

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

| | |
|--|--|
| Organization Legal Name: | 3S Rivers Protection Network (3SPN) |
| Project Title: | Raise Awareness of Possible Impacts from Dams on the Sesan and Srepok River (RAPIDS) |
| Date of Report: | September 2010 |
| Report Author and Contact Information | 3S Rivers Protection Network (3SPN) Mr. Meach Mean Email: meachmean@hotmail.com 3SPN coordinator (+855) 11 758 970 Mailing Address: PO Box 89007, Banlung Town, Ratanakiri Province |

CEPF Region: Indo-Burma Hotspot. The project will focus on the Sekong, Srepok and Sesan rivers in Ratanakiri and Stung Treng Provinces, Cambodia. The Sekong and Sesan are priority sites within the Mekong River and Major Tributaries priority corridor, while the Srepok is an important component of that ecosystem.

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 3: Engage key actors in reconciling biodiversity conservation and development objectives

Grant Amount: 19,910 USD Total Project Budget for all funding sources. 25,650 USD

Project Dates: One year; 01 June 2009 to 31 May 2010 (project was extended until September 2010)

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):

Local communities participated in the research and documentation through the existing network chaired by the 3 S Rivers Protection Network. Participation was voluntary and the villages involved were therefore partners in the project.

The People Resources and Conservation Foundation was the only external implementing partner, providing technical and material assistance in a number of areas:

- Input into project and activity planning, as requested by 3SPN
- Support with design and reporting of the participatory research activity
- Direction on the policy-level focus of the project, including the form of the research outputs, design of the advocacy program and basin-wide GIS analysis
- Support with editing the Quarterly Update briefing documents and Dam Background document

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.

The RAPIDS Project did not work directly to protect any particular priority value of the CEPF profile. However, RAPIDS was aimed at strengthening the community's capacity to engage in the issue of hydropower development on the Sesan and to a lesser extent Srepok and Sekong rivers, and to improve understanding of the likely short and long term social and environmental impacts

of hydropower projects on the 3 S Rivers, particularly the Proposed Lower Sesan III dam at Vern Sai. These rivers are part of the Mekong and Major Tributaries priority corridor, and this project made a small contribution towards sustainable development in this area through:

- 1) Improved awareness among local communities of dams in the region and their likely impacts. This was achieved through:
 - a. Regular meetings and briefings under the project
 - b. Production of a newsletter (*Living Rivers*) in Khmer language and distributed through our network of over 72 villages on the three rivers.
- 2) Improved awareness among decision-makers of the social and environmental values of the rivers, particularly the area threatened by the proposed Lower Sesan III dam. This was achieved through:
 - a. *Living Rivers*, which included local stories, information and concerns from local communities and was distributed provincially and nationally.
 - b. Preparation of a Preliminary Social and Environmental Impact Assessment for the Lower Sesan III dam, which is currently in draft form and undergoing review and will be distributed to decision makers.
 - c. Preparation of a video containing first hand testimony from local communities regarding the values of the Sesan river and their concerns regarding proposed dam developments.

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

Overview of actions

Through the approval proposal, the project had recruit project officer and project assistant to facilitate to run the project to reach its goal and objective. We completed the recruitment of the RAPIDS one project offer Mr. Phou Bunthann, and one assistant Mr. Um Touch, and subsequently met with the PRCF technical advisor, Mr. Mark Grindley, to discuss on research methodology. The research methodology was prepared early in 2010. Meetings were then held to select target villages followed by field visits to the target area. The project methodology document was translated from English into Khmer language to make project details accessible to the target communities and to the local authority for their consideration.

Project officer is in regular contact with PRCF technical advisor via email, phone call to discuss about the process of the project.

We also complete the Participatory research target area selection and research was conducted at those research target area, supporting local community network for action on dams; expansion of the network into villages along Sesan and Srepok Rivers to determine the concerns and demands of affected villager in this region to raise awareness of the possible impact of the proposed dams. 3SPN via regular local meetings and provincial level meetings aimed to strengthen the capacity of the community network to analyze, plan, implement, monitor and document their environmental and social changes for advocacy purposes.

Quarterly Dam Update document, 'Living Rivers', was produced in two languages, English and Khmer and sent to partner NGOs, donors, medias, activists inside and outside country for all

level, locally, nationally and international. The Khmer language version is especially important and was disseminated to 3S local communities including those villages in the target area

Summary of outputs

During the project implementation we have achieved the following outputs;

- MoU, Inception report, and Implementation between PRCF and 3SPN is implemented
- Research methodology is now complete
- 25 villages along the Sesan River have been selected as project target area, 20 villages in Taveng, 5 villages in Andong Meas district and 3 in Vernsai district. The Sesan III dam is located in Taveng district, Vernsai district is downstream, whilst Andong Meas district is in upstream of the dam
- The Project information has been translated into Khmer version which available for use by community
- Home video of flood video in 5 districts has been produced and this will be very useful for the project video
- Project officer and technical advisor are working closely on the project via email and phone call
- 2 Maps of 2 districts, Vernsai and Taveng districts have been produced and send to technical advisor to create flood inundation zone map
- Quarterly dam update, *Living Rivers Newsletter* edition 1, 2 and 3 is finished. 3SPN will continue to produce the newsletter beyond the life of the project.
- District governors in the target area of Ta Veng, Vuen Sai, and Andong Meas support the project and sign on permission paper
- Elders and focal person transfer knowledge, rights, and information relevant to natural resources along the rivers to their community and raise them to protect/conservate their own resources which they relying on.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: Not relevant

Species Conserved: Not relevant

Corridors Created: Not relevant

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

Several challenges were experienced, listed below by activity:

1) Community research

There was much less data available than previously thought and it also proved hard to gather much qualitative data from local residents. Most villages are indigenous people lack of capacity and they don't familiar keep all data at their own village, most every year most village population statistic data were collected and send to Department of Planning at provincial level, so everything related to their villages we can find at Department of Planning. This meant that the final Preliminary EIA was based on secondary and previously published data and anecdotal evidence and included very little original, qualitative data compared with what was originally envisioned.

2) *Living rivers*

Compilation, editing and layout for the newsletter took much longer than was envisioned, and translation also made completion of *Living Rivers* as a quarterly output very difficult. Instead of investing a disproportionate amount of time in the preparation of the newsletter we reduced the final number of copies (three were produced during the 18 months of the project). However, we now have experience or producing this newsletter and will continue to do so with a more streamlined process.

3) Preliminary Social and Environmental Impact Assessment

More work was required to prepare this document than planned. This was due to the complexity of ensuring as many relevant aspects of a scoping or preliminary EIA could be included as possible, the necessary mapping and GIS work, and the problems of communication between multiple authors. Some low priority sections were therefore dropped and the focus of the study reduced to ensure that a first draft could be produced within the project time frame. This is now undergoing review and will be used in future 3SPN activities as an advocacy tool.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

The RAPIDS project was resulted positive impacts because the project is part of their main source to support their activity.

As a long time that 3S communities have work to advocate to fine best resolution for the issue they are facing especially hydropower dam development which cause many negative impacts to 3S communities who living along the riverside, affected to their livelihood and destroyed biodiversity along/in river.

One part of RAPIDS project were provided a new technical and modern than what they could do such as the project provided a short technical of Video Camera use which they have never done before. The affected community have shoot their own video for home video and then hand over to project officer to combine and edited which participated from local community.

Out of that they understand of conservation to their own natural resources which they are relying on after they assisted in monthly meeting which raised by project officer.

Lessons Learned

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

We have learned that the project is important and relevant to the 3S region communities. The RAPIDS project helps 3SPN to support the community raise their awareness of possible impacts from dams on the Sesan and Srepok Rivers in the aim to protect their necessary resources, which they traditionally rely on. Moreover, this project is useful to community to conduct their own video which they can then share their voice as their concerns. The audience will see their faces and hear the community's voice and is anticipated to have a large impact.

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

By and large the project was designed well based on the current situation as we understood it, although we have identified some weaknesses that we will learn from. The main one is that a tighter focus is more suitable for one year projects. A second is that, were the donor expects the project to be implemented within 12 months of contract signing, project setup time has to be kept to a minimum. We were ambitious in our aim to present a wide range of published and unpublished data, including that from original research with local communities, in an accessible way in order to highlight possible impacts from a proposed dam. Although this process has been complicated and the results are not as detailed or thorough as planned, it has still been a valuable experience for us. In particular, we now have a much better idea what is involved in EIA and how we might engage in future development planning processes and assessments. Any future community awareness and preliminary impact assessments will therefore greatly benefit from the RAPIDS project experience.

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

The project included several integrated activities and was quite ambitious, which may have resulted in a lack of focus. There were also some communication issues within the staff team, and between the 3SPN team and the project partner (PRCF), which were particularly relevant for the EIA activity. One reason is that the original project was designed by the former 3SPN Chairman who then left prior to implementation; although the handover could have been improved, some misunderstandings were probably unavoidable. Communications between the team and PRCF were improved after the mid-term review, but due to multiple responsibilities within 3SPN it was sometimes hard for the team to meet regularly and RAPIDS was not always the top priority for 3SPN, especially during floods and other natural disasters affecting our constituents. Better progress monitoring is something 3SPN is working to improve across all its activities, and the RAPIDS project has helped highlight areas of weakness on that issue.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

Even the project did not work directly to the conservation but every monthly meeting the project had share and raise their awareness to think about their natural resources and biodiversity which they used to rely on since their ancestor which now have been a big change and actually we found that all communities very concern about the loss of their natural resource. For instance they would like to protect and conserve their natural resource such as land, forest, river and fish species but the main thing is that they do not know how to conserve and there's no supporter. For instance, villagers in Samkha village complain of the loss of the rare fish species.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

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

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

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

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

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

| |
|-------------------------------------|
| Sustainability/Replicability |
|-------------------------------------|

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

3SPN and 3S community will use the Video and Pre EIA report which resulted from CEPF fund for raise the public awareness to understand of possible impact which will cause by hydroper Lower Sesan III dam and spread out their impacts experiences, the important of river and their general concern within the government dam development plan.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

No unplanned sustainability or replicability has been observed.

| |
|------------------------------------|
| Safeguard Policy Assessment |
|------------------------------------|

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

| |
|---|
| Performance Tracking Report Addendum |
|---|

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| CEPF Global Targets | | | | |
| (Enter Grant Term) | | | | |
| Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant. Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project. | | | | |
| Project Results | Is this question relevant ? | If yes, provide your numerical response for results | Provide your numerical response for project | Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010. (Attach annexes if necessary) |

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

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

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

| Name of Community | Community Characteristics | | | | | | | Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|---|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Small landowners | Subsistence economy | Indigenous/ ethnic peoples | Pastoralists/nomadic peoples | Recent migrants | Urban communities | Communities falling below the poverty rate | Other | Increased Income due to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | sustainable natural resources management | Ecotourism revenues | Park management activities | Payment for environmental services | Improved security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices | More secure access to water resources | Improved tenure in rangelands or other natural resource areas | Reduction of risk due to titling, reduction of risk due to natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc.) | More secure sources of energy | Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or other social services | Increased traditional knowledge for environmental conservation | Improved decision-making due to strengthened civil society and institutions | Other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit:



Additional Comments/Recommendations

The development of the original proposal took several months of review and feedback with CEPF, which seemed excessive for a 20,000 USD project. For this reason, the start date was revised several times and by the time the contract was signed several key staff had moved or were allocated to other activities. Also, the project was considered as started on the day the contract was signed, which did not allow for any set-up time or for seasonality in timing of activities; we were therefore unable to complete the project within one year.

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

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

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Mr. Meach Mean
Organization name: 3S Rivers Protection Network (3SPN)
Mailing address: PO Box 89007, Banlung Town, Ratanakiri Province
Tel: (+855) 11 758 970, Office Phone: 9+855) 75 974 112
Fax:
E-mail: meachmean@hotmail.com