



CEPF Final Project Completion Report

Instructions to grantees: please complete all fields, and respond to all questions listed below.

Organization Legal Name	<i>Conservation International</i>
Project Title	Giant Softshell Turtle Protection in Kratie Region, Cambodia
Grant or GEM Number	64077
Date of Report	7 August 2017

CEPF Hotspot: Indo Burma

Strategic Direction:

Grant Amount: \$119,843.00

Project Dates: May 1 2014- April 30 2017

PART I: Overview

1. Implementation Partners for this Project (*list each partner and explain how they were involved in the project*)

Fisheries Administration – undertook community education sessions about Cambodian Fisheries Law, and provided law enforcement back-up to community patrollers who reported illegal activities.

Local community patrollers – recruited into the project to patrol nesting sites, record and safeguard new hatchlings, and ensure safe release into the Mekong.

Turtle Survival Alliance (TSA) – TSA and a range of other turtle experts globally (from Wildlife Conservation Society, and Global Wildlife Conservation and others) were brought into the project to provide technical advice, which they did in good faith. Our technical partners advised on turtle care, center design, and financial opportunities, and TSA provided a travel grant for our Project Manager to attend their conference in the US in 2016.

2. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

Overall we succeeded in achieving the following:

- educating children in 12 local schools about the importance of conservation and the plight of endangered species, in particular *Pelochelys Cantorii*
- Raising awareness amongst estimated 535 adult fishers of their rights and responsibilities under the Cambodian Fisheries Law.
- Protecting 154 turtle nests and ensuring safe hatching of 2750 turtles
- Completing thorough analysis of the tourism prospects for the project
- Negotiating the successful transition of the project to a partner NGO which will ensure a sustained conservation effort for the species long term.

3. Briefly describe actual progress towards each planned long-term and short-term impact (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each long-term impact from Grant Writer proposal

a. Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
<p>Increases in the <i>Pelochelys cantorii</i> population will be sustained over a 5-10 year period and beyond as a result of project activities;</p>	<p>Only longer term monitoring will be able to determine the success of this impact. However for the duration of the project, turtle nest numbers remained reasonably steady, despite a couple of setbacks (one being the need to change to a more cost effective patrolling method, which reduced the number of people protecting nests, and the second being a very hot 2015/16 nesting season which resulted in many nest failures). This achievement in the circumstances described above indicates potential for a positive trend for the number of nests and possibilities for increases in the coming 5-10 years assuming level of effort is maintained.</p>
<p>• The community incentives program will serve as an effective model for other conservation organizations to replicate for species conservation, one that minimizes threats from over exploitation and illegal harvesting;</p>	<p>The community incentives model was quite successful, however was not able to achieve donor-independence as we had hoped through securing a income from tourism. By employing community rangers we achieved our goal of providing a level of protection for the nests, however not as high as that afforded by the model of paying all community members for nest protection. The latter, however was not financially sustainable.</p> <p>What has been of long term value from the incentives scheme however has been the community awareness raised. A study commissioned by the project found that even after community members ceased involvement in the incentive program, 83% were inclined to stop or</p>

	reduce their egg harvesting habits. These results suggest that the scheme might have induced some kind of ‘crowding-in’, the surest form of protection that the project could have provided the turtles.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pilot program and interventions that began in 2009 (including nest discovery/protection, head starting, Mekong Turtle Conservation Center or MTCC visitation and tourism), will be transformed into a long term, self-sustained conservation program for conservation of <i>P. cantorii</i>; 	The goal of self- sustainability was elusive for the project. However the nest discovery and protection work undertaken by the project was strong and successful, and demonstrated sufficient result to attract a range of international technical and financial supporters, and to encourage WCS to take custodianship of the project in 2017. The other parts of the project (MTCC, headstarting, tourism) were annexed because they were proving unviable. It was a significant achievement of its own to accumulate the data and advice to develop these understandings and confidently make the decisions required to make the conservation program more focused, efficient and streamlined for the future.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MTCC fully functioning and operating NGO with sustained financing and limited CI assistance; 	CI withdrew entirely from the MTCC on account of advice that it served no technical conservation purpose, and had very limited prospects for raising the conservation finance required through tourism. However it continues to operate independently, without <i>Pelochelys Cantorii</i> , and still strives to educate the public and tourists about turtle conservation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The MTCC and Mekong Turtle Conservation Program (MTCP) will raise local and national awareness about the importance of turtles and stimulate interest by media, communities, and government officials nation-wide and internationally 	The project did this well. The project was well visited by local tourists in particular, and was frequently featured on national television. Internationally the project was featured in a number of blogs, and we have records of 10 media exposures over the project life. We also maintained the MTCC website as a public face for the project.

b. Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of <i>Pelochelys cantorii</i> hatchlings and nests protected will double in comparison to 2009 numbers totaling 4,000 hatchlings and 200 nests; 	This impact was not achieved, and is largely attributable to the reasons outlined under the first long term impact (reduction in protection payments to the community and at least one poor nesting season). About 50 nests were protected for each year of the project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An effective incentives program will be piloted with new ideas on how to influence behaviors in the longer-term, and will also provide reduced costs compared to current payment program; 	A research project was conducted into this, which considered two major changes that CI made to the incentives scheme in the first half of the project – firstly limiting payments only to the proof of

	<p>healthy hatchlings (as opposed to paying for nest ID, nest protection and then hatchlings), and secondly reducing the payment in half due to budgetary restraints. In the second half of the project CI opted for the incentive scheme that was most financially viable (paying dedicated rangers rather than compensating all community members who protected nests), but the report produced as part of the project contains advice which could be used for a redesign of the system as and when budget allows. This report has been handed to WCS to consider.</p>
<p>• MTCC visitation will double in comparison with 2010 numbers, and other aspects of tourism development will be enhanced through collaborative work with partners World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and Cambodian Rural Development Tourism (CRDT);</p>	<p>MTCC visitation numbers rose from 3000 to 4000 over the life of the project (2014 – 2017). The report author does not have the 2010 figures available, but it seems likely that, per this trend, the figure did double from the 2010 number. Tourism development was discontinued as a result of firstly the findings of a tourism feasibility consultancy that was carried at the site under a separate CEPF grant – and also because of the development of competitors in the region which would have made financial success difficult for the MTCC.</p>
<p>• CI will establish the MTCC as a local NGO, and help set it up to be: 1) financially sustainable; 2) effectively manage visitor-related activities; 3) administer the head starting and nest protection program and all aspects of the MTCP; 4) with CI playing only an advisory role for turtles and other species conservation.</p>	<p>Thinking regarding the MTCC went through several phases during the life of the project, and upon advice that a) headstarting was not a useful or financially efficient conservation strategy (comparative to nest protection) and b) the MTCC was unlikely to provide a viable base for tourism development, the decision was made to discontinue involvement in the MTCC. The manager of the facility who had been contracted by CI expressed a wish to continue operating the center independently, and CI facilitated the arrangements to make this possible, on the understanding that the center would no longer house <i>pelochelys cantorii</i>.</p>

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

There were significant challenges with this project:

- Discovering health problems in the headstarted turtles which could not be rectified adequately without modifications to the MTCC which CI did not have the resources to undertake
- Monitoring the population of wild turtles – a methodology that was humane, affordable and practical was not able to be discovered.
- Coming to the realization, through the tourism consultancy, that building a profitable tourism base would require far greater investment than CI could manage, and that there was a clear disinterest amongst other donors in supporting community based tourism development. Aside from tourism we considered a ‘trust fund model’ to sustain the project long term, but again were faced with similar challenges in how to capitalize the fund to the level required to cover project costs.

The greatest successes of the project are:

- The protection of 154 turtle nests and 2750 hatchlings
- The successful and popular education program carried out in 12 regional schools
- The decisions taken to focus only on activities which delivered premium conservation outcomes, and the significant learnings made through the course of the project which can be used to inform future decision making for the project, ensuring it is as efficient and strategic as possible in the future.

5. Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

No

PART II: Project Components and Products/Deliverables

6. Components (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer

6. Describe the results for each deliverable:

Component		Deliverable	
#	Description	Description	Results for Deliverable
1	Sustain the Mekong Turtle Conservation Program and enhance its conservation effectiveness	MTCP Coordinator implements head starting and release program which incorporates handling and captive management guidelines, to ensure turtles recovered from nesting beaches for head starting are provided with the best care possible.	We maintained the headstarting program for the duration of the project, and went to significant lengths to gain advice on how to maximize the quality of the care provided the turtles. This included establishing relationships with a number of international turtle experts who visited the site and provided us with assessments of the turtles’ health and recommendations for improvement. We also sent Yoeung, our turtle manager, to the TSA’s annual conference in New Orleans, Louisiana, August 1-4, 2016 and then their Turtle Survival Centre in South Carolina for a week of intensive turtle care tuition. These were implemented as far as was possible without making major restructures to the facilities (the latter of which were not accounted for in this budget). However it became evident that in order for the MTCC to be

			<p>suitable for effective headstarting, major renovations would be required. It was deemed that even if these were undertaken and the turtles released in optimum health at the end of their headstarting period, this was likely to have little positive impact on the wild population, and thus the investment unjustified. Headstarting was thus discontinued, and the <i>pelochelys cantorii</i> kept in the center are now all released.</p>
		<p>Joint activities designed by WWF and CI implemented by MTCP Coordinator for nest discovery, species payments/patrolling (white-shouldered ibis and Giant softshell turtle) in year two of the project which increased number of hatchlings at reduced costs.</p>	<p>This collaboration took place at the outset of the project, but was discontinued when WWF ran out of funding for their nest protection work.</p>
		<p>Report written by MTCP Coordinator (assisted by CI turtle experts) comparing initial 2007 data to end of project data for populations of <i>P. Cantorii</i> in Kratie region.</p>	<p>CI explored different possible options for monitoring the populations of <i>P. Cantorii</i>, but was not able to develop a system that was feasible. Nest protection and successful hatchling release showed a steady trend throughout the project, with 49 nests found in the recent nesting season and 819 hatchlings released, but how well this reflects the wild population of the species is still unclear.</p>
2	<p>Improve the turtle and nest protection incentives program</p>	<p>Report written by Center for International Cooperation of Agricultural research for Development (CIRAD) doctoral and Royal University of Agriculture RUA master's student by the middle of year three summarizing findings and making recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the turtle and nest protection incentive program.</p>	<p>This report was prepared, and was very informative. It concluded that the model of the incentive program bore less influence than expected on the level of commitment the community had to protecting the turtle nests. As described earlier in this report, even after the incentive program change to employ individual rangers rather than offering rewards to any community member who cared for a nest, a behavior change had taken place which was to some degree maintained. Thus it suggested that an incentive scheme might be most useful as an emergency measure to raise awareness. We might conclude that thereafter, a focus on law enforcement to manage the behavior of those remaining community members not influenced by the social messaging might be the best use of limited funds. This is the course that CI followed.</p>
		<p>Plan written by MTCP Coordinator with input from CIRAD, RUA and</p>	<p>At the end of the project, CI was just implementing the only incentive scheme that resources allowed – the employment of 6 rangers during nesting season. We did</p>

		WWF implements priority activities for improving payment/patrolling (incentive) program by the end of the project with behavior changes evident	have other ideas for boosting the effectiveness of community patrolling, such as garnering support from local high profile individuals to be known as 'Turtle Ambassadors', and rather than being written into a plan under this grant, they were written into follow up proposals such as to the USFWS, submitted in March 2017. (Note this proposal has been successful in reaching the final round of assessment).
3	Improve visitation and tourism at the Mekong Turtle Conservation Center (MTCC) and enhance capacity for independent management	Plan written by Tourism Development Consultant, with Senior Technical Director, CRDT and WWF input and priority recommendations implemented which increase tourism to the region and for the MTCC--- by the end of the project.	<p>Tourism was not pursued as a sustainable finance source for the project. The Tourism Development Consultants' report recommended a move of the MTCC facility to Koh Trong Island, to improve access to the tourism market. We could not see a way to finance such a move, and were advised by the consultant that the MTCC would struggle to ever attract significant numbers of tourists in its present location. WE decided to press ahead in the present location regardless, but then a number of developments led to the decision to abandon tourism plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We received reports of similar tourist attractions setting up on Koh Trong • We received advice that the MTCC would require significant, and expensive, upgrades to be truly suitable for keeping <i>pelochelys cantorii</i> (the main tourist attraction) • Per the above point, early drafts of Cambodia's new Environmental Code suggested that organizations would need to be able to demonstrate significant conservation benefits to keeping endangered species captive to obtain a permit; and we were being advised that even the best headstarting program for this species could probably not do that. <p>As such this component of the program was not delivered, and effort redirected into searching for other long term solutions for the program.</p>
		Operations and visitor information and management manual for MTCC staff and 100 Pillar Pagoda monks written by Tourism Development Consultant and used by MTC Program Coordinator and MTCC staff to manage	As above.

		the center in year two of the project.	
		Annual record of visitation and interactions with visitors is compiled and shows an increase in visitation.	MTCC visitor numbers increased from 2014-2017 from 3000 to 4000.
		Charter content and transition plan drafted by the Senior Technical Director by the end of the project which will then be used to set up the new NGO to manage the center and head starting among other key MTP activities	Rather than transition the project to NGO status, we transitioned the project to WCS, and facilitated the request of the previous CI-contracted manager of the MTCC to continue to run the center independently. The MTCC will no longer house <i>pelochelys cantorii</i> , but will continue to raise awareness for the conservation of the species as best it can.

7. Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

NA

PART IV: Lessons, Sustainability, Safeguards and Financing

Lessons Learned

8. 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:

- Project Design Process (*aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Project Implementation (*aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community

The whole project period was itself a learning experience, about the difficulties of tourism in that particular locale (and in the face of emerging, unscrupulous competition), about the difficulties of monitoring softshelled turtles, and of finding sustainable, donor-independent finance for this kind of project.

However we also learned about the importance of partnerships, and towards the end of the project we were at the beginning of a path of building partnerships that we probably should have begun fostering much earlier (Turtle Survival Alliance, Global Wildlife Conservation, Wildlife Reserves Singapore). However, the good news is that in the period we did engage with

these agencies, they became sufficiently invested and committed to the project to want to maintain serious involvement even after the project moved to WCS.

We also had a positive experience of maintaining open and honest lines of communication with our donor about challenges, reinforcing our conviction that this is the only course of action when projects hit troubles times.

Sustainability / Replication

9. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.

Sustainability was the main challenge for this project – with endless supply of donor funds we could happily have run the project forever and enjoyed watching the rise in turtle nest numbers.

By the end of this project we had not achieved donor independence, although we had explored several options (tourism, trust funds). What we did achieve was a more solid network of interested donors to sustain the project into the future, by negotiating the move of the project to WCS. This was unplanned, and was a direct result of our other attempts to find post-CEPF finance for the project failing. However, it is the best thing that could have happened to the project – not only will the project have a much more dynamic financial future in this species-oriented organization, but Yoeung, the CI Project Manager who went with the project, will have much greater support from WCS's staff of species conservation specialists and vets. CI now feels confident about the future of the project and the species.

Safeguards

10. If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social or environmental safeguards that your project may have triggered.

N/A

Additional Funding

11. Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of CEPF investment

a. Total additional funding (US\$) 7000

b. Type of funding

Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source, categorizing each contribution into one of the following categories:

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
The AP Fund	Project co-financing	7000	Small private foundation in the US – liked the work we were doing through CEPF and wanted to contribute.

* Categorize the type of funding as:

- A *Project Co-Financing (other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this 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 funded project)*
- C *Regional/Portfolio Leveraging (other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project)*

Additional Comments/Recommendations

12. Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF.

As we have noted in the GEM reports – this was a difficult phase for this project. It was a ‘make or break’ phase, and it would have been easy for CEPF to lose faith as we turned this way and that looking for the best way to sustain the project into the future. Had CEPF given us a hard time about this and not provided the space we needed to explore alternatives, the end of the grant would likely have heralded the end of the project, and with it, the end of support for an endangered species coming under increasing trafficking pressure with no other protection in the world. We are thus extremely grateful to CEPF for understanding, flexibility and support we received. Although we could not deliver on all the things we envisaged at the proposal stage – the project is emerging from this grant leaner, more strategic and much better placed for a successful future. Thank you.

PART IV: Impact at Portfolio and Global Level

CEPF requires that each grantee report on impact at the end of the project. The purpose of this report is to collect data that will contribute to CEPF’s portfolio and global indicators. CEPF will aggregate the data that you submit with data from other grantees, to determine the overall impact of CEPF investment. CEPF’s aggregated results will be reported on in our annual report and other communications materials.

Ensure that the information provided pertains to the entire project, from start date to project end date.

Contribution to Portfolio Indicators

13. If CEPF assigned one or more Portfolio Indicators to your project during the full proposal preparation phase, please list these below and report on the project's contribution(s) to them.

Indicator	Narrative
Not aware of these – please notify us if we need to report something here	

Contribution to Global Indicators

Please report on all Global Indicators (sections 16 to 23 below) that pertain to your project.

14. Key Biodiversity Area Management

Number of hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) with improved management

Please report on the number of hectares in KBAs with improved management, as a result of CEPF investment. Examples of improved management include, but are not restricted to: increased patrolling, reduced intensity of snaring, invasive species eradication, reduced incidence of fire, and introduction of sustainable agricultural/fisheries practices. Do not record the entire area covered by the project - only record the number of hectares that have improved management.

If you have recorded part or all of a KBA as newly protected for the indicator entitled “protected areas” (section 17 below), and you have also improved its management, you should record the relevant number of hectares for both this indicator and the “protected areas” indicator.

Name of KBA	# of Hectares with strengthened management *	Is the KBA Not protected, Partially protected or Fully protected? Please select one: NP/PP/FP

** Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were improved due to implementation of a fire management regime in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were improved due to invasive species removal in the second year, the total number of hectares with improved management would be 500.*

15. Protected Areas

Number of hectares of protected areas created and/or expanded

Report on the number of hectares of protected areas that have been created or expanded as a result of CEPF investment.

Name of PA*	Country(s)	# of Hectares	Year of legal declaration or expansion	Longitude**	Latitude**
0					

* If possible please provide a shape file of the protected area to CEPF.

** Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).

16. Production landscape

Please report on the number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened biodiversity management, as a result of CEPF investment. A production landscape is defined as a landscape where agriculture, forestry or natural product exploitation occurs. Production landscapes may include KBAs, and therefore hectares counted under the indicator entitled "KBA Management" may also be counted here. Examples of interventions include: best practices and guidelines implemented, incentive schemes introduced, sites/products certified and sustainable harvesting regulations introduced.

Number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened biodiversity management.

Name of Production Landscape*	# of Hectares**	Latitude***	Longitude***	Description of Intervention
0				

* If the production landscape does not have a name, provide a brief descriptive name for the landscape.

**Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were strengthened due to certification in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were strengthened due to new harvesting regulations in the second year, the total number of hectares strengthened to date would be 500.

*** Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).

17. Beneficiaries

CEPF wants to record two types of benefits that are likely to be received by individuals: formal training and increased income. Please report on the number of men and women that have benefited from formal training (such as financial management, beekeeping, horticulture) and/or increased income (such as tourism, agriculture, medicinal plant harvest/production, fisheries, handicraft production) as a result of CEPF investment. Please provide results since the start of your project to project completion.

17a. Number of men and women benefitting from formal training.

# of men benefiting from formal training*	# of women benefiting from formal training*
325	210

**Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men benefited from training in beekeeping, and 3 of these also benefited from training in project management, the total number of men who benefited should be 5.*

17b. Number of men and women benefitting from increased income.

# of men benefiting from increased income*	# of women benefiting from increased income*
8	3

**Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men benefited from increased income due to tourism, and 3 of these also benefited from increased income due to handicrafts, the total number of men who benefited should be 5.*

17c. Total number of beneficiaries - Combined

Report on the total number of women and the number of men that have benefited from formal training and increased income since the start of your project to project completion.

Total # of men benefiting*	Total # of women benefiting*
325	210

**Do not count the same person more than once. For example, if Paul was trained in financial management and he also benefited from tourism income, the total number of people benefiting from the project should be 1 = Paul.*

18. Benefits to Communities

CEPF wants to record the benefits received by communities, which can differ to those received by individuals because the benefits are available to a group. CEPF also wants to record, to the extent possible, the number of people within each community who are benefiting. Please report on the characteristics of the communities, the type of benefits that have been received during the project, and the number of men/boys and women/girls from these communities that have benefited, as a result of CEPF investment. If exact numbers are not known, please provide an estimate.

18a. Please provide information for all communities that have benefited from project start to project completion.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics (mark with x)							Type of Benefit (mark with x)							# of Beneficiaries			
	Subsistence economy	Small landowners	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Other*	Increased access to clean water	Increased food security	Increased access to energy	Increased access to public services (e.g. health care, education)	Increased resilience to climate change	Improved land tenure	Improved recognition of traditional knowledge	Improved representation and decision-making in governance forums/structures	Improved access to ecosystem services	# of men and boys benefiting	# of women and girls benefiting

*If you marked "Other" to describe the community characteristic, please explain:

2																			
3																			

19b. For each law, policy or regulation listed above, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

No.	Country(s)	Date enacted/ amended MM/DD/YYYY	Expected impact	Action that you performed to achieve this change
1	NA			
2				
3				

20. Best Management Practices

Please describe any new management practices that your project has developed and tested as a result of CEPF investment, that have been proven to be successful. A best practice is a method or technique that has consistently shown results superior to those achieved with other means.

No.	Short title/ topic of the best management practice	Description of best management practice and its use during the project
1	N/A	
2		

21. Networks & Partnerships

Please report on any new networks or partnerships between civil society groups and across to other sectors that you have established as a result of CEPF investment. Networks/partnerships should have some lasting benefit beyond immediate project implementation. Informal networks/partnerships are acceptable even if they do not have a Memorandum of Understanding or other type of validation. Examples of networks/partnerships include: an alliance of fisherfolk to promote sustainable fisheries practices, a network of environmental journalists, a partnership between one or more NGOs with one or more private sector partners to improve biodiversity management on private lands, a working group focusing on reptile conservation. Please do not use this tab to list the partners in your project, unless some or all of them are part of such a network / partnership described above.

No.	Name of Network/ Partnership	Year established	Country(s) covered	Purpose

Part V. 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:

17. Name: Virginia Simpson
18. Organization: Conservation International Greater Mekong
19. Mailing address: PO Box 1356, Phnom Penh Cambodia
20. Telephone number: +855 23 214627
21. E-mail address: vsimpson@conservation.org