



CEPF Final Project Completion Report

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

Organization Legal Name	<i>Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust</i>
Project Title	Embedding Sustainable Community Management Practices at Key Sarus Crane Wetlands in the Cambodian Lower Mekong
Grant or GEM Number	64120
Date of Report	9 th June 2017

CEPF Hotspot: Indo-Burma

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 1. Safeguard priority globally threatened species by mitigating major threats

Grant Amount: US\$200,000.00

Project Dates: 1/4/2014 – 31/3/2017

PART I: Overview

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

BirdLife International, Cambodia Programme (Birdlife) have supported the administrative facilitation of the project, provided office space and in-country support for staff, and have been the direct point of contact for Chamroen Chiet Khmer (CCK), a primarily Khmer speaking organization. WWT have worked under BirdLife's MoU with the government. Through this MoU, Birdlife have played an important role as the first point of contact with the Ministry of Environment. Birdlife have also provided strategic advice on mechanisms for liaison with external stakeholders, and have introduced project team members to a wide-ranging network of local people and organisations who have given input to our project.

Chamroen Chiet Khmer (CCK) have delivered elements of the community-based conservation and livelihoods work at Boeung Prek Lapouv (BPL) Protected Landscape and have been the direct point of contact with community groups, especially for Community Fisheries and the Sarus Crane Rice sustainable farming groups. CCK have also led on the development of water management features at BPL, linked to retaining water for longer in attempts to ameliorate the impact of the many artificial canals draining water rapidly from the reserve after the wet season.

CCK have delivered environmental awareness linking all WWT conservation interventions with the message of healthy wetlands for healthy people.

Mlup Baitong (MB) have supported livelihood work at Anlung Pring (AP) Protected Landscape and deliver environmental education programmes through established courses and the creation of eco-gardens in school grounds. Livelihood work has focused on sustainable and alternative farming demonstration sites, community-based savings groups and ecotourism. They have long-established relationships with local community institutions and were initially instrumental in building trust and solving any disputes after the creation of the Protected Area. The Mlup Baitong project finished well before this WWT project so we have inherited many of these roles over the last year.

2. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

Anlung Pring and Boeung Prek Lapouv Protected Landscapes represent some of the few remaining seasonally inundated grasslands in the Lower Mekong Delta. Over the last three years, this CEPF funded project has supported community-based management mechanisms for local people to accrue benefits from the Protected Landscapes. Ecotourism programmes and community fisheries are now functioning and showing evidence to support progress towards their clearly defined goals. Regular patrolling, enforcement and awareness has increased understanding of the areas protected status and the ecosystem services that it supports whilst minimizing the impact of key and ongoing threats. The creation of community wetlands and schools education programmes has contributed to increased goodwill and sustainable farming partnerships have shown positive progress to improve livelihoods and decrease harmful chemical inputs to the natural environment. The approach taken by this project has informed the production of best-practice wise-use guidelines for wetlands at a national level.

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

List each long-term impact from Grant Writer proposal

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

Impact Description	Impact Summary
Both Boeung Prek Lapouv (BPL) (8305ha) and Anlung Pring (AP) (217ha) "Management and Conservation Areas for Sarus Crane and Other Birds" are being sustainably co-managed by local people in ways which improve local livelihoods, enhance wetland biodiversity and protect the Sarus crane population	The Community-based ecotourism group at Anlung Pring (AP) has a clear and established governance structure, benefit share system to help fund Local Community Group (LCG) patrolling, and has been granted official rights to accrue income from tourists visiting the reserve. Early income has exceeded initial targets and the benefit share system is providing revenue for the administration and operations of the group, whilst also making financial contributions to the management of the reserve. Additional value-added activities have created income opportunities amongst the wider community. Local people understand the

	<p>sustainability of the programme is inextricably linked to a healthy wetland with a healthy population of sarus crane.</p> <p>The designation of Romenth North Community Fishery (CFi) created a co-management system for this natural resource within and around Boeung Prek Lapouv (BPL) Sarus Crane Reserve protected area. Alongside a second CFi at Kampong Krasang, the communities have worked with local government to decrease illegal fishing and restore inundated forest nursery habitat. The change in overarching government authority (from the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries to the MoE) resulted in the rescinding of formal rights CFi rights in area within the Protected Landscape. The project is working with the MoE to ensure CFi rights will be incorporated into a new zoning model for the reserve so that the progress made during this project can continue into the future. Sixty famers within the former 'Buffer Zone' of the Protected Area have converted to sustainable rice farming practices, with increased profitability, decreased chemical inputs, and signed agreements in place for zero encroachment.</p>
<p>The sites are being used to demonstrate wise-use sustainable management to Cambodian (and other) wetland managers</p>	<p>Guidance for the Wise Use of Freshwater Wetlands in Cambodia has been developed alongside wetland managers, the environmental sector, development organisations, multiple government departments and local community groups. A study tour to BPL was held to demonstrate integrated approaches to wetland management at the site. Wetland Site Managers from across the country attended a finalization and dissemination workshop and have access to the guidance. The guidance has been supported by the Ministry of Environment and is awaiting a foreword from the Minister, after which it will be shared with the Indo-Burma Ramsar Regional Initiative as an example of easily accessible practical guidance.</p> <p>BPL has been used as a case study for the Ramsar Wetland Disease Manual, with a Wetland Health Assessment completed at the site.</p>

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

Impact Description	Impact Summary
<p>Capacity of local communities to participate in sustainable protected area management will have been increased; community representatives will share decision-making responsibilities with other stakeholders</p>	<p>Anlung Pring Community-based Ecotourism (CBET) Group is fully functioning and accruing income from crane viewing and value added activities. There is a clear governance structure and members have decided upon and documented all roles and responsibilities. Training has been given in hospitality, financial management, critical thinking, leadership, management, safety and security, and bespoke operational management. At an end-of-training test, 93% of all questions were answered to an acceptable or higher level. The CBET is supported by a voluntary a-political Board to review progress and provide ongoing support into the future.</p> <p>Multi-stakeholder cooperation between local community associations, government departments and project partners has led to the creation of Illegal Fishing Crackdown, and Land Tenure Review committees. These platforms have helped to build belief that major challenges can be addressed. Newly established Community Fisheries have been granted legal rights to control certain areas for natural resource management and supported to implement patrolling and re-create nursery habitat areas. Farming groups have been supported with training and equipment and have improved yields whilst decreasing chemical inputs. No land encroachment was recorded by any members of our Sarus Crane Rice Group.</p>
<p>Reserve demarcation will be completed and local people will have a clear understanding of protected area regulations and values</p>	<p>Reserve demarcation is complete and clear at Anlung Pring. Awareness of the Protected Area and associated rules and regulations is high, with over 80% of people surveyed around each site aware of the illegality of all major wetland threats at both sites.</p> <p>Plans for reserve demarcation at Boeung Prek Lapouv had to be reviewed after the transfer of government management authority from MAFF to MoE. Under the MoE system, previous 'core' and 'buffer' zones were amalgamated into one until a formal zoning process is completed. WWT will support this process over the next year. Habitat restoration area (e.g. restored inundated forests)</p>

	<p>and water management trial feature are clearly marked with signs clearly explaining the purpose, rules and regulations.</p>
<p>Biological and hydrological data collection protocols will be in place and data is being used to inform management</p>	<p>Collection protocols are in place and data collection has been ongoing throughout the project. Data on water quality at Anlung Pring has been accepted for publication in the Cambodian Journal of Natural History (In Press – June 2017) and the results have influenced the transition away from high-intensity shrimp farming directly around the Protected Landscape. Water level monitoring has been assessing the effectiveness of new water management trial features and feeding into Water Management Group decision making (e.g. control of the sluice gate separating the northern and southern sections of the reserve).</p> <p>Biodiversity and human use data has guided adaptive management of the alien species programme, identified and confirmed the successful maintenance of priority habitat, and assisted the illegal fishing committee. All data will be used during the upcoming zoning process.</p>
<p>Seasonally-inundated grasslands and associated aquatic habitats/fauna at both sites will be less threatened by unsustainable/illegal activities</p>	<p>Land-use around AP has shifted to lower intensity shrimp farming resulting in improvements to water quality between 2016 and 2017. The Local Community Groups and Rangers recorded no illegal activities within AP during the final six months of the project and habitat condition has remained stable. The new community-use wetland created at a nearby village has decreased direct daily pressure on the Protected Landscape. Local community members are benefiting from the presence of the sarus crane through the community-based ecotourism scheme.</p> <p>Sixty farmers at BPL have participated in a programme to convert to systems of sustainable rice intensification. This has shown to be more profitable than previously used practices and members also benefit from access to cooperatively-owned central equipment. These benefits have so far been sufficient to halt encroachment into the protected area by members of this group. Land encroachment is however still a major threat in areas outside of the</p>

	<p>sarus crane rice group (see next box below</p> <p>Illegal fishing methods have decreased at BPL Protected Landscape after the creation and support of legally recognized CFis and restoration of habitat and the Illegal Fishing Crackdown committee.</p>
<p>Incidents of illegal conversion of wetlands to rice fields will have declined</p>	<p>No illegal conversion has occurred with AP.</p> <p>Several attempts of illegal conversion were made at BPL and the Local Community Groups (LCGs) have reported that this threat appears to have increased during the final year of the project. The uncertainty caused by the transition of management authority from MAFF to MoE was seized upon by farmers (outside of the Sarus Crane Rice group) to increase the hectareage of land that they are farming within the protected landscape. WWT has supported the creation of a Land Tenure Review committee to review all land claims inside the Protected Area prior to the MoE zoning process. It is very disappointing to see an increase in encroachment, but the MoE Protected Landscape framework does offer the opportunity to address the ongoing land-disputes at BPL and create a more realistic and fair integrated landscape which local people can support.</p>
<p>Sarus crane numbers are stable or increasing at both sites</p>	<p>The national population of sarus crane has decreased sharply during the period of this project. From regional censuses conducted in March/April each year, the number has decreased from 671 in 2014 to 379 in 2016 (data from 2017 is not yet available).</p> <p>The report from Darwin University suggests that the level of threat is increasing in the breeding areas, but the links to the El Nino climate cycle and natural annual variations are also poorly understood at present. WWT has been involved in a regional action planning process to work towards better understanding in this area.</p> <p>In Dec 2016, BPL and AP were home to over 70 % of the total population. At BPL the population decreased from 203 (2014) to 152 (2016) and population at AP decreased from 314 (2014) – 172 (2016). At both sites, the population actually</p>

	increased in 2015 (234 and 321 respectively), so the 2016 figure may be an anomaly, caused by extraordinary weather that year.
--	--

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

The two main challenges were the extreme weather conditions and the major government level change to the Protected Area management system and support network. The El Nino global weather cycle caused a severe disruption and drought in Cambodia during 2015-16. The Cambodian National Committee for Disaster Management estimated that 2.5 million people were left without safe drinking water and/or experienced water shortages for farming. This placed a strain on local community members at our sites and also led to the protected areas experiencing shorter wet seasons. The main affect that this had on Impacts was the dramatic decline in sarus crane numbers. This is however a national trend and data showed that BPL and AP were both very important feeding grounds during this period.

The transfer in the management authority at BPL from a Sarus Crane Reserve under the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries to a Protected Landscape under the Ministry of Environment created uncertainty and the site. The protracted process caused confusion for local community groups, especially the community fisheries who lost formal rights to operate in the reserve. In reality the community fishery could informally continue at the site but progress to establish efficient patrolling and models for financial sustainability were delayed. Land encroachment increased during this period, but this was the bringing to the surface of an ongoing dispute around land tenure at the site and had catalyzed the creation of a land tenure review committee. This process may indeed be beneficial for the future conservation management of the site, but it did lead to unpredicted habitat loss. Our LCG teams were able to report and address some threats, but much great law enforcement support was needed.

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

The prolonged dry season at BPL probably contributed to the first recorded successful hatching of a Bengal florican at the site.

PART II: Project Components and Products/Deliverables

6. Components (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer

Component 1 – Enhanced protection of Sarus Crane population in BPL and AP protected areas

1.1. Local people's awareness of the two protected areas and associated regulations is increased

1.2. Protected area regulations enforced by Local Conservation Groups (LCGs) and other community members to prevent disturbance to and illegal exploitation of cranes and wetland resources

1.3. Protected area management effectiveness tracking tool (SP1 METT) scores for BPL and AP reserves show an increase over the project period (using final METT from phase 1 project as the baseline)

Component 2 – Enhanced management of seasonally-inundated grasslands and associated habitats at BPL and AP

2.1. Site management plans implemented (first three years of 2014 - 2018 plans)

2.2. Water level management plans (WLMP) in place by yr 2 and being implemented by yr 3 at both BPL and AP agreed with stakeholders through participatory working methods

2.3. New data available to inform site management as a result of research activities undertaken by WWT(Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust)/partners/stakeholders at BPL and AP

Component 3 – Capacity of local communities and government to participate in sustainable co-management of the Protected Areas increased

3.1. Sustainable farming partnership projects established at 6 sites (3 within BPL, 3 adjacent to AP) by yr 1 by WWT (with support from Mlup Baitong (MB)/Chamroen Chiet Khmer (CCK)/BirdLife). These sites will be based on individual farms (as a minimum) or groups of farms where conditions allow.

3.2. Sustainable tourism development and marketing (STDM) strategy produced for AP in partnership with MB by yr 1 using participatory working methods and implemented from yr2

3.3. Community fisheries establishment (by yr 1) and development at BPL by CCK supported by WWT (leading on management plan development and inputs of technical advice)

3.4. Community liaison, discussion and reporting mechanisms and structures for BPL and AP established by yr 1

3.5. Two Community Officers and two Technical Officers (a total of four Wetland apprentices) trained and supported by WWT and partners, complete 30 month wetland management apprenticeship

Component 4 – Projects delivered by WWT, CCK, MB and other partners are coordinated effectively and results and learning disseminated appropriately.

4.1. Project delivery is coordinated effectively by WWT

4.2. Partners' capacity to deliver project objectives and activities is supported and enhanced

4.3. Compliance with CEPF social safeguard policies monitored and reported to CEPF every 6 months

4.4. Opportunities for disseminating learning identified and capitalised upon

6. Describe the results for each deliverable:

Component		Deliverable		
#	Description	Sub-#	Description	Results for Deliverable
1	Enhanced protection of Sarus Crane population in BPL and AP protected areas	1.1	Local people's awareness of the two protected areas and associated regulations is increased	<p>The percentage of people aware that Anlung Pring (AP) and Boeung Prek Lapouv (BPL) had official protection as Protected Landscapes increased from 82% to 96% and 68% to 93% respectfully between 2014 and 2017. This is a positive indication that awareness interventions and community integration have been successful for the project.</p> <p>In AP, awareness of the two main local threats to the reserve was strong, with <90% of respondents knowing that it was illegal to poison birds and start fires. 92% of people knew that regulated use was allowed within the reserve and 86% of respondents knew that it was illegal to hunt birds. There is generally good support for, and understanding of conservation protection at AP. The change in status from Sarus Crane Reserve (under MAFF) to a Protected Landscape (MoE) has resulted in very few changes for this site, with regulations staying largely the same.</p> <p>In BPL 75% of respondents said that wetlands are important for their livelihoods. This was a statisticall significant, if small, increase from 67% at the start of the project. The change in status from Sarus Crane Reserve (under MAFF) to a Protected Landscape (MoE) has caused a lot of confusion around permitted and illegal activities. Of the activities that have been illegal both pre and post management authority transfer, 88% of respondents knew that it was illegal to hunt birds, 92% knew it was illegal to poison birds, 94% knew it was illegal to start fires. There was some confusion around fishing, where only 72% knew that it was legal to fish using sustainable techniques. This was surprising after recorded messages were played, and information panels erected in all ten villages that were part of Koh Andet CFI. Further interrogation of these results showed that the majority of confusion is in the predominantly rice-farming communities away from the established Community Fishery areas and respondents were unlikely to fish in the reserve.</p>
		1.2	Protected area regulations enforced by Local Conservation Groups (LCGs)	This has been ongoing throughout the project. To meet the framework of the new MoE Protected Landscape system, the LCG was split up into a local ranger team for law regulation enforcement and a field monitoring team to focus on biodiversity monitoring. At AP the regular patrolling and community engagement work have resulted in zero illegal exploitation

		<p>and other community members to prevent disturbance to and illegal exploitation of cranes and wetland resources</p>	<p>activities over the last six months. Any previous illegal activity before that has been minor and is normally resolved through clear explanations of the rules and regulations. No persecution of cranes was recorded in the wider area.</p> <p>Neighbouring shrimp farms around AP increased in scale and intensity at the start of the project after they were taken over by a Vietnamese company. The ranger teams discovered that the new farmers had been releasing polluted water into the reserve by damaging the dyke around the reserve and, in a few cases installing small sluice gates to control water levels. This led to an investigation into water quality (see Section 2.3 below). Awareness initiatives by the LCGs and sharing results of this investigation led to conversion to more sustainable practices.</p> <p>The size of BPL makes patrolling a consistent challenge. A team of six permanent staff have conducted regular patrols through the reserve (at least 12 patrols per month). The project set up a multi-stakeholder illegal fishing crackdown committee and supported associated action parties and Community Fishery patrolling. This has made an contribution to combatting illegal activities, with 85% of people (from a representative social survey of 234 households) reporting that external illegal fishing pressures have decreased.</p> <p>Only six incidences of burning have been recorded since the beginning of 2016, mainly for honey collection and rat catching. No incidences of crane hunting were recorded or reported, and bird hunting is infrequent, with only three significant incidences recorded since the beginning of 2016. In two of these cases the offenders were not found.</p>
	1.3	<p>Protected area management effectiveness tracking tool (SP1 METT) scores for BPL and AP reserves show an increase over the project period (using final METT from phase 1 project as the baseline)</p>	<p>At the end of this project the Ramsar-adapted Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool was preferred to the METT due to its specific relevance to wetlands. There is however significant overlap so this reporting compares the scores for all areas where direct comparison is possible.</p> <p>The adapted R-METT score for BPL Protected Landscape has increased from 58% (2013) to 68% (2017) demonstrating an increase in protected area management effectiveness for BPL. Areas where the score had increased included resource inventory, security of budget, education and awareness, state and commercial neighbours, local communities.</p> <p>The adapted R-METT score for AP Protected Landscape has</p>

				increased from 69.69% (2013) to 78.79% (2017). Areas where the most significant improvement had been gained was in visitor facilities, commercial tourism operators, staffing, equipment, protection systems and site objectives.
2	Enhanced management of seasonally-inundated grasslands and associated habitats at BPL and AP	2.1	Site management plans implemented (first three years of 2014 - 2018 plans)	<p>Site management plans were followed throughout the project. Management frameworks were maintained and remained relevant until the change of Protected Area status (MAFF to MoE). At this point a meeting was held with all local stakeholders and the Department of Freshwater Conservation of the MoE. New reporting frameworks were confirmed for both sites and the Site Manager and site-based ranger teams were given new roles and responsibility descriptions. Communication at BPL is ongoing to create a new zoning scheme and associated management plan.</p> <p>The translation has not been seamless, with a long period of uncertainty creating instability for those responsible for direct conservation management of the site. The Management Plan at Anlung Pring was largely unaffected and the action plan continued as scheduled. Anlung Pring is a small site and the entirety will be transferred to become a single zone site with full 'core' protection throughout.</p> <p>At Boeung Prek Lapouv, the change of status will have more significant implications. Up until the point of management transfer, the management plan was largely being followed. Our adaptive management approach led to the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The original plan suggested a focus on sustainable harvesting fishery quotas, but an initial independent consultancy recognized that illegal external pressures were having a much more significant effect than unsustainable harvesting by local people. Therefore emphasis was shifted to illegal fishing crackdown groups, involving the newly established Community Fisheries, law enforcement groups, the LCGs and the Forestry and Fishery Administrations. - The Land Tenure Programme to transfer land rights to local communities was originally abandoned due to a lack of support from the two District Governors controlling land within BPL. This was partly due to the complex land-use history of the site, creating areas of land with conflicting individual land-claims, and the political sensitives in the build up to local elections. The passing of these elections and the transfer to an MoE Protected Landscape does however now offer increased opportunity to address this issue in a fair and transparent way through

			<p>a land tenure review committee (this has been established and is being supported by the Provincial Governor and Ministry of Environment) and new zoning scheme.</p> <p>It should be noted at this point that key grassland habitats have remained in a similar condition from the start until the end of this project.</p> <p>There has however been land encroachment towards the edges of the Protected Landscape, especially during the transition of government management authority. It is hoped that the land tenure review committee will help to address this threat.</p> <p>A Wetland Health Risk Assessment was completed in 2017 to provide the managers of BPL with information about key health risks, their impacts, and provide mitigation options with actions that will effectively reduce the risks to domestic livestock, wildlife and people.</p>
	2.2	Water level management plans (WLMP) in place by yr 2 and being implemented by yr 3 at both BPL and AP agreed with stakeholders through participatory working methods	<p>A Water Level Management Group (WLMG) is established at Anlung Pring. Together with project partners, the WLMG has developed a water management plan and monitoring protocol. The project has supported this group and management plan by providing digital elevation models of the site, water analysis of the hydrologically isolated northern and southern sections (assessments throughout the year in; Jan 2016, Mar 2016, May 2016, Nov 2016, Mar 17), repair of the main sluice gate at the site (completed by the Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology), installation of water level gauges, and data collection by the community. The Water Level Management Group is now directly responsible for controlling water levels at the site (by-law created in Oct 2016) and is advised by WWT and Birdlife.</p> <p>At BPL digital elevation models have fed into a Hydrology Management Protocol. Water level gauges have been installed and a 16 hectare water management trial established to investigate methods to retain water in the site for longer once the flood water recedes. This has been necessary due to the increasingly rapid anthropogenic drainage from the site. Early results indicate that the soil at the trial site is highly porous, so blocking infrequently used canals may be necessary to prevent water leaching away. Lessons learnt from this trial will be integrated into future MoE Management Planning at the site.</p>
	2.3	New data	Annual crane reports completed by PhD candidate at Charles

			<p>available to inform site management as a result of research activities undertaken by WWT(Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust)/partners/ stakeholders at BPL and AP</p>	<p>Darwin University with results shared at Annual Liaison Panel meetings for each site and submitted to MoE. Biodiversity and human use data collected by LCGs throughout the project period to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guide decisions made by Illegal Fishing Crackdown Committee. Data on methods of illegal fishing, spatial and temporal activity hotspots, indirect species disturbance. - Input to Water Level Management Groups. Data on water level changes throughout the year and effectiveness of water management trials. - Feed into Community-based Ecotourism interpretation material, spreading awareness about the ecological value of the site. - Influence invasive species clearance programme and review effectiveness. The main species' of focus were <i>Mimosa pigra</i>, <i>Ipomoea rubens</i>, <i>Nelumbo nucifera</i> and <i>Eichhornia crassipes</i>. The dominant species was <i>Mimosa pigra</i> where results showed that we were achieving 92.23% stem mortality and 7.77% stem re-growth after one year. <p>Data collected on water quality at Anlung Pring guided local government action to pressure Vietnamese businesses to abandon high intensity shrimp farming due to the detrimental impact that the effluent was having on water quality inside the protected area. The project has investigated alternative uses of these areas, but these were of little interest to the foreign-owned company who moved their operations. The area is back in the hands of local people who we are supporting to develop sustainable farming on the sites.</p> <p>Other data collected to feed into management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land Elevation survey (2015), - Attitude surveys (2014 & 2017), - AP land use and ownership mapping (2015), - BPL soil analysis (2016), - BPL and AP plant communities (2015 and follow-up in 2017) - Local business assessment (completed by a Norton University student) at AP tourism site.
3	Capacity of local communities and governm	3.1	Sustainable farming partnership projects established at 6	<p>We have exceeded our target for the number of Sustainable Farming Partnerships sites in an attempt to cascade knowledge around new techniques to a great number of villages.</p>

	ent to participate in sustainable co-management of the Protected Areas increased		<p>sites (3 within BPL, 3 adjacent to AP) by yr 1 by WWT (with support from Mlup Baitong (MB)/Chamroen Chiet Khmer (CCK)/BirdLife). These sites will be based on individual farms (as a minimum) or groups of farms where conditions allow.</p>	<p>At AP, Mlup Baitong were supported to develop three sustainable rice Farmer Field Schools (FFS) at locations on main access routes into villages around the reserve. All farmers included in these schemes agree to become FFS ambassadors and share information with other community members interested in the programme. FFS have also been incorporated into MB's ecoschools programme. Three vegetable growing demonstration sites, a domestic fowl Farmer Producer Groups and a Lepironia Farmer Producer Group have also been set up. The latter provides lepironia for ecotourism handicrafts. 35 households directly benefit from sustainable farming projects at AP but the number of others adopting new techniques due to the demonstration sites has not been quantified.</p> <p>At BPL, two Sarus Crane Rice Groups have been set up, each comprising 30 people around three villages (Keo Kamleung, Banteay Thleay and Chroy Pon). Each SCRG has received 10 training session on good agriculture practice, received improved seeds and inputs and are members of a cooperatively owned equipment scheme, with preferential access to drum seeders, a rice oven and seed selector. Each SCGR has an associated community-based savings scheme. A Trainer group has been established who are intended to teach new members in the future. All members join a harvest festival at the end of each year, to celebrate the methods they have used and to complete the monitoring of their inputs. Profitability of new techniques was on average 40.4% greater than traditional techniques, mainly due to the lower investment required in quantity of seed and volumes of fertilizer and pesticide. A value chain analysis has been completed to review further benefit systems to members of these group and attract organic growth of the concept.</p> <p>A Buffalo Bank was created at BPL to provide alternative livelihoods for one of the poorest villages. Seven households signed agreements to manage project buffalo. Each of the six female buffalo have now produced two offspring, which have been shared out equitably amongst all households within the village. Part of the condition of the agreement is to ensure that there is zero land encroachment around the village.</p>
		3.2	Sustainable tourism development and marketing (STDM) strategy	Community-based Ecotourism (CBET) is now fully established at AP and benefit sharing system established and implemented. WWT has completed many additional activities to ensure the successful completion of this element of the programme, especially during the final year of the project once Mlup Baitong ended their CEPF-

			<p>produced for AP in partnership with MB by yr 1 using participatory working methods and implemented from yr2</p>	<p>funded project. A new CBET Centre and restaurant have been established, improvements have been made to the ranger station and viewing platform, eight homestays have been equipped and supported to become operational, and additional cultural products (traditional fishing, rice wine distillery, leperonia weaving, Khmer noodle making) have been created to attract tourists when the crane is not present on site.</p> <p>Tourism management board was established to supervise the tourism operation and ensure transparency and fairness. CBET have 55 members who have been trained and have received benefit over the first season of tourism operation.</p> <p>Marketing targeted to individual tourists and tour agents has proved successful, exceeding our targeted revenue from the site. In the last two months of the project a total of 172 people visited the Anlung Pring CBET project. US\$674.81 was raised for Reserve management.</p> <p>Marketing strategy implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Logo & brand developed - Website developed with linked facebook and instagram (www.mekongcrane.com), additional online marketing and filtering completed. - Marketing material produced for crane season and distributed: 2 A3 leaflets, A4 & A3 Tuk Tuk card, Business cards, A4 leaflet. Focus distribution in Kep & Kampot - Marketing material produced for off-season and distributed: 1 A3 poster & 1 A4 leaflet. Focus distribution Kep, Kampot, Sihanoukville & Phnom Penh - Marketing events at Kampot Sea festival in 2016
		3.3	<p>Community fisheries establishment (by yr 1) and development at BPL by CCK supported by WWT (leading on management plan development and inputs of technical advice)</p>	<p>Kampong Krasang Community Fishery (CFi) is fully established with a management plan in place and regular patrolling is ongoing. Membership is high, but in reality membership fee collection is irregular and engagement is lower than the membership lists suggest. Romenth North Community Fishery (CFi) (formally called Koh Andet CFi) has been established and approved by government and a basic management plan is in place (currently only available in Khmer). The development of a more comprehensive management plan was abandoned when BPL became a Protected Landscape under the MoE, as CFis cannot officially operate within an MoE Protected Landscape. This has decreased the size and scope of the CFi, but there are opportunities to convert this CFi into a community sustainable use zone within the new MoE</p>

			<p>Protected Landscape zoning schemes.</p> <p>An awareness campaign, using posters and recorded messages, and illegal fishing crackdown committees and associated action, have built confidence in the CFi concept. The LCGs and CFi patrol groups have been effective in working with the illegal fishing crackdown committee to run events and regularly patrol the fishery. Any large-scale illegal activities have led to arrests. Smaller-scale illegal activities have led to signed agreements between the offender and the ranger group committing to changing behaviours to legal practices.</p> <p>A Community Fishery Business Plan has been created by an independent consultant and highlights options for membership incentives and sustainable financing mechanisms.</p>
		3.4	<p>Community liaison, discussion and reporting mechanisms and structures for BPL and AP established by yr 1</p> <p>Liaison Panel meetings were held in 2015 and 2016; at each site there were meetings at provincial (for high level political support) and district levels (for more detailed discussions about the project and relevant stakeholders). In 2017 the District and Provincial meetings were combined at each site so that the new Protected Landscape designation could be clearly communicated to stakeholders and a direct dialogue could be facilitated. Representatives included; national and provincial government departments, commune councils, village chiefs and natural resource management associations.</p> <p>Emergency Community Liaison meetings were held to address specific issues that arose in the community and protected landscapes. An Illegal Fishing Committee was established and met in Aug 16, Sep 16, and Oct 16 once the CFis were becoming established and required support from law enforcement agencies and government to address the large scale external illegal fishing threats coming into the area. Similarly Land Encroachment meetings were held in 2016 and 2017.</p> <p>In addition regular contact was held with all the community groups involved with the project, CBET, SCR & CFis.</p>
		3.5	<p>Two Community Officers and two Technical Officers (a total of four Wetland apprentices)</p> <p>Two Wetland Apprentices (WAs) were recruited from their respective communities for the project. Both successfully completed the apprenticeship and received formal certification. Each WA completed training in English language, IT, and project coordination, as well gaining hands-on experience in wetland conservation, budget submissions, informal reporting, and</p>

			<p>trained and supported by WWT and partners, complete 30 month wetland management apprenticeship</p>	<p>attending study tours to other wetlands in Cambodia and Vietnam.</p> <p>The proposed two Technical Officer roles were combined into one more senior position.</p>
4	<p>Projects delivered by WWT, CCK, MB and other partners are coordinated effectively and results and learning disseminated appropriately</p>	4.1	<p>Project delivery is coordinated effectively by WWT</p>	<p>WWT has received Mlup Baitong's (MB) end of project report and is waiting for a similar report from CCK. An internal review of the project has shown that the majority of project components have been completed to a high level and on time. Coordination and communication has generally been good. Unfortunately MB do not have funding to continue at AP in the short-term. Due to our continued presence and combined project identity in the eyes of the community, MB are comfortable that WWT will continue to build on their legacy at AP and are concentrating efforts on some other priority projects.</p> <p>As mentioned in section 3.4, annual Liaison Panel meetings were held in 2015, 2016 & 2017 and were opportunities for partners to discuss results and workplans to all other relevant stakeholders. The meetings also provided important feedback to the project.</p> <p>Joint partner meetings were held in Phnom Penh regularly during the first two years of the project, after which the partners decided that site-based meetings focusing on specific interventions would be a more appropriate use of time – an example being the eight CBET management meetings attended by all relevant stakeholders, including MB, WWT and Birdlife, at Anlung Pring in the final year of their project.</p> <p>Several projects, like the ecoschools project at AP were co-managed by WWT and MB, with each partner delivering individual elements (MB – demonstration gardens and biodiversity lessons; WWT – water and natural resource education). At BPL, CCK were present at all interventions with community interaction elements.</p> <p>CCK have had problems with their financial administration towards the end of this project. WWT has provided time and administrative support to assist CCK to investigate the problem and report it to CEPF.</p>
		4.2	<p>Partners' capacity to deliver project</p>	<p>English language training delivered to representatives from all partners and financial and operational management support given to CCK and MB respectively. An English language intern was based</p>

		objectives and activities is supported and enhanced	<p>at AP to support the CBET group with basic English training and support MB field staff with English communication skills.</p> <p>The WWT Wetland Apprentices were stationed in their respective partner's offices, providing support for their activities and logistics an identifying areas where additional WWT support would be welcome.</p> <p>At BPL, WWT have supported a number of consultancies to assist CCK to continue with their projects into the future. A Business Plan has been created for the two Community Fisheries which, if implemented would be likely to secure the sustainability of the group. We will continue to support CCK to develop a workplan for this.</p>
	4.2	Compliance with CEPF social safeguard policies monitored and reported to CEPF every 6 months	<p>Social Safeguards have been completed regularly throughout the project detailing ways that WWT and project partners have been complying with CEPF social safeguard policies. The final Safeguard Report is attached to this end of project report.</p>
	4.4	Opportunities for disseminating learning identified and capitalised upon	<p>A major output of this component is the Guidance for the Wise Use of Freshwater Wetlands in Cambodia (See Section 7 of report for web link).</p> <p>This was developed alongside the MoE and Birdlife through a multi-stakeholder process, with the initial workshop held in Phnom Penh in Aug 2016 prior to a Study Tour to BPL to meet community members and discuss practical elements and use of the guidance. Stakeholders included site managers, development and environmental NGOs, all relevant government departments and other interested parties. Drafts created and submitted to the working group for feedback prior to a finalization and dissemination workshop in March 2017. External feedback was received from the Ramsar Secretariat, International Water Management Institute, Ramsar Scientific and Technical Review Panel, IUCN Cambodia, BirdLife International, Birdlife Cambodia, and WWT Consulting.</p> <p>A paper has been accepted for publication in June's edition of the Cambodian Journal of Natural History on water quality impacts of intensive shrimp farming around AP Protected Landscape.</p> <p>Welcome the Bird events have been held in BPL and AP bringing</p>

				<p>local students together with students from the city to KBAs to celebrate seasonal migrations and learn about the importance of a healthy environment. WWT and Birdlife have supported the Cambodia Nature Birding Club to test survey techniques and contribute to species lists in AP. WWT have represented our conservation work at BPL and APP at National Environmental Day and World Wetland Day events.</p> <p>WWT have shared information about the sites at an international Conference on Sarus Crane Conservation in India, contributed to the Eastern Sarus Crane Regional Action Plan and presented the project at the Wetlands Alliance International Conference in Cambodia. Members of the team have also joined study trips to key sarus crane sites in Vietnam to shared information about conservation of BPL & AP.</p> <p>WWT have representation on the national working sub-group for Community Fisheries where the challenges and opportunities at Boeung Prek Lapouv and discussed and represented.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

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

- [Guidance for the Wise Use of Freshwater Wetlands in Cambodia](#) – Click to follow link.
- [Community-based Ecotourism website for Anlung Pring Protected Landscape](#). This site provides an overview of the CBET product at AP, describes the [benefit share system](#), and pictures of some of our [interpretation material](#).

PART IV: Lessons, Sustainability, Safeguards and Financing

Lessons Learned

8. Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building.

A key lesson learnt from this project is the value of having a diverse partnership and maintaining strong relationships with multiple government ministries/departments at local, provincial and national level. A lot of the progress made throughout this project was due to the networking done by project staff in country, tapping into the broad wealth of knowledge on the wide spectrum of elements in this complex integrated project. The ability of the project to adapt to the dynamic political environment was increased through the involvement of Birdlife International, Cambodia Programme, who assisted us in navigating the regular changes and uncertainty.

The main project partners were invaluable in facilitating on-site conservation and development interventions, but the project was also reliant on external consultants to deliver some of the technical livelihood elements. It may be useful to also partner with a larger development organization in the future so that we have international expertise in this area. It would be vital to ensure that this partner has full buy-in to the long-term success of the interventions rather than the short-term interest that naturally comes with an external consultant.

The major variations in weather conditions caused by the El Niño cycle made annual comparisons difficult for our monitoring and evaluation, which highlighted the importance of considering control sites.

Sustainability / Replication

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

The sustainability of the project is largely down to the participatory approach taken throughout and the involvement of local partners who had already built trust with the local communities. Short-term interventions like the creation of Chres Community Wetland at the beginning of the project were useful in decreasing human impact on the wetland but also showed local people that we were willing and able to support people's needs. BPL is a site with facing many different challenges so it was important for us to think about how these can be addressed beyond this project period. The multi-stakeholder networks created through the illegal fishing crackdown committee and land tenure review groups have helped to develop communication channels that would not normally be possible between local community groups and government. The Business Plan and Value Chain Analyses for the CFIs and Sarus Crane Rice groups were developed to factor in mechanisms for financial resilience for our community associations. These networks and support plans are especially important during this transitional period to a Protected Landscape at BPL.

Guidance for the Wise Use of Freshwater Wetlands in Cambodia is well-known throughout Cambodia, evidenced by recent contact made by the KFW-funded Lower Mekong Basin Wetland Management and Conservation Project who are investigating ways to build capacity within wetland stakeholders, and the Indo-Burma Ramsar Regional Initiative.

Safeguards

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

See above and Safeguard reports.

Additional Funding

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

a. Total additional funding (US\$)

\$479,993

b. Type of funding

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

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
Albert George & Nancy Youngman Trust Fund	A	\$8,741.41	Ex. rate: GBP to USD monthly average 04/14
The Martann Trust	A	\$7,997.44	Ex. rate: GBP to USD monthly average 10/15
Darwin Initiative	A	\$362,102	
Donations from individuals	A	\$64,524.04	Ex. rate: GBP to USD monthly average 10/15
WWT in-kind	A	\$36,627.11	Ex. rate: GBP to USD monthly average 10/15

* Categorize the type of funding as:

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

Additional Comments/Recommendations

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

N/A

PART IV: Impact at Portfolio and Global Level

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

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

Contribution to Portfolio Indicators

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

Indicator	Narrative

Contribution to Global Indicators

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

14. Key Biodiversity Area Management

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

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

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

Name of KBA	# of Hectares with strengthened management *	Is the KBA Not protected, Partially protected or Fully protected? Please select one: NP/PP/FP
Kampong Trach - Cambodia	217	FP
Boeung Prek Lapouv - Cambodia	11,505	FP

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

15. Protected Areas

Number of hectares of protected areas created and/or expanded

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

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

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

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

16. Production landscape

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

Number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened biodiversity management.

Name of Production Landscape*	# of Hectares**	Latitude***	Longitude***	Description of Intervention
Sarus Crane rice Farmer paddies (Sustainable rice production)	90	10.737474	104.997467	Sustainable Agriculture training & incentives for implementation
Kampong Krasang Community Fishery	6,849	10.756396	105.060429	Increased patrolling and reduction of illegal fishing and off season fishing.

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

**Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were strengthened due to certification in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were

strengthened due to new harvesting regulations in the second year, the total number of hectares strengthened to date would be 500.

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

17. Beneficiaries

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

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

# of men benefiting from formal training*	# of women benefiting from formal training*
875	631

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

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

# of men benefiting from increased income*	# of women benefiting from increased income*
115	115

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

17c. Total number of beneficiaries - Combined

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

Total # of men benefiting*	Total # of women benefiting*
875	631

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

18. Benefits to Communities

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

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

Please note that we do not have exact break downs of gender in our data but have used total numbers of project participants within each community and divided 50:50 as this is the standard gender ratio in the area.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics (mark with x)							Type of Benefit (mark with x)							# of Beneficiaries			
	Subsistence economy	Small landowners	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Other*	Increased access to clean water	Increased food security	Increased access to energy	Increased access to public services (e.g. health care, education)	Increased resilience to climate change	Improved land tenure	Improved recognition of traditional knowledge	Improved representation and decision-making in governance forums/structures	Improved access to ecosystem services	# of men and boys benefiting	# of women and girls benefiting
Chress Village	X	X								X			X	X	X		537	537
Koh Chamkaar Village	X	X								X			X	X	X		170	170
Koh Tnoat Village	X	X								X			X	X	X		170	170

Kdol Chrum Village	X	X							X						X	X	252	252
Kampong Krasang Village	X	X							X						X	X	83	83
Chey Chouk Village	X	X							X						X	X	88	88
Sangkum Meanchey Village	X	X							X						X	X	261	261
Thmor Bei Dum Village	X	X							X						X	X	159	159
Banteay Sluek Village	X	X							X						X	X	38	38
Dei Leuk Village	X	X							X						X	X	8	8
Daem Doung Village	X	X							X						X	X	178	178
Tropeang Tonle Village	X	X							X						X	X	116	116
Chroy Pon Village	X	X							X						X	X	102	102
Chumrum Village	X	X							X						X	X	305	305
Keo Kampleung Village	X	X							X						X	X	306	306
Banteay Thleay Village	X	X							X						X	X	418	418
Prolay Meas Village	X	X							X						X	X	262	262
Daem Chan Village	X	X							X						X	X	228	228
Daem Kroch Village	X	X							X						X	X	207	207
Chambok Em Village	X	X							X						X	X	469	469

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

18b. Geolocation of each community

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

Name of Community	Latitude	Longitude
Chress Village	10.494115	105.511191
Koh Chamkaar Village	10.481957	104.509888
Koh Tnoat Village	10.475330	104.548278
Kdol Chrum Village	10.761515	105.065404
Kampong Krasang Village	10.790977	105.064273
Chey Chouk Village	10.691557	105.025530
Sangkum Meanchey Village	10.750583	105.055525
Thmor Bei Dum Village	10.735148	105.092332
Banteay Sluek Village	10.727583	105.043017
Dei Leuk Village	10.719319	105.022804
Daem Doung Village	10.705524	104.912799
Tropeang Tonle Village	10.730334	104.912503
Chroy Pon Village	10.729762	104.937996
Chumrum Village	10.767162	104.936151
Keo Kampleung Village	10.756518	104.959569
Banteay Thleay Village	10.740003	104.958811
Prolay Meas Village	10.723774	104.906389
Daem Chan Village	10.798328	104.952155
Daem Kroch Village	10.791315	104.949953
Chambok Em Village	10.793105	104.944735

19. Policies, Laws and Regulations

Please report on change in the number of legally binding laws, regulations, and policies with conservation provisions that have been enacted or amended, as a result of CEPF investment. “Laws and regulations” pertain to official rules or orders, prescribed by authority. Any law, regulation, decree or order is eligible to be included. “Policies” that are adopted or pursued by a government, including a sector or faction of government, are eligible.

19a. Name, scope and topic of the policy, law or regulation

No.	Name of Law, Policy or Regulation	Scope (mark with x)			Topic(s) addressed (mark with x)														
		Local	National	Regional/International	Agriculture	Climate	Ecosystem Management	Education	Energy	Fisheries	Forestry	Mining and Quarrying	Planning/Zoning	Pollution	Protected Areas	Species Protection	Tourism	Transportation	Wildlife Trade
1																			
2																			
3																			

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

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

20. Best Management Practices

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

No.	Short title/ topic of the best management practice	Description of best management practice and its use during the project
1	Wetland Wise Use Guidelines, Cambodia	<p>The aim of these guidelines is to provide support for stakeholders living in and around wetlands to enhance their understanding of: the importance of wetlands for biodiversity and people; the considerations that need to be taken into account when managing wetlands; and methods that can be employed in the management of different features and activities within wetlands.</p> <p>The guidance covers management authorities, policy & legal framework, wetland management planning, wetland management plan, agriculture, fisheries, flooded forest, wetland fauna, invasive species, ecotourism and CEPA.</p> <p>The guidelines were developed throughout the project, through bringing together a wide range of stakeholders in a series of workshops, and site visit to Boeung Prek Lapouv.</p>

21. Networks & Partnerships

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

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

Part V. Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

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

Please include your full contact details below:

17. Name:	Tomos Avent
18. Organization:	Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust
19. Mailing address:	Slimbridge, Glos, GL2 7BT, UK
20. Telephone number:	01453 891243
21. E-mail address:	tomos.avent@wwt.org.uk