

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	BirdLife International
Project Title:	Facilitating CEPF Investment in the Indochina Region of the Indo-Burma Hotspot through a Regional Implementation Team
Date of Report:	25 December 2013
Report Author and Contact Information	Jonathan Charles Eames OBE BirdLife International Mobile: +84(0)913239649 Jonathan.Eames@birdlife.org

CEPF Region: Indo-Burma

Strategic Direction: 4

Grant Amount: \$899,929.43

Project Dates: 1 July 2008 – 30 December 2013

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

The BirdLife Regional Implementation Team (RIT) have engaged with a range of stakeholders in each country of operation including Vietnam, Thailand, Lao PDR and Cambodia. A full range of grantees, including international NGOs, local NGOs, academic institutions, community groups have been reached out to inform them about CEPF funding opportunity, encouraged them to apply for grants, and assisted them with design, management, monitoring, reporting on and replicating conservation actions. The RIT have also promoted the engagement of civil society groups and individuals that were unlikely to be able to apply for grants directly, by encouraging larger applicants to include sub-granting and/or mentoring arrangements in their proposals.

The RIT have engaged a range of stakeholders in grant making through 'Technical Review Groups' and 'National Advisory Groups' in each country including experienced international and local conservation practitioners or academics responsible for technical review of proposals and overseeing the strategic evolution of the CEPF portfolio in each country. These two groups have promoted stakeholder participation and ensured increased ability to mitigate conflicts of interest.

Also, we have involved more than 120 representatives from donors, partners, grantees and non grantees in the Grantee workshop for the first phase of investment in Indo-Burma in Phnom Penh, Cambodia in March 2013.

Conservation Impacts

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

The CEPF Ecosystem Profile was based on consultations in 2003 and the updating process was conducted in June 2011 – January 2012 on four thematic studies (literature review, interviews, small group meetings).

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

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

The project will help realise the vision for CEPF investment laid out in the Ecosystem Profile. This vision is of a programme of CEPF investment that delivers long-term conservation and poverty alleviation benefits beyond the five-year investment period.

The project will proactively engage with CEPF grantees during the proposal preparation and project implementation stages, to ensure that the long-term sustainability of individual projects is maximised. Project components that grantees could be encouraged to include or strengthen include: documenting lessons learned and preparing best-practice guidelines; strengthening the capacity of government, local community or indigenous civil society partners; developing long-term funding strategies for site-conservation initiatives; effecting lasting changes, such as mainstreaming biodiversity into other policy sectors; and leveraging additional resources from projects and programmes in other sectors.

The project will also provide direct support to local civil society organisations in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam with proposal preparation. This will strengthen their fund-raising capacity, thereby assisting them to consolidate achievements supported by CEPF and secure funding for follow-on activities. Moreover, the project will forge partnerships among civil society organisations to implement projects. This will facilitate networking, mutual support and information sharing, and, thereby, help the achievements of the CEPF investment programme to be replicated and sustained.

Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:

The project has helped realise the vision for CEPF investment laid out in the Ecosystem Profile. This vision is of a programme of CEPF investment that delivers long-term conservation and poverty alleviation benefits beyond the five-year investment period.

The project has proactively engaged with CEPF grantees during the proposal preparation and project implementation stages, to ensure that the long-term sustainability of individual projects is maximised.

The project has also provided direct support to local civil society organisations in Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam with proposal preparation. This helped strengthen their fund-raising capacity, thereby assisting them to consolidate achievements supported by CEPF and secure funding for follow-on activities. Moreover, the project promoted partnerships among civil society organisations to implement projects.

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

To pro-actively drive the development of a CEPF investment portfolio in the Indochina Region that realises the vision set out in the Ecosystem Profile, and build a broad constituency of civil society organisations working across institutional and geographical boundaries towards achieving shared conservation goals, while ensuring effective coordination with the CEPF Secretariat on all aspects of implementation.

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

After five years the RIT operating in Indochina, it has facilitated 43 large and 83 small grants. To date, projects under these grants in the hotspot have identified and/or secured core populations of 47 globally threatened species, with local conservation teams being put in place for 11 of them, and nest protection schemes for nine. Protection and management have been strengthened for

more than 1.5 million hectares across 24 key biodiversity areas in the hotspot, and new protected areas, covering more than 34,000 hectares, have been established. Outside of protected areas, conservation goals have been integrated into more than 160,000 hectares of production landscapes, and civil society networks have raised concerns about the social, environmental and economic implications of hydropower dam development on the Mekong River and its major tributaries, and helped affected communities voice their concerns. As well as benefiting from strengthened voice, more than 100 local communities across the hotspot have received direct benefits from sustainable use of natural resources.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: 2,105,874 ha
Species Conserved: At least 28 species
Corridors Created:

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

N/a.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

N/a

Project Components

Project Components: *Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

Component 1 Planned: Regional Implementation Team (RIT) for the Indochina Region operationalised.

Component 1 Actual at Completion:

The RIT was established in July 2008 and appropriately qualified staff recruited and trained. The office was also established, and effective management and accounting procedures in place within three months of start of project. Financial reports and RIT performance reports were submitted to CEPF in the required formats and according to the schedule specified in the contract. Programmatic audits were conducted annually, and RIT audits conducted after first and third full calendar years of implementation.

Component 2 Planned: CEPF promoted as a funding mechanism among all sections of civil society, and expectations of potential applicants managed

Component 2 Actual at Completion:

Outreach activities were conducted to raise profile of CEPF, the ecosystem profile publicised, and application process clarified. Civil society organisations and other key stakeholders active in biodiversity conservation in Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, and Lao PDR were aware of CEPF launch and calls for proposals. Stakeholders were updated on progress of CEPF investment strategy and CEPF's new small and large grants, funded project progress, CEPF grantees workshop and site visits via the BirdLife's website and quarterly newsletter, The Babbler, the mailing lists, Facebook and Twitter pages. Achievements and lessons learned by the RIT in Indo-

Burma was also presented by BirdLife during the BirdLife World Congress, the world's largest civil society partnership for nature with attendees from over 120 countries, held in Ottawa, Canada from 19 to 22 June.

Component 3 Planned: Strategic guidance provided to potential applicants to ensure that proposals to CEPF are consistent with the investment strategy and coordinated with each other and with investments by other donors

Component 3 Actual at Completion:

By the end of the project, four calls for Lols have been issued with deadlines for submission set. Also, CEPF funding was approved for projects under all investment priorities and within both priority corridors. Supervision mission was conducted annually by the Grant Director.

Component 4 Planned: Assistance with design, management, monitoring, reporting on and replicating conservation actions provided to local civil society organisations in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam on a needs basis

Component 4 Actual at Completion:

Summary of investment strategy, eligibility criteria and application process in English and the relevant local language was prepared and sent to local civil society organisations in Vietnam, Thailand, Lao PDR and Cambodia. By the end of the project 30 local and grassroots civil society organisations have been engaged in CEPF projects via sub-granting or mentoring by larger organisations. Hands-on assistance with project design, management, monitoring, reporting and/or replication was provided to more than 30 local and grassroots civil society organisations by end of project.

Component 5 Planned: Internal and external reviews of grant applications carried out

Component 5 Actual at Completion:

Technical review of all small grant Lols was conducted by at least two experts within six weeks of submission while this review of all core grant LOIs conducted by at least three experts within six weeks of submission. National Advisory Group meetings were held annually and endorsement of list of small grants proposed for approval by the RIT. Internal review of all full proposals was completed within six weeks of submission.

Component 6 Planned: Small grants awarded and contracting carried out, and recommendations on core grant applications provided to the CEPF Secretariat

Component 6 Actual at Completion:

Four calls for proposals have successful announced, all documentation of contracted projects uploaded onto GEM. All small grants were published in the newsletter and shared via the mailing lists. Recommendations on core grant applications were provided to the Grant Director.

Component 7 Planned: CEPF investments monitored and evaluated at project and portfolio levels

Component 7 Actual at Completion:

Simple indicators for monitoring the biodiversity and socio-economic impacts of investments in the Indochina Region were selected (METT). Totally, by the end of the project capacity of 25 civil society organisations have been piloted by the tracking tool, of which 12 organisations are in Cambodia, nine in Vietnam, two in Laos and two in Thailand. The project officers and finance

officer kept tracks on all grantees' reporting timeline and manage to review and approve reports within four weeks. Site visits to all core grant and small grant projects have been conducted to review implementation and evaluate any requested modifications to project design. All site visit reports have been completed and uploaded on GEM. The grantee workshop for the first phase of investment in Indo-Burma was held in Phnom Penh, Cambodia in three days, 25-27 March 2013. More than 120 representatives from donors, partners, grantees and non grantees have attended the event, sharing project results, lesson learned and providing feedback on the programme. They also provided helpful comments on the grant making process and Lol or proposal form development.

Component 8 Planned: Results and lessons learned documented and disseminated through a communication and replication strategy

Component 8 Actual at Completion:

Implementation of the communication and replication strategy achieved 100% (26 activities). Some grantees have participated in an exchange visit to at least one CEPF project of particular interest to them by end of project such as the site visit (18-22 Mar 2013) to Stung Treng Ramsar site and Central Mekong prior the CEPF Grantees Workshop for the first phase of investment in Indo-Burma involved the most donors and grantees: the Ministry of Environment of Japan and the Margaret A. Cargill Foundation) joined staff from the CEPF Secretariat, the BirdLife RIT and six CEPF grantees (WWF Cambodia, the Cambodian Rural Development Team (CRDT), Community Economic Development (CED), Conservation International, WorldFish Center and International Rivers. Some other site visits in Cambodia often involved two grantees working on the same area or implementing similar activities in order to share experiences and lesson learned. Totally, 15 publications relating project results have been collected and shared through The Babbler whenever it is possible.

Component 9 Planned: Additional investment leveraged for conservation outcomes in the Indochina Region through partnerships at project and portfolio levels

Component 9 Actual at Completion:

Totally, US \$ 7,261,312.48 in co-financing has been leveraged, of which \$1,366,666.48 are for small grant projects and \$5,894,646.00 are for large grant projects.

Were any components unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

None.

Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

None.

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.

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

None.

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

None.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

None.

Additional Funding

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 the CEPF investment in this project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

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

- 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.)*

Sustainability/Replicability

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

None.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

None.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

Together with CEPF, the RIT monitored compliance with safeguard policies, ensuring that all necessary safeguard monitoring reports were submitted prior to closing out grants. All grants have complied with the safeguards, and no issues of concern were identified.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

None.

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: Jonathan Charles Eames OBE
Organization name: BirdLife International
Mailing address:
Tel: +84(0)913239649
Fax:
E-mail: Jonathan.Eames@birdlife.org

*****If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages*****

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets

(Enter Grant Term)

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

Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	Yes		36,129 ha	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?	Yes		34,044 ha	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.	Yes		2,105,874 ha across 28 KBAs	
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	N/a			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	Yes		105 communities	

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:			Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance.	Other		
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities										Payment for environmental services	
Total																						

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

