

Report on

Final Project Evaluation

Community Empowerment for

Biodiversity Conservation along the

Sesan and Srepok River in the Mekong



Koy Ra
July 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT | 3 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 4 |
| I INTRODUCTION | 8 |
| 1.1 Background..... | 8 |
| 1.2 Objective | 9 |
| 1.3 Limitation | 9 |
| II METHODOLOGIES | 9 |
| 2.1 Villager interview | 9 |
| 2.2 Focus group discussion..... | 9 |
| 2.3 Stakeholder interview | 10 |
| 2.4 Reviewing documents and meeting project team | 10 |
| III RESULTS..... | 10 |
| 3.1 General characteristics of respondents | 10 |
| 3.2 Environmental education and awareness raising..... | 11 |
| 3.3 Dialogue and advocacy..... | 15 |
| 3.4 Livelihood improvement | 16 |
| 3.5 Discussion | 16 |
| IV CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION | 17 |
| REFERENCES | 19 |
| Appendix 1: Questions for villager Interview | 20 |
| Appendix 2: Guiding Questions for FGD with Community | 24 |
| Appendix 3: Guiding questions for stakeholder interview (3S Rivers Protection Network | 24 |
| Appendix 4: Guiding questions for interviewing project team | 25 |
| Appendix 5: Achievement on advocacy and dialogue programme..... | 26 |
| Appendix 6: Term of Reference (ToR) | 29 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the project team for providing me with the opportunity to work together with you all. I am very grateful to Mr. Tep Boonny for this. I am also thankful to Mr. Seang Sothea, Mr. Leng Sarorn and Mr. Mean Chamroeun, for their kind support, cooperation and comments. Thanks also go Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) for its financial support.

Mr. Moeur Theara deserves special thanks for his kindness and support during the fieldwork. I would especially like to thank the project focal point, project counterparts and commune councils, who have participated in the focus group discussion and meetings. This report would not have been completed without their support.

SCW colleagues in Ratanakiri province welcomed me warmly. I am very much impressed with their kind support and comments on the improvement of research methodology and coordination during my field mission. Last but not least, I would like to express my sincere thanks to all villagers who actively participated face to face interview.

Thank you!

Koy Ra

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Save Cambodia's Wildlife (SCW) has been implementing a project on "Community Empowerment for Biodiversity Conservation along the Sesan and Srepok River in the Mekong Basin" within four districts (Lumphat, Koun Mom, Taveng and AndoungMeas districts), six communes, and thirty seventh villages in Ratanakiri Province since July 2010. The project is funded by Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) through Birdlife International.

The expected results of the project were i) Improved community awareness of the potential impacts and status of the proposed dams, ii) Improved awareness among decision makers of the environmental and social impacts of development processes, iii) Improved communications between 3S communities and other stakeholders, particularly provincial and national decision makers, iv) Strengthened capacity of the current network of 3S communities in the areas of biodiversity sustainability and advocacy, and v) Improved cooperation between relevant government and private sector actors, and civil society for sustainable development.

The overall objectives of the final evaluation is to measure the outcomes and impacts of the project implementation within the last 3 years from the period of July 2010 to June 2013 that focused on Environmental Education, Community-based Natural Resources Management, and Good Governance.

Different methods and approaches have been employed for this evaluation. These include villager interview, focus group discussion, stakeholder interview, and reviewing project document and meeting project team. The main objective of the villager interview was to understand the knowledge of villagers on environmental and natural resources and what they have learnt from the project. The main objective of a focus group discussion is to gain their view on the project implementation, as well as perception of the villagers' knowledge on environmental conservation and the outcome and impact from project implementation. The main objective of this interview was to better understand the cooperation among the project staff with local authorities, challenges of project implementation, and their suggestions for future project opportunity. Furthermore, meeting was also held with project team in order to understand the achievements of project, challenges and follow up with some documents for reviewing.

In general, all respondents who participated in the training course related to biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services, which was conducted by SCW, informed us that the course was easy to understand, because the trainer used simple methods and materials for the training. As a result, 83.7 % of respondents have heard the word environment and biodiversity while before project implementation, it was reported only 71.4 % heard this word.

Furthermore, 76.4% of all respondents had the ability to explain what the word environment and biodiversity mean. All respondents reported that they know these words from SCW and 3SPN while some reported that they knew these words from their neighbor and village chief. Related to knowledge on the word natural resources, 86.0% of villagers confirmed that they knew the word natural resources and they were also able to explain what the natural resources mean.

Before the project implementation, only 4% of villagers have known some information about hydropower dam construction around their communities or in the upstream. However, after implementing the project, most of respondents (62.8%) confirmed that they have heard information about hydropower dam construction around their communities or on the upstream of the Mekong Basin. Before project implementation, only 66.9 % of respondents were able to describe the negative impact of hydropower dam construction while it is increased to 81.4 % after project implementation.

Most of respondents (53.5%) were able to describe the benefit of forest resources to humans, while 46.5% and 23.2% were able to describe the benefit of forest resources to wildlife and economy. The main benefit of forest resources to wildlife is their habitat.

Respondents were also asked about their ability to describe the main natural resources surrounding their communities. Those resources are forests, wildlife, rivers including fish, and minerals. None of the respondents had any information or knowledge about minerals close to their communities'. Most of the respondents (61.9%) were able to observe and describe tree species that have disappeared from the community. Those species include Neangnoun, Kranhoung, Beng. The rest of respondents could not be able to observe and describe these characteristics. Moreover, 46.5% of respondents reported that some species, including Sokrom, Thnung, Pdeak, Chhoeu Teal are now endangered in their community. Fifty five percent (55%) respondents reported that forests in their community are now degraded and deforested. Forest degradation has left only a small amount of tree species, for example Khlong, Trach, and Langeang species, which are less commercial. The main reasons of forest degradation and deforestation in their communities were expansion of agriculture land such as Chamkar, other development activities, and clearing by outsiders.

Most of respondent (67.4%) were able to observe and describe some main wildlife species that have disappeared from their community while 44.2% were be able to observe and describe some main fish species that have disappeared from their community. It is noted that most of small animals, such as monkeys, wild chicken, and wild pig still exist in their communities', while the bigger animals and some other globally endangered species have disappeared from their communities'. Those species include elephants, tigers and Banteng.

The good governance and advocacy action plan on environmental and biodiversity conservation have been integrated into Quarterly Action Plans of the 3S Network and semester by joining the

3S community meeting. As a result of this, local community could also prepare their work plan with budget for financial support.

Local communities have raised their concerns about hydropower dam construction around their communities, as well as upstream, in form of written letters sent to different government institutions/ministries, including the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology, the Parliament, and the Chinese Embassy. Furthermore, local communities have also raised their concerns about the negative impacts of hydropower dam in the forum in which they participated.

The capacity of villagers and stakeholders has been improved. This improvement can be seen through good cooperation between villagers and local authorities. Taveng Krom commune reported 5 cases of illegal fishing between 2012 and 2013 by villagers to commune councils and local Fishery Admiration. Other communities report similar cases, without remembering the exact number. This means that people have been aware on the important of natural resources to their livelihood.

It was reported in all communes that illegal activities on natural resources have decreased. However, some villagers are still practicing small scale illegal activities (electrical fishing) for their household food consumption only. Even if this is a small scale illegal fishing; most of them are practicing this activity only in at night, when other villagers find it difficult to report it to local authorities. Moreover, some stakeholders reported that this small scale illegal activity is hard to crack down since those who have practiced this activity have no alternative options.

Many dialogues and trainings on good governance and advocacy have been implemented. Among those activities, integrating good governance and advocacy action in to quarterly action plan is regarded as crucial activity for good governance and, thus, contributed to sustainability of remaining natural resources in or surrounded their communities.

Even, there is a good impact on environmental, biodiversity, and natural resources knowledge as well as good governance and advocacy, the achievement on livelihood enhancement is still limited. Thus, it is a challenging task for sustainable natural resources conservation.

Recommendation for future project opportunity:

- It would be good, if the illegal cases reported by villagers and local communities are carefully solved and strict law enforcement have been taken into account by local authorities, so whom are not obeyed the law, it must punish and fine. Otherwise, participation from villagers or local communities will be reduced in the future
- Future training should have a follow up activities so that people are still reminded what they have learnt, otherwise, they tend to forget easily.

- Since there are different ethnic groups and speak different languages, discussion with the support from ethnic people who speak Khmer fluently would be an advantage for increasing their understanding.
- Like in some other provinces, local communities in the target sites are very much depending on natural resources. Therefore, conserving these resources without providing or improving livelihood option would be a challenging task.

I INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Save Cambodia's Wildlife (SCW) has been implementing a project on "Community Empowerment for Biodiversity Conservation along the Sesan and Srepok River in the Mekong Basin" within four districts (Lumphat, Koun Mom, Taveng and AndoungMeas districts), six communes, and thirty seventh villages in Ratanakiri Province since July 2010. The project is funded by Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) through Birdlife International.

The main goal of the project is to minimize the serious negative impacts from dam constructions and other forms of development processes to natural resources, more especially the engendered species and living conditions of local communities along the 3S region. The specific objective of the project is to i) raise awareness and build community capacity on biodiversity conservation of the endangered species within the Sekong, Sesan, and Srepok Rivers ecosystems; ii) promote dialogue between the dam affected communities and actors concerned to secure their basic rights, and restore their socio-economic, cultural, and environmental situation; and iii) enhance alternative options for local livelihoods whose their livings depends on natural resources along the target areas.

To reach the objectives mentioned above, SCW has worked in partnership with 3S Rivers Protection Network (3 SPN), which has an extensive experience working in Ratanakiri province. SCW focused on the biodiversity conservation awareness raising and promoted small scale livelihoods, while 3SPN worked on capacity building related to relevant law instruments and promoting advocacy-based-dialogues between Sesan and Srepok River communities and actors concerned. SCW was the main implementer and accountable to CEPF Indochina for the project implementation.

The expected results of the project were i) Improved community awareness of the potential impacts and status of the proposed dams, ii) Improved awareness among decision makers of the environmental and social impacts of development processes, iii) Improved communications between 3S communities and other stakeholders, particularly provincial and national decision makers, iv) Strengthened capacity of the current network of 3S communities in the areas of biodiversity sustainability and advocacy, and v) Improved cooperation between relevant government and private sector actors, and civil society for sustainable development.

A consultant was selected to prepare the completed project evaluation process and materials for data collection at field and partner meetings as required. The main task of the consultant was to produce a complete quality final evaluation report describing the precise outcomes of the project.

1.2 Objective

The overall objectives of the final evaluation is to measure the outcomes and impacts of the project implementation within the last 3 years from the period of July 2010 to June 2013 that focused on Environmental Education, Community-based Natural Resources Management, and Good Governance.

1.3 Limitation

There is a baseline report; however, baseline information related to the project objectives is still limited. Therefore, perception before and after project implementation of community member related to the objective mentioned above will be employed.

This study was undertaken from 25 June to 17 July 2013, due to the rainy season, people were very busy with their agricultural work. During this period, villagers left their home to Chamkar, where they stay almost the whole season for agricultural production. Thus, meeting those people is quite a challenging task. Furthermore, there are many different ethnic groups in the project site who speak different languages. Therefore, only those who can speak Khmer or Laos languages were met for gathering data and information.

II METHODOLOGIES

2.1 Villager interview

The main objective of the villager interview was to understand the knowledge of villagers on environmental and natural resources and what they have learnt from the project. This includes their knowledge on environmental impacts of development projects in or around their area as well as other knowledge from dissemination activities.

The study had intended to interview 50 percent of villagers who participated in the training course conducted by SCW. However, since most of villagers left their village to Chamkar for agricultural production, only a small number of villagers (4-6 people in each commune) who participated in SCW training course were available for the interviews. In addition, villagers (6-8 people in each commune) who did not participated in the training course conducted by SCW were also interviewed in order to get their perception on the project implementation. Therefore, only 10-12 villagers were interviewed in each commune. Appendix 1 shows the questions that were used for the villager interview. Villagers were randomly selected, which based on accessibility to the villages and their ability to speak Khmer or Laos.

2.2 Focus group discussion

Since not so many people were available in the villages, only 4 community members were invited to participate in focus group discussion. The main objective of a focus group discussion is to gain their view on the project implementation, as well as perception of the villagers' knowledge on environmental conservation and the outcome and impact from project implementation. Four focus group discussions were held in four communes in four districts. Appendix 2 shows the guiding questions for focus group discussion.

2.3 Stakeholder interview

Key stakeholders included commune head, village chief, and 3SPN’s staff. The main objective of this interview was to better understand the cooperation among the project staff with local authorities, challenges of project implementation, and their suggestions for future project opportunity. Appendix 3 shows the guiding questions for the stakeholder interview.

2.4 Reviewing documents and meeting project team

All documents related to the project were reviewed. Those documents included a lesson plan and agenda for training, project documents (CEPF Letter of Inquiry), project logical framework, baseline survey report on community awareness about biodiversity conservation, a manual for “capacity building on participatory biodiversity conservation such as natural resources management, fisheries law, commune investment plan and good governance”. Furthermore, the project team in Ratanakiri province was also met. The main objective of the meeting was to understand the achievements and challenges of the project and to follow up with some documents for reviewing. Appendix 4 shows the guiding questions from the meeting with project team in Ratanakiri province.

III RESULTS

3.1 General characteristics of respondents

This study interviewed 43 villages in 4 districts, 5 communes (Taveng Loeu, Taveng Krom, Talao, Chey Odom, and Sery Monkul communes), and 11 villages (Pleu Thom, Bangket, Kanart Touch, Khopong, Lumphath, Samkha, Seangsay, Srepok Touch, Talav, Topunroeng Touch, and Veangchan).

In general, the respondents were not old with an average age of 38 years old. Most of the respondents (67%) were from the Lao ethnic group followed by 25.5% Khmer). 55% of respondents were 55% women and the rest were man. Almost 50 % of respondents participated in the two-day-training course on “participatory biodiversity conservation, such as natural resources management, fisheries law, commune investment plan and good governance” conducted by SCW. Table 1 summarizes general characteristics of the respondents.

Table 1: General characteristics of respondents

| | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|
| Ethnic group | | |
| Kachak | 1 | 2.33 |
| Khmer | 11 | 25.58 |
| Lao | 29 | 67.44 |
| Prov | 2 | 4.65 |

| | | |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Total | 43 | 100 |
| Sex | | |
| Male | 19 | 44.2 |
| Female | 24 | 55.8 |
| Total | 43 | 100 |
| Education | | |
| No school | 16 | 37.2 |
| Primary school | 23 | 53.5 |
| Secondary school | 3 | 7.0 |
| High school | 1 | 2.3 |
| Total | 43 | 100 |
| Participated in training course conducted by SCW | | |
| Participated | 20 | 46.5 |
| Did not participate | 23 | 53.5 |
| Total | 43 | 100 |

3.2 Environmental education and awareness raising

In general, all respondents who participated in the training course related to biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services, which was conducted by SCW, informed us that the course was easy to understand, because the trainer used simple methods and materials for the training. As a result, 83.7 % of respondents have heard of the word environment and biodiversity while in the baseline conducted in 2010 (Oeng et al., 2010) reported that only 71.4 % heard this word.

Furthermore, 76.4% of all respondents had the ability to explain what the word environment and biodiversity mean. All respondents reported that they know these words from SCW and 3SPN while some reported that they knew these words from their neighbor and village chief. Related to knowledge on the word natural resources, 86.0% of villagers confirmed that they knew the word natural resources and they were also able to explain what the natural resources mean.

Before the project implementation, only 4% of villagers have known some information about hydropower dam construction around their communities or in the upstream (Oeng et al., 2010). However, after implementing the project, most of respondents (62.8%) confirmed that they have heard information about hydropower dam construction around their communities or on the upstream of the Mekong Basin. Furthermore, they informed that they have got this information from 3SPN. Before project implementation, only 66.9 % of respondents were able to describe the negative impact of hydropower dam construction while it is increased to 81.4 % of respondents were able to describe the negative impact of hydropower dam construction. Table 2 summaries the knowledge or information gained before and after the project implementation.

Respondents were also asked some questions related to the benefit of natural resources for humans, as well as for biodiversity. Most of respondents (53.5%) were able to describe the benefit of forest resources to humans, while 46.5% and 23.2% were able to describe the benefit of forest resources to wildlife and economy (Table 3). The main benefit of forest resources to wildlife is their habitat.

Table 2: Summary of knowledge of villagers gained before and after project implementation

| No. | Knowledge/information of villager on | Before project implementation (July 2010) | After project implementation (July 2013) | Increase (%) |
|-----|--|---|--|---------------|
| 1 | Knowing the word environment | 71.4 % | 83.7% | 12.3% |
| 2 | Ability to explain the word environment and biodiversity | Not available | 76.4% | Not available |
| 3 | Knowing the word natural resources and ability to explain what natural resources are | 77.7% | 86.0 | 8.3% |
| 4 | Hydropower dam construction in upstream of the Mekong basin | 4% | 62.8% | 58.8% |
| 5 | Positive impact of hydropower dam construction | 0.9 | 2.3 | 1.4% |
| 6 | Negative impact of hydropower dam construction. | 66.9 | 81.4 | 14.5% |

Table 3: Ability of respondent to describe the benefit of some key natural resources

| No. | Ability of respondent to explain the | Not able | able |
|-----|---|----------|------|
| | Benefit of forest resources for human | 46.5 | 53.5 |
| | Benefit of forest resources for wildlife | 53.5 | 46.5 |
| | Benefit of forest resources for economic | 76.8 | 23.2 |
| | Benefit of wildlife for human | 53.5 | 46.5 |
| | Benefit of wildlife for economic | 79.1 | 20.9 |
| | Benefit of river system for human | 55.8 | 44.2 |
| | Benefit of river system for aquatic resources | 67.5 | 32.6 |
| | Benefit of river system for economic | 86.1 | 14.0 |

It is shown that most of respondents were able to describe the benefit of natural resources to their everyday life activities while the understanding of the benefit of natural resources to the economy was still limited to some respondents.

Respondents were also asked about their ability to describe the main natural resources surrounding their communities. Those resources are forests, wildlife, rivers including fish, and minerals. None of the respondents had any information or knowledge about minerals close to their communities'. Most of the respondents (61.9%) were able to observe and describe tree species that have disappeared from the community (Table 4). Those species include Neangnoun, Kranhoung, Beng. The rest of respondents could not be able to observe and describe these characteristics. Moreover, 46.5% of respondents reported that some species, including Sokrom, Thnung, Pdeak, Chhoeu Teal are now endangered in their community. Fifty five percent (55%) respondents reported that forests in their community are now degraded and deforested. Forest degradation has left only a small amount of tree species, for example Khlong, Trach, and Langeang species, which are less commercial. The main reasons of forest degradation and deforestation in their communities were expansion of agriculture land such as Chamkar, other development activities, and clearing by outsider (Table 5).

Table 4: Ability of respondents to respond on the main natural resources in their community

| No. | Ability of respondents to describe | Not able to describe | Able to describe | Species/condition |
|-----------------|---|----------------------|------------------|---|
| Forest | Tree species that used to exist and have now disappeared in their community | 38.1 | 61.9 | Neangnoun, Kranhoung, Beng. |
| | Endangered tree species in their community | 53.5 | 46.5 | Chhoeu Teal, Pdeak, Thnung, Kokoh, Sokrom |
| | Present condition | 44.2 | 55.8 | Forest are degraded with only small and spare tree of mix species including Khlong, Trach, Lengeang, etc. |
| Wildlife | Wildlife species that used to exist and have now disappeared in their community | 32.6 | 67.4 | Tiger, beer, elephant, piton, deer, banteng, pikok, wild buffalo |
| | Endangered wildlife species in their | 46.5 | 53.5 | Banteng, deer, wild pig, monkey, picok, etc. |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|------|------|---|
| | community | | | |
| | Present condition | 34.9 | 65.1 | Wild chicken, wild pig, monkey, deer, etc. |
| Water and fisheries | fish species that used to exist and have now disappeared in their community | 55.8 | 44.2 | Trey Pava, Trey Kulreang, Trey Tasak, Trey PaseEy, etc. |
| | Endangered fish species in their community | 62.8 | 37.2 | Trey Kaek, Trey Chppin, Trey Pava, Trey Kcha |
| | Present condition | 60.5 | 39.5 | Snake-head fish, Trey Real, Trey Chhpin, Trey Kahe. |

Most of the respondents (67.4%) were able to observe and describe some main wildlife species that have disappeared from their communities', while 44.2% were able to observe and describe some main fish species that have disappeared from their community as shown in Table 4.

It is noted that most of small animals, such as monkeys, wild chicken, and wild pig still exist in their communities', while the bigger animals and some other globally endangered species have disappeared from their communities'. Those species include elephants, tigers and Banteng.

Table 5: Ability of respondents to describe the main cause of depletion or degradation of main natural resources in their communities

| No. | Ability of respondent to describe on | Not be able to describe | Be able to describe | Species/condition |
|-----|--|-------------------------|---------------------|--|
| 1 | The main cause of forest degradation and deforestation | 46.5 | 53.5 | Clear cut by outsider, expansion of Chamkar, and development activities. |
| 2 | Effect of forest degradation and deforestation | 58.1 | 41.9 | No wood for utilization, No wildlife, No habitat for wildlife, Storm, and floods |
| 3 | The main cause of loss or endangered wildlife | 41.9 | 58.1 | Loss of habitat caused by land use and land change |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------|------|---|
| 4 | Effect of loss of wildlife | 51.2 | 48.8 | Lack of food, future generations will never see those animals again |
| 5 | The main cause of loss or endangered fish species | 69.7 | 30.3 | Hydropower dam construction in the upper part, Illegal fishing, and increasing population |
| 6 | Effect the loss of endangered fish species | 74.4 | 25.6 | Buy food from market, loss of income source, |

3.3 Dialogue and advocacy

SCW in partnership with 3SPN conducted many dialogues and advocacy programmes targeting 6 communes on different topics as shown in appendix 5. It is a challenging task to educate people with different backgrounds for environmental conservation as well as advocacy within 3 years and measuring its impact. However, cooperating with 3SPN, who have advocacy experience since 10 years, has surely enhanced SCW success rate.

The good governance and advocacy action plan on environmental and biodiversity conservation have been integrated into Quarterly Action Plans of the 3S Network and semester by joining the 3S community meeting. As a result of this, local community could also prepare their work plan with budget for financial support.

It was reported during group discussions that since they have gained more knowledge on environmental and biodiversity conservation; local communities have raised their concerns about hydropower dam construction around their communities, as well as upstream, in form of written letters sent to different government institutions/ministries, including the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology, the Parliament, and the Chinese Embassy. Furthermore, local communities have also raised their concerns about the negative impacts of hydropower dam in the forum in which they participated.

Even if many dialogues and trainings on advocacy and good governance have been conducted, only some villagers have known or heard about those dialogues or trainings. Table 6 shows the percentage of villagers who have known or heard about the main dialogues or trainings on advocacy and good governance by SCW/3SPN.

Table 6: Four main advocacy and good governance dialogue/training

| No. | Dialogue | Yes (%) | No (%) |
|-----|---|---------|--------|
| 1 | Have you ever participated in or heard of dialogues/trainings related to share best practices | 48.8 | 51.2 |

| | | | |
|---|---|------|------|
| 2 | Have you ever participated in or hear of the dialogues/trainings related to biodiversity conservation of the endangered species within the upstream Mekong basin in a radio talk show | 27.9 | 72.1 |
| 3 | Have you ever participated in or heard of dialogues/trainings related to capacity building activities on good governance and advocacy | 25.6 | 74.4 |
| 4 | Have you ever participated in or heard of dialogues/trainings related to awareness raising and advocacy campaigns on biodiversity conservation | 34.9 | 65.1 |

3.4 Livelihood improvement

One specific objective of the project, stated in the project document, was to enhance alternative local livelihood options that depend on their natural resources. Since natural resources are decreasing, alternative livelihood options shall help them to be more financially independent. The study found that not many activities have been undertaken on this, besides informing villagers about main product price on the board located in the village.

3.5 Discussion

Through observations during field visits, group discussions, and key stakeholder interviews, the capacity of villagers and stakeholders has been improved. This improvement can be seen through good cooperation between villagers and local authorities. Taveng Krom commune reported 5 cases of illegal fishing between 2012 and 2013 by villagers to commune councils and local Fishery Admiration. Other communities report similar cases, without remembering the exact number. This means that people have been aware on the important of natural resources to their livelihood.

Furthermore, it was reported in all communes that illegal activities on natural resources have decreased. However, some villagers are still practicing small scale illegal activities (electrical fishing) such as fishing for their household food consumption only. Even if this is a small scale illegal fishing; most of them are practicing this activity only in at night, when other villagers find it difficult to report it to local authorities. Moreover, some stakeholders reported that this small scale illegal activity is hard to crack down since those who have practiced this activity have no alternative options.

Many dialogues and trainings on good governance and advocacy have been implemented. Among those activities, integrating good governance and advocacy action in to quarterly action plan is regarded as crucial activity for good governance and, thus, contributed to sustainability of remaining natural resources in or surrounded their communities.

IV CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

After a three year project implementation, 83.7 % of respondents have heard the word environment and biodiversity while in 2010; only 71.4 % of respondents had heard this word. Furthermore, 76.4% of respondents were able to explain what the word environment and biodiversity mean.

86.0% of villagers confirmed that they know the word natural resources and that they are also able to explain what the natural resources mean? However, the natural resources that they know are related to forest, wildlife and riverine ecosystem while they do not have any knowledge about minerals. Most of the respondents (53.5%) were able to describe the benefits of forest resources to humans while 46.5% and 23.2% respectively were able to describe the benefits of forest resources to wildlife and the economy.

Before the project implementation, only 4% of villager had known about hydropower dam construction around their communities or in the upstream of the Mekong basin. However, after the project implementation, most of respondents (62.8%) have confirmed that they have known information about hydropower dam construction around their community or on the upstream.

Before the project implementation in 2010, only 66.9 % of respondents were able to describe the negative impacts from hydropower dam constructions, compared to 81.4 % after the project implementation.

Being in a partnership with 3SPN has enhanced also SCW knowledge and has made the work more effective and successful.

As results of the project implementation, villagers started working in a better cooperation with local authorities reporting illegal activities in their communities. This is regarded as successful impact of the project implementation.

Furthermore, local communities started engaging in work and budget plans to protect natural resources in their communities. In the meantime, local communities also started to express their concerns about the impact of proposed development projects (hydropower dam) within or close to their communities. As results, written documents expressing their concerns of the impacts of development projects on their community have been submitted to the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology, the Chinese Embassy, and the Parliament.

Even, there are a good impacts on environmental, biodiversity, and natural resources knowledge as well good governance and advocacy, the achievement on livelihood

enhancement is still limited. Thus, it is a challenging task for sustainable natural resources conservation.

Recommendation for future project opportunity:

- It would be good, if the illegal cases reported by villagers and local communities are carefully solved and strict law enforcement have been taken into account by local authorities, so whom are not obeyed the law, it must punish and fine. Otherwise, participation from villagers or local communities will be reduced in the future
- Future training should have a follow up activities so that people are still reminded what they have learnt, otherwise, they tend to forget easily.
- Since there are different ethnic groups and speak different languages, discussion with the support from ethnic people who speak Khmer fluently would be an advantage for increasing their understanding.
- Like in some other provinces, local communities in the target sites are very much depending on natural resources. Therefore, conserving these resources without providing or improving livelihood options would be a challenging task.

REFERENCES

SCW. 2010. Project document. CEPF Letter of Inquiry.

SCW. 2010. Project's logical framework

Oeng. K, Lai. V, San. S, Se. S, Vin. S. 2010. Report on baseline survey communities awareness about biodiversity conservation.

SCW. 2013. Training course on capacity building on participatory biodiversity conservation such as natural resources management, fishery law, commune investment plan and good governance.

SCW. Undated. Project logical framework

SCW. Undated. Lesson plan and

Appendix 1: Questions for villager Interview

I General information

1. What is your name?..... Sex: 1 Male 2 Female Age:.....Years
 Ethnic group?..... Village.....Commune.....District.....

2. Education

- 1. No school
- 2. Primary school
- 3. Secondary school
- 4. High school

II Awareness raising

1. Have you ever participated in any training course? (please fill the table below)

| No. | Training course | Conducted by | Easy to understand | Comments for improvement |
|-----|-----------------|--------------|--|--------------------------|
| 1 | | | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Easy to understand 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to understand, why?..... | |
| 2 | | | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Easy to understand 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to understand, why?..... | |
| 3 | | | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Easy to understand 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to understand, why?..... | |
| 4 | | | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Easy to understand 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to understand, why?..... | |
| 5 | | | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Easy to understand 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to understand, why?..... | |
| 6 | | | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Easy to understand 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to understand, why?..... | |

2. Among the course mentioned above, what are best for participant understanding?

3. Have you ever heard the team environment? 1 Yes 2 No 3 Other
4. What does environment mean?
 1 refer to human 2 wind, mountain, and sea 3 everything around us
 4 Other.....
5. What does a natural resource mean?
 1 every useful thing on earth 2 river, lake, and mountain 3 other.....
6. What are the benefits of natural resources for villager and the nation?

| No. | Natural resources | Benefit for | | |
|-----|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | Humane | Wildlife | Economic |
| 1 | Forest | | | |
| 2 | Wildlife | | | |
| 3 | Water (Fish) | | | |
| 4 | Mineral | | | |
| 5 | Others | | | |

7. What resources that you think are now losing, endanger? What is the main course? and what are their impact?

| No. | Natural resources | Loss | Endanger | Current condition | Course | Impact |
|-----|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1 | Forest | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | | | | |
| 2 | Wildlife | | | | | |
| 3 | Water (Fish) | | | | | |
| 4 | Mineral | | | | | |
| 5 | Others | | | | | |

8. Have you been aware about any information on dam construction around your community or in the upstream?
9. Could you please describe what are the positive and negative impact from hydropower dam construction?
 Positive impact:.....

 Negative impact:.....

10. How do you know these impact? who teach/tell you?

III Local dialogue and awareness

1. Have you ever participated or hear in any forum below:
 - a. Dialogue and share best practices 1 Yes 2 No
 - b. Biodiversity conservation of the endangered species within Mekong through radio talk show: 1 Yes 2 No
 - c. capacity building activities on good governance and advocacy: 1 Yes 2 No
 - d. Awareness raising and advocacy campaign on biodiversity conservation: 1 Yes 2 No
2. Is there any other dialogues? (please describe)

IV Enhance local livelihood

- 4.1 Have you ever got any information from production to marketing of your product?
 1. Yes 2. No
- 4.2 If question is yes, Where did you get it (get from who)?
- 4.3 Is there any group of model families formed?

1. Yes

2. No

4.4 If question 3 is yes, who support this formation?.....

4.5 Have you ever participated in public private sector forum (for sharing information on local product etc.)? 1 Yes 2. No

4.6 If question 5 is yes, who supported this forum?

Appendix 2: Guiding Questions for FGD with Community

1. What are the benefit of forest, river, etc. (benefit of ecosystem services)?
2. What are the benefit of natural resources and negative impact of loss of natural resources? What have you learnt about natural resources conservation? How have you learnt this? Who has trained you in natural resources conservation?
3. What are endanger species have you known so far (fauna and flora)? how many percent of these species have you known before implementing the project? why? how did you increase your knowledge on this endanger species?
4. How many dialogues have you participated? What were the topics for dialogue? What do you think about those dialogues (is it meaningful)? why? How do you think for the improvement of future dialogues?
5. What are the most successful of the project? what are the less successful of the project? why for both?
6. What were the main livelihood activities before project implementation? What are the main livelihood activities now? is it improved? if not why? how can it be improved? if it is improved, Who help this improvement?
7. In general, how can you say about this project? very success? success? not so success? not success? why? could you please list down any example about good impact from the project?
8. Have you any information about hydropower damp construction around/nearby your community? do you know what are the positive and negative impact of that project?
9. Is there any support from SCW to the communities on implementation of the roles and responsibilities in biodiversity conservation in your commune?
10. Have you ever heard capacity building to groups of model families on business plan, small grant management, and proposal writing? What are they about?
11. How many model families developed their business plan and proposal to access small grant for operating their local products?
12. How many model families got grant based on their proposal?
13. Trend analysis for knowledge on biodiversity, resources, and capacity of villager.
14. Any meeting/conference with other stakeholder on natural resources conservation? who support?
15. Is there any change on your thinking about natural resources and environment, advocacy etc.?

Appendix 3: Guiding questions for stakeholder interview (3S Rivers Protection Network(3SPN), commune council, and village chief)

- 5 Do you know about CEBIC project? How would you say about that project? Could you please list down any example about good impact from the project?
- 6 Have you ever heard 3S Community network dialogue for advocacy coordination and information sharing among the communities? Who initiate this idea? What was about? How do you feel?
- 7 Could you explain what does environment, biodiversity, ecosystem, etc.?

8. Have you ever seen/hear about documents on good practices and case studies on biodiversity conservation as the results of implication activities within target sites? Who documented it? How do you feel on that document?

Appendix 4: Guiding questions for interviewing project team

1. Have you conducted any training? If so what are the topic of those training? Have you satisfied with those training? Why? If not satisfy, how can we improve it?
2. Are those training conducted as planned? If not, why?
3. How about dialogue? How many? What topics? Are satisfied with those dialogues? Why and why not?
4. What are material and tool for awareness raising? What are the methods for awareness raising?
5. Have you conducted livelihood enhancement? How can you say about this enhancement strategy? Does community happy with this? How do you know? How can you improve it in the future?
6. In general, how can you say about this project? Very success? Success? Not so success? Not success?
7. Could you please list down any example about good impact from the project?
8. Anything to add?

Appendix 5: Achievement on advocacy and dialogue programme

| N° | Main Activity | Date | Place | Achievement |
|----|--|-------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Sending youth community representative to attend the Youth Forum on Xayabouri dam in Lao PDR | 27/11/2011 | Phnom Penh City | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3SPN has sent 15 youth communities which 8 were women to attend the youth forum on Xayabouri dam in Phnom Penh city. • Regarding to this event, the 3S youth representative got more understanding on the Xayabouri dam situation and its negative impacts which will cause by this project. • More ever the 3S youth representative shared on the forum to other participants on real impacts experience which caused by hydropower dam on the Sesan and Srepok river area for more understanding. They also raised their concern regarding the Xayabouri project event they live in the 3S area, if something harmed to the Mekong it's surely harm to the 3S river too. |
| 2. | Sending communities representative to attend the first national conference on agriculture, energy and climate change | 1-2/12/2011 | Phnom Penh hotel, Phnom Penh city | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3SPN has sent 15 communities which 5 were women to attended the meaning full first national conference on agriculture, energy and climate change with more than 147 participants (44 women) attended this important national workshop, including community representatives from affected areas of Ratanakiri, Mondolkiri, Stung Treng, around Tole Sap, Mekong, and seashore area in an effort to provide an opportunity for all relevant stakeholders to find a win-win solution for the operation of the project. More ever, there are also participation representative from stakeholders such as department, ministry, company nationally and internationally. • This workshop brought together the communities, government, and development partners on LS2 dam development, and other relevant stakeholders to discuss on the quality of the EIA report and compensation and resettlement standard of the company • Community representative also reported that their communities could not accept the result of the EIA report because the company has not included or surveyed the communities located downstream or upstream. These communities will be impacts and the company needs to include or provide compensation for indirect impacts. "Our communities request to the company and Cambodian government, that if the Lower Sesan II dam must be built, please provide research or survey for the communities who are living downstream and upstream who will face indirect impacts from the project and provide real and suitable compensation for every impact." • And more ever the communities' representative from area who will be affect by the project read their joint statement of their concern around the Lower Sesan II dam and requests to the company and Cambodian government to find mechanism and solution to solve and mitigate the |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | impacts for those affected communities. |
| 3. | Collecting more information on Vietnamese worker in Lower Sesan II dam site | 12-14/1/2012 | Srekor and KbalRomeas village, Stung Treng province | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3SPN had sent 2 communities representative (advocacy team) to collected more information on Vietnamese workers came to work in the dam site of Lower Sesan II in Srekor and Kbalromeas village in Stung Treng province for more understanding. • In this information collection, the team found that the Vietnamese company sent their workers to work on Lower Sesan II dam site to high light and cut some trees on the reservoir of the dam in the two villages which made local communities very unhappy with their work because of they came without providing enough information for where they come from and what they are doing here. |
| 4. | 3S community meeting | 18-9/1/2012 26-27/6/2012 | 1 in Taveng district and 1 in 3SPN office | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were 66 communities representative which 16 were women to attended the 3S meeting to raise awareness community on advocacy work on Lower Sesan II dam, to set their own action plan for 3S community to advocate to find our best solution for themselves. More ever the meeting also provided capacity building to them on the good governance, FPIC and shared them on other recently information happening in the 3S area. • The meeting shared the communities on the information update of Lower Sesan II dam and its negative impacts which will cause by this project. • As the result meeting, all participants together shared about their living and problem they are facing to each other and raise up their concern and set up advocacy strategic plan for their advocacy work. • More ever, the capacity and collaboration between the 3S community in Ratanakiri and Stung Treng were strengthening through sharing information and discussion in during the meeting. |
| 5. | 3S community traditional praying ceremony | 28/2/2012 | Sreko village, Stung Treng province, at Lower Sesan II dam site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community representatives about more than 500 communities who will be affected by the Lower Sesan II dam joined together to perform a traditional praying ceremony to ask the Kor La Kann Spirit for help. The spirits response to communities' request that was that there will be no dam built in five years. Community representatives promised to offer a pig or buffalo to the spirit if this premonition comes true with two main objective of 1; wish for happiness and good health for all communities living along the Sesan and Srepok Rivers who are relying on environment and natural resources and 2; ask the spirit to soften the government's and company's heart to stop building Lower Sesan II dam and chose other option for electricity generation with the aim to avoid the negative impacts which will affect to communities who are living alongside of the Sesan and Srepok Rivers. • In the ceremony they prepared two parades, one by boats and by foot walks to spirit house at the dam site which |

| | | | | |
|----|---|-----------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>were full participation from local communities themselves. The two parades they would like to show the public to know the important of the river and spread out their concern regarding to the proposed dam project which they all willing to stay at their own house, do not want to move to another area.</p> |
| 6. | 3S celebration | 23/3/2012 | Srepok Thom village, SereyMongkol Commune, Kon Mom districts, Ratanakiri province | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The one-day event is held annually, and this years, the 10th gathering marked a special occasion for community to come together and highlight the achievements of the network throughout the past year, raise up their concern on negative impacts from dam and set the strategic plan for their advocacy work in the future with totally 450 participation. • The solidarity of the various communities continued after the initial speeches, when villagers marched down the one-kilometre stretch of main road in Fang commune, carrying banners, singing and chanting positive slogans emphasizing the importance of the river to their respective communities. Once community reached the Srepok Riverside, the group released around 5,000 fish spawns to increase future stocks. They also prayed for the future prosperity of those living along the river, while monks blessed the ceremony. • Then at the afternoon, the elders with all participants celebrate the village cleaning ceremony from the head of to the end of village to clean bad thing replace by good things coming to the village. • Anyway, they also prepare a joint statement together which will be sent to relevant stakeholder at locally, nationally and internationally. |
| 7. | Sending community to submit letter to Cambodian National Assembly | 14/2/2013 | Phnom Penh | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3SPN has supported the 13 communities' representative to submit their letter to Cambodian National Assembly in order to request for cancelling the Lower Sesan II dam in Stung Province. • The National Assembly has received community letter and promise to provide feedback answer later. |

Appendix 6: Term of Reference (ToR)

FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION, Community Empowerment for Biodiversity Conservation along the Sesan and Srepok River in the Mekong Basin

Save Cambodia's Wildlife (SCW) is seeking a National Consultant for final project evaluation - The Project is "Community Empowerment for Biodiversity Conservation along the Sesan and Srepok River in the Mekong Basin" within four District's (Lumphat, Koun Mom, Taveng and AndoungMeas), Ratanakiri Province, funded by Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) through Birdlife International.

Overall Objectives:

The overall goal of the final evaluation is to measure the outcome and impact of the project implemented in the last 3 years from the period of July 2010 to June 2013 that focus on Environment Education, Community-based Natural Resources Management, and Good Governance.

The National Consultant for final project evaluation will respond to the following objectives:

- Develop evaluation tools and methods for project evaluation,
- Analyze the outcome and impact of the project based on the concept paper, project log frame, baseline indicators and other determined reliable and relevant documents ,
- Synthesize a detailed evaluation report of the project named above.

Scopes of Work:

Upon consultation and agreement with the SCW, the consultant is requested to prepare the completed project evaluation processes and materials for data collection at field and partner meetings as required. The consultant will produce a complete quality final evaluation report with precise outputs.

Skills and Competencies:

- At least (5 years) of experience conducting project management and evaluation,
- Experience in the fields of biodiversity conservation, natural resource management, and good governance,
- Knowledge and experiences regarding participatory approaches,
- Being innovative and hold strong facilitation skills,
- Good interpersonal skills and able to deal with our diverse stakeholders.

Tentative Assignment Date:

The implementation period is from June 25th – to July 12nd, 2013 including preparation and field implementation. The date for submission of the completed project evaluation report is on July 17th, 2013.