approach refers to establishing a relationship between NGO implementing partners (CCK, MB, CIRD) and beneficiaries. The NGO Consortium member (MB, CCK, CIRD) assumes the commitment to provide to the SHG or beneficiaries in the program financial aid as i.e. to top-up the saving group, capacity building to saving group leaders, providing water tanksetc. In conjunction with this, there will develop a commitment to protect the sites. These co-responsibilities are based on the understanding, value and ownership of the beneficiaries in taking their responsibilities for conservation work seriously. As this commitment develops, the contract agreement between NGO and beneficiary should be replaced by a co-responsibilities agreement. ***WWT should provide coaching to leaders (Chief/ Vice Chief) of LCG, CLDMC, VVC to enable them conduct bi-annual refresher trainings to their team members to address the high staff turnover .***
- ***WWT, MB and CCK should establish common standards for handling feedback and complaints to encourage communities to participate in law enforcement at APMCA and BPLMCA. LCGs should then be trained in implementing these standards.***
 - For communities: MB and CCK should provide coaching on how register a complaint or give feedback to LCG by phone call and to complete the appropriate forms which will then be kept at CLDMC or VVC. The coaching should also include what information is required for effective complaint and feedback.

- For LCG: WWT/LCG to nominate two focal persons for communities to send complaints or feedback to. The two focal persons should not be LCG Chief or Commune Chief who can be very busy with other tasks, but could be Vice Chief or LCG member who has sufficient time to receive complaints or feedbacks from villagers and then to submit them to LCG Chief for taking action including issuing a response to the community member. The handling of complaints or feedback should be reported back to communities through CLDMC or VVC by phone call and a summary of actions taken provided to the monthly community meeting or commune meeting and community forum.
- For CLDMC or VVC: MB and CCK should support CLDMC or VVC to play as bridging role in the interaction between communities and LCG. CLDMC or VVC should provide phone numbers of the focal persons to the communities.

37. **Prepared questions and answers used during the CF should be reviewed regularly and updated as required to ensure communities are able to fully participate in the meeting.** WWT together with representatives from LCGs, MB, CCK, CIRDC should have a meeting to review and update the questions and answers for the CF or other community awareness raising. Table 13 summary some examples of questions and answers which need to be reviewed and updated.

Table 13. Summary of example questions and answers to be reviewed and updated

Existing prepared questions and answers	Suggested questions and answers
<p>Question 1: What activities are not allowed by law when hunting wildlife? Answer 1: (Poisoning, using fishing nets and microphone with recorded bird songs to trap wild birds), using spotlights, poaching and collecting bird's eggs and chicks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should start from definition of wildlife, kind of wildlife to be protected at conservation areas, and why it needs to be protected. - Should clearly ask the question 'What are the illegal activities related to protection of wildlife? Should clearly answer 'hunting, disturbing protected birdlife and unsustainable use of biodiversity...
<p>Question 3: To prevent birds from being hunted what can we do? Answer 3: (Reporting to commune chiefs, policemen and LCG), arresting offenders, telling relatives not get involved in hunting wildlife.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standard of handling complaints or feedback of the communities under paragraph 33

38. **The good practice in awareness raising on the protection and conservation of wildlife and biodiversity conducted at village level by CLDMC in working with LCG with technical support by MB, or by LCG member should be replicated by the different groups in Liaison Panel proposed in the next 5 years management plan.**

- At AP: MB should continue support to CLDMC in conducting awareness raising at village level with LCG to CBETG, Sustainable Farming Group (SFG), SHG during the monthly awareness raising or the Panel Forum.

- At BPL: CCK should provide support to VVC in conducting awareness raising at village level with LCG to CBETG, SFG, Community Fishery, SHG during the monthly awareness raising or the Panel Forum.
39. ***The CBET initiative should be included as an expenditure priority in Commune investment budget plans.*** WWT, MB and CCK should consult and assist the Commune Councils at the five target communes (Sala Khang Tbong, Prek Kreuz, Kg Krasang, Prey Kla, and Romearn), to allocate some of their infrastructure budget to support and develop the CBET and integrate this into their annual investment plan.
 40. **The logical frameworks of all implementing partners (WWT, MB, CCK, CIRD), should be included in site management plans to ensure consistency of monitoring and effective coordination.**
 41. **The bi-monthly PCC meeting should be maintained as a forum to update on progress, share information and experiences, coordinate activities and make decisions together.** WWT, BLIIC, MB, CCK, CIRD should review and update the guidelines of PCC meeting to optimise participation in this joint-decision making process.

D. Glossary of Selected Terms Used

Sustainable Agriculture – trial sustainable rice farming techniques (and other crops) that minimise the impact of agriculture on the natural environment and wetland values. This will be combined with a focussed awareness raising programme on environmental & health issues related to the application of agricultural chemicals and wetland management in general

Community fisheries – develop the newly-established community fisheries and build capacity in sustainable natural resource management

Community-based ecotourism – establish community-based ecotourism as a means to provide further benefit to local communities from the conservation site and a potential source of sustainable financing for conservation efforts

Biodiversity and water management – trial water management and various habitat management measures, monitor trends of selected variables (*e.g.* water quality, water levels, extent of wetlands) as well as conservation features (*e.g.* cranes and other biodiversity)

Demarcation and land tenure – demarcate areas of the reserve that are not currently clearly marked and communicate this to local communities to help them better understand how, where and if regulations apply. Clarify land tenure so that local people feel more able to participate in delivering sustainable management of the wetland

Laws and regulations – clarifying existing regulations and assessing the need for new or amended regulatory tools to help in managing BPL, maintaining a law enforcement team in the form of the existing Local Conservation Group, and conducting daily patrols and prevent illegal activities.

Awareness and capacity building – key to achieving the aims and objectives of this plan will be the participation of wetland users and all other stakeholders in decision-making and management of the reserve. For this to be possible, a targeted programme of training and learning will be designed for each of the projects outlined above and delivered focusing on the key theme of sustainable natural resource management.

E. References

Pich Buna, Iem Mayonri, Chan Ratna, Chun Sony, Department of Fishery Lot Development of Fishery Administration, BPL PRA Report, March 2013

Ecosystem Services, WWT, August 2012

Leng Chanthy, Leav Phalen, Nhem Khemara, Leav Makara, Socio-economic Analysis at Boeng Sala Khang Tboung commune, Kampong Trach district, Kampot province, August 2007.

Hem Sakhan, CEPF Small Grant Final Project Completion Report, CCK 21 November 2011.

Memorandum of Understanding between the Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust, Mlup Baitong, Chamroien Chiet Khmer, BirdLife International in Indochina- Cambodia Program and Cambodian Institute for Research and Rural Development, 19 May 2010.

Prime Ministerial Decree (sub decree) On Establishment of Anlung Pring Management and Conservation Area for Sarus Crane and Other Birds located in Kampong Trach District, Kampot Province, Royal Government of Cambodia 06 January 2011.

'World Bank/WWF (2007) Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool' Anlung Pring Management and Conservation Area for Sarus Crane and Other Birds in Kampong Trach District, Kampot Province.

'World Bank/WWF (2007) Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool' Anlung Pring Management and Conservation Area for Sarus Crane and Other Birds in Kampong Trach District, Kampot Province

Robert van Zalinge, Andy Graham, Ses Vong Sambat, Um Sokun, Seng Kim Hout, Pal Holly 'A rapid assessment of the value of natural resources collected from the Anlung Pring Sarus Crane Reserve and surrounding floodplain by local communities' WWT, 02 June 2013.

Robert van Zalinge, Andy Graham, Ses Vong Sambat, Um Sokun, Seng Kim Hout, Pal Holly 'A rapid assessment of food- and fuel- based ecosystem service values derived from the Boeung Prek Lapouv Sarus Crane Reserve by local communities' WWT, Feb 2012.

Seng Vanna, Uong Seth, and Seng Kim Hout, 'Monthly Report on the Project Activities Implemented at BPLMCA in Takeo Province and APMCA in Kampot Province, LCG - FA/MAFF-WWT

Seng Kim Huot, 2012 Annual Report on the Project Activities Implemented at APMCA in Kampot and BPLMCA in Takeo Provinces, FA/MAFF-WWT

Seng Kim Huot, Summary Results in Graph at BPL and AP, FA/MAFF-WWT, July 2013

Field trip: Working on the ecosystem service assessment at APSCR with CCK staff

F. Annexes

ANNEX 1. TOR OF THE EVALUATION

Introduction

The project “Establishing sustainable management at key wetlands for Sarus Crane in the Cambodian Lower Mekong” began in 2010 and will end June 2013. It was funded by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) and was delivered by a consortium of organisations (see below) and led by Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust based in the UK. The project funded the employment of a project team based in Phnom Penh (a National Project Manager and a Technical Adviser) and its line management from the UK. Consortium members also received separate funding from CEPF to deliver specific packages of activities within the whole project.

Key question:

Have we made any difference to the state of the two crane reserves and the lives of local people who use and are dependent upon the two wetlands, Boeung Prek Lapouv (BPL) and Anlung Pring (AP)? Has the project changed the way people think about cranes and wetlands?

The following questions will help us to understand more:

- Baseline: what was the situation before the project started?
- What were our interventions during the project?
- What are the outputs? i.e. the tangible things that took place as a result of our interventions
- What are the outcomes? i.e. The changes during the project period that have been fully delivered - this could be “concrete” things like numbers of information panels installed etc but also includes new knowledge, skills gained by project partners and other stakeholders
- What is the impact? i.e. the longer-term changes that will be sustained as a result of the project

We would like to evaluate the relationship between the four NGOs and how effective they have been at working together:

- Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (WWT) – project co-ordinators and technical advisers based in UK
- Chamroen Chiet Khmer (CCK) – working at BPL
- Mlup Baitong (MB) – working at AP
- Cambodian Institute for Research and Rural Development (CIRD) working at Anlung Pring

We also want to consider how the project has worked with Forest Administration in the Government which is the legal management body.

Conclusions and recommendations for future projects

- Are we doing what we said we’d do?
- Are we making any difference?
- Are we doing the right things?
- How do we know?

- Do we need to change anything?

Timetable

- The evaluation must be completed and report submitted to WWT by 31st July 2013

Payment

- To be agreed

ANNEX 2. EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Schedule	Location	Objectives	Person responsible
Sat 13th – Sun 14th July	Consultant Office based	Desk review and prepare evaluation tools	Evaluation Tream: Bora & Srey Neth
Mon 15th July, 4pm - 6 pm	Via Skype and email	Preliminary meeting to approve Evaluation Tools and confirm the appointments for field visits	- WWT: Andy Graham, Head of WWT and Robert van Zalinge (Technical Adviser) - CCT, MB, CIRD. - Evaluation Team: Bora
6pm – 9pm	Consultant Office based	Finalize tools for field visit	- Evaluation Team: Bora,
Tue 16th July 6am	Departure to Kampot	Stay at Kg Trach guest house	Evaluation team: Bora Srey Neth
9am - 10.30am	Mlup Baitong Office	Introduction Project Briefing and Finalize schedule	MB Project management team Evaluation team: Bora & Srey Neth
10.45am - 12am	CIRD Office	Introduction Project Briefing, clarification and Finalizing schedule	CIRD Project management team Evaluation team: Bora & Srey Neth
1.30pm – 5.30pm	Kaoh Chamkaar Village Boeung Sala Khang Tboung Commune/ Kampong Trach district, Kampot province	- FGD,; o SHGs (1.30-2.15pm) o LCGs (2.15-3pm) - Direct Observation and Individual interview (3-5.30pm)	- MB Staff, Evaluation team: Bora & Srey Neth - SHGs (15 rep.) - LCGs (15 rep.)
Wed 17th July 8-11.30am	Kaoh Tnaot Village Prek Kreuz Commune/ Kampong Trach district, Kampot province	- FGD,; o SHGs (8-8.45am) o LCGs (8.45-9.30am) - Direct Observation and Individual interview (9.30-12pm)	- MB Staff, Evaluation team: Bora - SHGs (15 rep.) - LCGs (15 rep.)

Schedule	Location	Objectives	Person responsible
8-11.30am	Preah Trohueng Village Prek Kreuz Commune/ Kampong Trach district, Kampot province	- FGD,; ○ SHGs (1.30-2.15pm) ○ LCGs (2.15-3pm) - Direct Observation and Individual interview (3- 5.30pm)	- MB Staff, Evaluation team: Srey Neth - SHGs (15 rep.) - LCGs (15 rep.)
12.30 – 3 pm	Departure to Takeo	Stay at Koah Andet	Evaluation team: Srey Neth
2 – 3.30 pm	Kampot Provincial FA, WBD/ MAFF	- FGD/ Individual interview	- MB Staff, Evaluation team: Bora - Provincial FA, WBD Team
3.30 – 5.30pm	CCK Office in Koh Andet	Introduction Project Briefing and Finalize schedule	CCK Project management team Evaluation team: Srey Neth
4pm	Departure to Takeo	- Stay at Koah Andet	Bora
Wed 18th July 8-12am	... Village, Kg Krasang Commune/ Borey Chulsar district, Takeo province	- FGD,; ○ SHGs (8-8.45am) ○ LCGs (8.45-9.30am) - Direct Observation and Individual interview (9.30-12pm)	- CCK Staff, Evaluation team: Srey Neth - SHGs (15 rep.) - LCGs (15 rep.)
8-12am	... Village, Chey Chouk Commune/ Borey Chulsar district, Takeo province	- FGD,; ○ SHGs (1.30- 2.15pm) ○ LCGs (2.15-3pm) - Direct Observation and Individual interview (3- 5.30pm)	- CCK Staff, Evaluation team: Bora - SHGs (15 rep.) - LCGs (15 rep.)
2 – 3.30pm	Takeo Provincial FA, WBD/ MAFF	- FGD/ Individual interview	- MB Staff, Evaluation team: Bora - Provincial FA, WBD Team
1.30 – 5.30pm	... Village Prey Kla Commune/ Koah Andet district, Takeo province	- FGD,; ○ SHGs (8-8.45am) ○ LCGs (8.45-9.30am) - Direct Observation and Individual interview (9.30-12pm)	- CCK Staff, Evaluation team: Srey Neth - SHGs (15 rep.) - LCGs (15 rep.)
Thu 19th July	Return to PNH		Bora – Srey Neth
Mon 22th – Tue 23rd July	At individual offices	Key informant interview with Andy, Seng Kim Hout, Bou Vorsak, Dir of MB, CCK, CIRD, DFA-DWB/MAFF	- MB Staff, Evaluation team: Bora
Abbreviation: DFA (Department of Forestry Administration); DWB (Department of Wildlife and Biodiversity); SHGs (Self Help Groups);			

ANNEX 3. EVALUATION TOOLS

Date...../July 2013

Local Conservation Groups (LCGs) atConservation Site

a. Date of Establishment (Month/ Year.....and Composition of LCGs

S.No	Name	Position in the Government/ communities	Position in the LCG	Starting date in LCG
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				

b. Sites and households (HH) covered by LCGs

District	Commune	Village	Total HH	% HH collecting wild good

c. Capacity Development and training Received

	Purpose	Provided by	# days	When
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				

d. Roles and Responsibilities

	Roles	Yes/ No	If Yes, please explain
1	Education and awareness raising (indicators 2.1 and 2.3)		1.1. Who are in charge in awareness raising from the LCG ?..... 1.2. How many times/ month?..... 1.3. How many participants/ time?..... 1.4. Where? Village level..... Commune lev....District lev.... 1.5. Key messages..... 1.6. How to assess level of awareness on the recognition the value of the sites and the conservation of the communities? 1.7. Is Sub-Decree for protection the site included?..... 1.8. Do SHGs have Sub-Decree and map for the site?..... 1.9. Is necessary for SHGs to have Sub-Decree? Yes/ No Why..... 1.10. Lesson learned 1.11. New approach for improvement.....
2	Law enforcement patrols (indicators 2.2)		2.1. Who is involved in the patrols?..... 2.2. How many patrols/ month?..... 2.3. How many illegal activities arrested/ year?..... 2.4. What kind of illegal activities?.....

			<p>2.5. How to address illegal cases?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>2.6. Is it necessary for communities or SHGs to collaborate ? Yes/ No. Why?.....</p> <p>2.7. What kind of collaboration?.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>2.8. Lesson learned</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>2.9. New approach for improvement.....</p> <p>.....</p>
3	Bird survey and monitoring (indicators 2.1)		<p>3.1. Who involve?.....</p> <p>3.2. How many times/ year?.....</p> <p>3.3. Do you have sufficient skills on this monitoring?</p> <p>3.4. If yes, how to get them involve?.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>3.1. Lesson learned</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>3.2. New approach for improvement.....</p> <p>.....</p>
4	Others (Indicators 2.1)		<p>4.1. Are you involved in developing and updating management plan (MP)? Yes/ No If yes, how?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>4.2. Are you involve in the Community Forum? How useful?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>4.3. Are you involve in the Steering Committee? How useful?</p> <p>.....</p>
5	Networking with MB,		
	CCK		
	CIRD		
	SHGs		

e. Requirement and suggestions, if any.

f. Additional question suggestion – can the LCG benefit from additional members from the local community?

g.

.....

Date...../July 2013

SHG at the **Conservation Site:**

Villages:	Commune:
District:	Province:
Participants: Male Female	Total

h. Community Steering Committee (CSC) ofSite

	Name	Position in the Govt	Position in CSC	Starting date	Village/ commune
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					

i. SHGs in the communities

	Number and Type of LLH	HH members/ group	Village Name	Commune Name	Starting date
1Saving Groups				
2					
3					

4					
5					
6					
7					

j. SHG, organisation

	Type of SHG	Composition	Guideline	Action Plan
1	Saving Group			
2	Ecotourism Group			
3	Guide Group			
	Other sustainable livelihood option?			
4				
5				

Challenges:

Requirement:

k. Conditionality compliance

	Conditionality	Support to Conditionality
Saving group		
Ecotourism		
Guidegroup		

Challenges:

Requirement:

l. Capacity Development and Training Received

	Purpose	Provided by	# days	When
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				

m. Law enforcement

1. Are you aware Sub-Decree and map for KT? Y/ N if Y please explain, how, when and what are the main key message?

.....

Do you have Sub-Decree and map for KT? Y/ N if Y please explain how useful it is?

.....

2. Did you involve in developing management plan for KT? Y/ N if Y please explain, how, when and what are the main activities?

.....

n. Site management

3. Are you aware on how to maintain good quality habitat for KT? Y/ N if Y please explain, how and what are the main key activities? Who are responsible?

.....

4. Do you know LCGs for KT? Y/ N if Y please explain, what are their main roles and key activities? Do you think that you should collaborate with this group? Why? How? What?

.....
.....
.....
.....

5. Have you participated in community Forum? Y / N. If Yes, please explain: When the forum begin? How many forum per year (2011, 2012, 2013)? How important it is?

2011.....
2012.....
2013.....
Advantage.....
Challenge.....
How to maintain?.....

o. Requirement and suggestions, if any.

.....
.....
.....

