



CEPF Final Project Completion Report

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

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Organization Legal Name | BirdLife International –Cambodia Programme |
| Project Title | Securing the Long-Term Future of Vulture Conservation in Cambodia |
| Grant or GEM Number | 64092 |
| Date of Report | 22 June 2017 |

CEPF Hotspot: Indo-Burma

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

Grant Amount: US\$ 139,972

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*)

Wildlife Conservation Society – Cambodia (WCS): with a sub-grant from this project, WCS has delivered all project activities under component 1,5 and 9 in Chhep Wildlife Sanctuary (former Preah Vihear protected forest) and plays a significant role as a key member of Cambodia vulture working group.

World Wildlife Fund – Cambodia (WWF): with a sub-grant from this project, WWF has delivered all project activities under component 2,6, and 10 in Srepok Wildlife Sanctuary (former Mondulkiri Protected forest), Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and the Mekong Flooded Forest and plays a significant role as a key member of Cambodia vulture working group.

Angkor Centre for Conservation of Biodiversity (ACCB): with a sub-grant from this project, ACCB has delivered all project activities under component 3, 7, and 11 in Sesan and plays a significant role as a key member of Cambodia vulture working group.

2. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

A ten-year vulture conservation action plan (2016-2025) has been developed together with endorsed and inputs from all project partners. Western Siem Pang Important Bird and Biodiversity Area, known to support the largest vulture population in Cambodia, has been designated as new

protected area called "Siem Pang Kang Lech Wildlife Sanctuary" on the 9th of May 2016 by the Cambodian Government. Furthermore, a vulture working group has been formed with a combination of international and national non-governmental organizations, academic institutions and government agencies to secure a long-term commitment on vulture conservation and research in Cambodia. After the Save Asia Vulture from Extinction (SAVE) and Multi-Species Action Plan (MsAP) meetings in Mumbai, India in November 2016, the Cambodia vulture working group has successfully become a SAVE core partner. Some of Cambodian vulture conservation priority issues have been integrated into the SAVE blueprint action plan as part of strategy to secure regional support in doing future fundraising. A partnership agreement between BirdLife, WCS, WWF and ACCB has been renewed for another three years (2017-2019) in order to ensure the priority conservation activities at each vulture site such as vulture restaurants, nest searching and monitoring will be continued beyond this CEPF project period.

Many vulture nests have been protected by hiring the local nest guardians. However, in Western Siem Pang during the 2016-17 nesting season, jealousy among local community's members was recorded as a main reason of nest failure. The pilot cow bank scheme was partially successful but the number of cow in the herd did not grow as expected.

The project was able to confirm that NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) are not used at the vulture project sites. An anti-poisoning education movie and six big billboards about the harm of eating poisoned bush-meat was produced and installed at the roadside across five provinces, the vulture home range. Awareness raising and anti-poisoning campaigns (movies clips) were conducted with at least 120 VCD copies of these movie clips being circulated at all target sites for the education of local communities to stop committing wildlife poisoning and improve understanding about roles of vultures in supporting the ecosystem services. The ten-year vulture action plan, was designed and published about 300 copies in English and another 300 copies in Khmer. Educational meetings and other awareness raising activities were organized at all target sites. Several TV-talk shows have been done in order to raise awareness about vulture conservation in Cambodia. A visit of Minister of Environment to Western Siem Pang vulture restaurant was organized as part of strategy to generate more support from policy makers on vulture conservation.

Please see video link here: <https://youtu.be/Li4Qt6Pbyz4> or <https://youtu.be/1MpPmx-GcH4> (with English subtitle).

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 |
|---|---|
| Healthy and robust representatives of the Indochinese sub-populations of Asian vulture species are retained across three priority landscapes in Cambodia; the Northern Plains Dry Forest, the Eastern Plains Dry Forest and the Kratie to Stung Treng section of the Lower Mekong | <p>During the project period, the Cambodian vulture has declined in terms of numbers and range. So it is now neither robust nor healthy and is following a classic extinction model. Vultures now remain in significant numbers at only two sites namely Siem Pang Kang Lech and Chhep wildlife sanctuaries.</p> <p>The decline in numbers has been greatest in the Eastern Plains Landscape (EPL) (numbers of bird</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>have declines at all vulture restaurant sites and fewer nests have been found). In Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary (LWS) and Sesan, the number of vulture significantly decreased. The reasons for decline are believed to be poisoning and habitat loss. The most dramatic example of which was the destruction of 50,000 ha of vulture foraging and nesting habitat inside Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary in order to establish economic land concessions. The poisoning of cattle carcasses from an intensive beef rearing resulted in the deaths of an unknown number of vultures (which could have accounted for the entire population beyond the 4-5 recorded instances).</p> |
|--|---|

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

| Impact Description | Impact Summary |
|---|---|
| <p>Populations of three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture, and Red-headed Vulture) are effectively conserved at seven separate project sites in Cambodia; Preah Vihear Protected Forest (approx. 200,000 hectares), Western Siem Pang Wildlife Sanctuary (approx. 140,000 ha), Sesan (approx. 100 ha), Mekong Flooded Forest (approx. 34,000 ha), Mondulkiri Protected Forest (approx. 370,000 ha), Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary (approx. 220,000 ha), and Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary (approx. 250,000 ha). Key assumptions that shape current thinking of local communities will be investigated and tested at these seven sites, enabling more effective conservation interventions to be implemented for these highly-threatened species</p> | <p>There were many issues occurred during project period that led the project failed to deliver its short-term impacts successfully including few ten thousand hectares of vulture territory were granted to the economic land concession companies by the Cambodia Government to convert forest land into agro-plantation. This land used change was leading to the loss of vulture feeding ground, removed all free ranging livestock and wild animal from the landscape, loss of nest colonies.</p> <p>Another issue came a long side with this concession companies were logging (both licensed and unlicensed). With poor law enforcement and limited capacity, most of vulture nesting trees was selective cut down for timber which led to high disturbance and persecution.</p> <p>Spreading and increasing of trapaeng poisoning practices became a major issue adhere to the above points. Local poisoning for bust-meat caused indirect poison to vultures scavenged the poison carcasses that eliminated core population from their distribution ranges. Since a big poisoning event happened on 28th February 2014 at EPL that killed at least 16 vultures, the number of vultures visited to its monthly restaurant was extremely low. This similar experience also happened at LWS and Sesan sites while the poisoning practice is spread through dry forest landscape in Cambodia.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>The involvement of local community with nest protect scheme had both negative and positive effect, but it seems a negative effect had much influenced on vulture breeding process that led to high failure rate. Jealousy was one of the issues unknown nest destruction and disturbance. It revealed that ecological knowledge of local communities on conservation and their commitment were so low due to some livelihood and literature point of view.</p> |
|--|---|

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

1. Project partners showed a greater level of commitment and interest to deliver project outputs and outcomes. All partner had shown very high commitment to pursue and secure monthly vulture restaurant at each site. Despite, the EPL team had formed few group for conducting line transect to search for vulture nest location but it seemed the area had already loss its integrity for vulture, one nest found at this site since the project started. The rapid decreasing population of three vulture species throughout Eastern Plains Landscape was genius issue that's coherent to what just mentioned in the sort-term impact of the project.
2. Government partners showed little interest in the project and their capacity to lead species conservation interventions is not increase during the project life.
3. There was a fixation in the mind of some, on diclofenac. When in fact this drug is not used for cattle veterinary purposes in Cambodia.
4. Second ten-years vulture action plan (2016-2025) was finalised that aims to address all pending issues and long term goal to maintain current status of vulture population.

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

- Large scale land encroachment and nationwide illegal logging had significant negative impacts on the breeding success of the three vulture species. It has been learnt that the nest protecting scheme, especially introduce nest guardian, provide pro and con based on the context of each site and unexpected consequence occurrence. Nest protection scheme need to adapt in order to fit with each site context and ensure long term impact.
- Spreading of wildlife poisoning practices across dry forest landscape by using pesticide bait with food to kill wild animals and birds are becoming very serious issue for vulture conservation and public health.

PART II: Project Components and Products/Deliverables

6. Components (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer

6. Describe the results for each deliverable:

| Component | | Deliverable | | |
|-----------|--|-------------|---|--|
| # | Description | Sub-# | Description | Results for Deliverable |
| 1 | The threat of secondary poisoning to three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), is successfully clarified at the Northern Plains, overseen by WCS Cambodia | 1.1 | Updated information on the availability and use of Diclofenac and other toxic NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) in local communities in and around the Northern Plains | Result from household and pharmacy survey across the vulture distribution ranges within five provinces to the north and north-east of Cambodia proved that there is no presence of Diclofenac and other toxic NSAIDs used for veterinary purpose. The good news is giving the project more hope to secure long-term vulture conservation action in Cambodia but it is necessary to keep monitoring the use of these drugs and be ready to take action if required. |
| | | 1.2 | Updated information on the risk of secondary poisoning from pesticides (organochlorides/phosphates) to Vultures in the Northern Plains | There's no information of secondary poisoning cases in vultures across the Northern Plains within the project lifecycle. |
| 2 | The threat of secondary poisoning to three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), is successfully clarified at Mondulkiri Protected Forest, Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and | 2.1 | Updated information on the availability and use of Diclofenac and other toxic NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) in local communities in and around the Mondulkiri Protected Forest, Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and Mekong Flooded Forest | <p>The result from household and pharmacy survey across the vulture distribution ranges within five provinces to the north and north-east of Cambodia proved that there is no presence of Diclofenac and other toxic NSAIDs used for veterinary purposes.</p> <p>Thus, there was no information about the use of NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) in or around the Mondulkiri Protected Forest (recently this was upgraded as wildlife sanctuary and name as Srepok Wildlife Sanctuary), Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and the Mekong Flooded Forest; however, it was found</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-----|---|---|
| | Mekong Flooded Forest, overseen by WWF Cambodia | | | that there is widespread use of chemical pesticide (Carbofuran and other forms of pesticides) to poison wildlife for bush-meat. |
| | | 2.2 | Updated information on the risk of secondary poisoning from pesticides (organochlorides/ phosphates) to Vultures in the Mondulkiri Protected Forest, Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and Mekong Flooded Forest | A big incidental poisoning event occurred at Mondulkiri Protected Forest (currently call as Srepok Wildlife Sanctuary) at Antreh village. At least 16 vultures (11 white-rumped vultures, 3 slender-billed vultures and 2 red-headed vultures) got killed by eating a poisoned cow carcass on the 28 February 2014. A necropsy was performed by a pathologist and the WCS team at the National Veterinary Research Institute (NaVRI) to determine the cause of death. Results ruled out a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (diclofenac) used on cattle. It was informed that got poisoned by anger farmer to stop the cow from eating the crops in his home garden. |
| 3 | The threat of secondary poisoning to three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), is successfully clarified at Sesan, overseen by ACCB | 3.1 | Updated information on the availability and use of Diclofenac and other toxic NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) in local communities in and around Sesan | The result from household and pharmacy survey across the vulture distribution ranges within five provinces to the north and north-east of Cambodia proved that there is no presence of Diclofenac and other toxic NSAIDs used for veterinary purposes. There was no information about the use of NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) in and around the Sesan area but it was found that there is wide spread use of chemical pesticide (Carbofuran and other forms of pesticides) to poison wildlife for bush meat for daily consumption and profit. The project is working to combat this issue by conducting an anti-poisoning campaign and other direct interventions to prevent this issue. |
| | | 3.2 | Updated information on the risk of secondary poisoning from pesticides | There were three deliberated cattle poisoning cases in the Sre Sranouk commune, Sesan district on 4th, 13th and 22nd February |

| | | | | |
|----|--|-----|--|--|
| | | | (organochlorides/phosphates) to Vultures in Sesan | 2017 fortunately there were no affected to the vultures. Cashew plantation owners had used pesticide bait with food to kill cattle with aiming to protect their crops from constant grazing. ACCB was informed about these cases and took rapid action to prevent incidental vulture poisoning from happening by burning down the carcasses. |
| 4. | The threat of secondary poisoning to three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), is successfully clarified at Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary and Western Siem Pang IBA, overseen by BirdLife Cambodia | 4.1 | Updated information on the availability and use of Diclofenac and other toxic NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) in local communities in and around Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary and Western Siem Pang IBA | <p>The result from household and pharmacy survey across the vulture distribution ranges within five provinces to the north and north-east of Cambodia proved that there is no presence of Diclofenac and other toxic NSAIDs used for veterinary purposes.</p> <p>There was no information about the use of NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) in and around Siem Pang Kang Lech wildlife sanctuary and Lomphat wildlife sanctuary area but it was found that there is wide spread use of chemical pesticide (Carbofuran and other forms of pesticides) to poison wildlife for bush meat for daily consumption and profit. The project is working to combat this issue by conducting an anti-poisoning campaign and other direct interventions to prevent this issue.</p> |
| | | 4.2 | Updated information on the risk of secondary poisoning from pesticides (organochlorides/phosphates) to Vultures in Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary and Western Siem Pang IBA | <p>On 11th April 2015, there're 6 white-rumped vulture killed by poisoning event in Siem Pang Kang Lech Wildlife Sanctuary. The event was happened during Khmer New Year holiday, while most people travel home for celebrating new year with their families. The thieves used poisoned bait to kill dog on one family in the village to make them possible to still one motorbike. After eating poisoned bait, two dogs died in the house and other two ran about 500 meters from the house and died in rice paddy field. Six</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-----|--|--|
| | | | | <p>vultures got killed by scavenging these poisoned dog carcasses. All vulture carcasses were burned by local people before project staff arrive the incident place. It's reported the thieves are people from outside.</p> <p>In Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary, on 2nd August 2016, there was a deliberate vulture poisoning event committed by an unknown economic land concession worker that killed at least 3 vultures (one red-headed and two unknown species). Based on investigation, we believe that the worker used cow carcass from livestock farm as bait to poison the bird for food purpose and this worker didn't know the vulture due to they are migrated from central province of Cambodia to work with a concession company belong to Hoang Anh Gia Lai (HAGL). Another notice is concession company established a livestock farm with no proper mechanism to dispose the dead cows from their farm. After this accident, intervention have been done including meetings among local authority and concession senior officers to come up with proper mechanism for control the cow carcasses from farm, rapid inform the accident, and educated workers about wildlife crime. Vaccine and drug use to treat cows in this farm also investigated in order to make sure that the Diclofinac is banned.</p> |
| 5 | The factors preventing successful nesting, and potential solutions to these factors, are successfully clarified for three Critically | 5.1 | Nesting success using locally-hired 'Nest Guardians' evaluated for nesting vultures in the Northern Plains | In 2014-2015 breeding season 5 nest found (2 red headed vulture and 3 white-rumped vulture), local people were hired to guard all five nests. In 2015-2016, 5 nest found (3 red headed vulture and 2 white rumped vulture), local people were hired to guard all this five nests. In 2016-2017, 3 nests found (all are red headed vulture) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----|--|---|
| | Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), in the Northern Plains, overseen by WCS Cambodia | | | however only two nests were guard (the other one fledged out few days after found). |
| | | 5.2 | Nesting success using predator exclusion devices evaluated for nesting vultures in the Northern Plains | During project period only one nest baffle was used to protect the nesting tree from natural predation. It was later found that the chick had hatched already so the baffle was not necessary for that nest. |
| | | 5.3 | Local community participation in reporting vulture nests is strengthened with a 20% increase in the number of vulture nests reported in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 breeding seasons, compared to the 2012-13 season | One nest was found and reported by the local community and another nest was found by the project team. The number of vulture nests found for the 2016-17 breeding season was lower than the number of nests found from the last two breeding season, which counted 5 nests. The team spent an equal effort in that season in comparison to the previous breeding seasons in the search for nest locations. It was noted that vultures stopped using their previous nesting trees and there are low chances of them searching nest at new locations. |
| | | 5.4 | At least 5 villagers from local communities in the Northern Plains trained as 'Nest Guardians | During report period at 12 villagers were trained and hired to guard the nests. |
| 6 | The factors preventing successful nesting, and potential solutions to these factors, are successfully clarified for three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), in | 6.1 | Nesting success using locally-hired 'Nest Guardians' evaluated for nesting vultures in Mondulkiri Protected Forest, Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and the Mekong Flooded Forest | <p>The last nest found is 2010-2011 breeding season, since than there were no nests found in Srepok Wildlife Sanctuary (former called Mondulkiri Protected Forest) and Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary.</p> <p>At Mekong Flooded Forest site, during 2014-2015 three nest found (all white rumped vulture), local people were hired to monitor and all successfully fledge. 2015-2016 nesting season only one white rumped vulture nest found and local people was</p> |

| | | | |
|---|-----|--|---|
| Mondulkiri Protected Forest, Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and the Mekong Flooded Forest, overseen by WWF Cambodia | | | hired to do regular monitoring, nest successfully fledged. During last breeding season (2016-2017) one white rumped vulture nest found, local community was hired to monitor this nest until successful fledge. |
| | 6.2 | Nesting success using predator exclusion devices evaluated for nesting vultures in Mondulkiri Protected Forest, Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and the Mekong Flooded Fores | N/A |
| | 6.3 | Local community participation in reporting vulture nests is strengthened with a 20% increase in the number of vulture nests reported in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 breeding seasons, compared to the 2012-13 season | <p>At Mekong Flooded Forest site, during project period (2014-2017) four nest were found and reported by the local community and another nest was found by the project team. Only one nest found for the 2016-17 breeding season. The team spent an equal effort in that season in comparison to the previous breeding seasons in the search for nest locations. It was noted that vultures stopped using their previous nesting trees and there are low chances of them searching nest at new locations.</p> <p>At Srepok Wildlife Sanctuary and Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary, community awareness raising and transect research have been organized but unfortunately there was no nest founds.</p> |
| | 6.4 | A total of at least 8 villagers from local communities trained as 'Nest Guardians' across all three sites (Mondulkiri Protected Forest, Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and the Mekong Flooded Forest) | Four villagers from MFF site were trained and hired to monitor the nests. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-----|--|---|
| 7 | The factors preventing successful nesting, and potential solutions to these factors, in three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), are successfully clarified at Sesan, overseen by ACCB | 7.1 | Nesting success using locally-hired 'Nest Guardians' evaluated for nesting vultures in Sesan | <p>In Sesan, during 2014-2015 nesting season, 2 nests were found (all slender billed vulture), ACCB used staff to monitor these nests. As result one nest was successfully fledge and the other one was failed.</p> <p>During 2015-2016, only one red-headed vulture nest found by the project team. The nest was located on the mountain (part of an economic land concession area). The project could not hire a nest guardian for this nest; thus, the team work with the ELC manager to conduct regular nest monitoring checks as result one chick fledged out successfully. During 2016-2017 nesting season, only one red-headed vulture nest found by the project team.</p> |
| | | 7.2 | Nesting success using predator exclusion devices evaluated for nesting vultures in Sesan | N/A |
| | | 7.3 | Local community participation in reporting vulture nests is strengthened with a 20% increase in the number of vulture nests reported in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 breeding seasons, compared to the 2012-13 season | One nest was found by the project team during 2016-2017. The team spent big effort in that season in comparison to the previous breeding seasons in searching for nest locations but unfortunately we found only one. It was noted that vultures stopped using their previous nesting trees and there are low chances of them searching nest at new locations. |
| | | 7.4 | A total of at least 5 villagers from the local communities trained as 'Nest Guardians' | As mentioned above all nest founds were regularly monitor by project team and impossible to hire local communities for guarding due to nesting area located within economic land concession area. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-----|--|--|
| 8 | <p>The factors preventing successful nesting, and potential solutions to these factors, are successfully clarified for three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), at Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary and Western Siem Pang IBA, overseen by BirdLife Cambodia</p> | 8.1 | <p>Nesting success using locally-hired 'Nest Guardians' evaluated for nesting vultures in Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary and Western Siem Pang IBA</p> | <p>In Western Siem Pang, 2014-2015 breeding season, 13 vulture nests found (all slender billed vultures), all nests were monitoring by field staff, as result 4 nests failed and the other 9 nests successfully fledged. In 2015-2016, 13 vulture nest found (9 slender-bill vulture nests, 3 red-headed vulture nests and one white rumped vulture), local communities were hired to guard 8 nests and the remaining were monitored by field staff, as result 8 nests were success and the remaining were failed. For 2016 -2017 breeding season, 13 nest found (7 slender-bill vulture nests, 3 red-headed vulture nests and 2 white rumped vulture), all nests were monitored by field staff and as result only 6 nests were successfully fledged and the remaining 7 nests failed due to human disturbance. Jealousy among local communities could be a reason lead to nest failure.</p> <p>In Lomphat during 2014-2015, two nest founded (all are slender billed vultures), due to nest location locate in quite remote area we could not hire local people to guard however we use project staff to do regular monitoring. As result one nest successfully fledged and another one failed cause of disturbance (illegal logging). Four nests found during 2015-2016 breeding season but unfortunately all nest failed due to human destruction (illegal logging). The project had put strong effort during breeding season of 2016-2017 (all existing nesting location within this landscape have been visited) unfortunately there were no nests found for LWS site. Human disturbances and habitat loss were the main reasons of this disappearance.</p> |
|---|--|-----|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----|--|---|
| | | 8.2 | Nesting success using predator exclusion devices evaluated for nesting vultures in Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary and Western Siem Pang IBA | N/A |
| | | 8.3 | Local community participation in reporting vulture nests is strengthened with a 20% increase in the number of vulture nests reported in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 breeding seasons, compared to the 2012-13 season | Village meeting and awareness posters have been used to encourage local people to participate in nest searching and nest protection. During 2015-2016, 8 nests have been guarded and all are success however the cost of guarding is too expensive (some nest, we need to hire two people for guarding one nest). Focus on sustainability of this nest guarding activities, in 2016-2017 nesting season, we didn't hire local communities to guard the nests as result the unsuccessfully rate was increased. Based on failing evident, we suspected that the local people who use to earn income from guarding nests in previous season did some activities which make nest fail. |
| | | 8.4 | A total of at least 8 villagers from the local communities trained as 'Nest Guardians' | At Western Siem Pang, all nests found by the project team in the 2016-17 season and after doing nest protection cost analyzing and looking to sustainability of activities, BirdLife management team decided not to hire the local communities to guard the nests during this breeding season but when the project stopped offering the nest guarding opportunity, some community members who used to involve with the project were unhappy with such change. The lack of these expected temporary jobs caused anger and aggressive behavior that led to nest destruction. In the meantime, the project management team turned to be careful about that and tried to find a better solution to address these issues for the next breeding season. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|------|--|---|
| 9 | Carcass availability for three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), is successfully clarified at the Northern Plains, overseen by WCS Cambodia | 9.1 | Estimates for carcass availability (both wild and domestic animals) established for the Northern Plains | N/A |
| 10 | Carcass availability for three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), is successfully clarified at Mondulkiri Protected Forest, Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and the Mekong Flooded Forest, overseen by WWF Cambodia | 10.1 | Estimates for carcass availability (both wild and domestic animals) established for Mondulkiri Protected Forest, Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary, and the Mekong Flooded Forest | The result from team survey across the eastern plains landscape (EPL) proved that there are carcasses of wild large ungulates and livestock present in the forest landscape, approximately 3 carcasses per month. Otherwise, most of carcasses found were naturally carrion without scavenging of where the site had experienced a drop in vulture population since a big poisoning event happened. |
| | | 10.2 | Updated population estimates for wild ungulates in Mondulkiri Protected Forest and Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary are produced | N/A |
| 11 | Carcass availability for three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), is | 11.1 | Estimates for carcass availability (both wild and domestic animals) established for Sesan | There were at least three cattle carcasses found in February 2017 but unfortunately those carcasses were poisoned, so they could not be left for vultures to scavenge. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|------|--|---|
| | successfully clarified in Sesan | | | |
| 12 | Carcass availability for three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Slender-billed Vulture and Red-headed Vulture), is successfully clarified in Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary and Western Siem Pang IBA | 12.1 | Estimates for carcass availability (both wild and domestic animals) established for Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary and Western Siem Pang IBA | There were five carcasses observed by project team in Western Siem Pang (three buffalo and two cows). All carcasses were safe and free for vulture to scavenge. There were no carcasses recorded in Lomphat due to the limitation of manpower and time to research in the area. |
| | | 12.2 | Reviewing report of cow bank potential to sustainable provide carcasses to vulture restaurant | A pilot cow bank project in Western Siem Pang was finished in December 2016. In conclusion, the project was achieving medium rate successes at this testing scheme. There were several factors that limited the success rate of this cow bank process, including extremely drought with longer dry season in 2015 which led to the loss of some offspring and adults due to food and water shortages and overheating and limited knowledge in techniques on animal keeping. Many lessons were acquired from this innovative idea and they will allow for a solid mechanism to improve this activity aiming for a better success that will contribute greatly on vulture conservation in the medium and long-term period. The assessment report is provided as an attachment in this report. |
| 13 | Three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Red-headed Vulture and Slender-Billed Vulture) are more effectively conserved at all seven project sites | 13.1 | A full-time Cambodian Vulture project coordinator hired who demonstrates the ability to oversee the majority of technical activities at each site, and ensures that standard operating protocols are adhered to. | A full time vulture project coordinator was recruited and has been in position since April 2014. As result from this appointment, all project roost and nest survey forms, household and pharmacy questionnaires, survey protocols, vulture restaurant forms, databases and other training materials are all developed and finalized by all project partnership members. The coordinator also gave training to vulture rangers from five project sites on the |

| | | | |
|---|------|---|---|
| through better project coordination and increased capacity for vulture conservation in all project partners | | | <p>identification of three vulture species and vulture restaurant protocols.</p> <p>The vulture coordinator visited to all seven project sites and trained vulture rangers about vulture species identification, monitoring technique, vulture restaurant recording procedures, and predator exclusion devices.</p> |
| | 13.2 | Standardised, centrally administrated database for vulture nest data and for monitoring outcomes (i.e. fledging success/failure) produced | Nest data format was standardized and kept at a storing center (drop box) which had been established for all project partners to check and update data from their respective sites. |
| | 13.3 | Standardised, centrally administrated database for vulture mortality data produced | Mortality data storing format was standardized and kept at a storing center (drop box) which had been established for all project partner to check and update data from their respective sites |
| | 13.4 | A critical review produced of all known vulture nest data from between 2004 to 2013 for all seven project sites | Nesting data from 2004 until 2013 has been reviewed and manipulated in a standardized form based on available data from each site. The results of this reviewing were circulated to all vulture sites and used to support nest searching in coming years in the Eastern Plain, especially Lomphat wildlife sanctuary area, where vulture nesting was converted to be agriculture plantation and heavily disturbed by human activities (i.e. illegal logging). |
| | 13.5 | Three GIS maps produced for each of the seven project sites (21 maps in total) detailing | 7 maps of nest locations for the seven project sites and covering a period from 2004 to 2013 have been produced in A0 paper size and circulated to all project sites for support in nest searching. No new map was produced thereafter as the nest location maps for breeding season 2014 to 2016 were the same. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------|--|---|
| | | 13.6 | Compliance with CEPF Social Safeguard Policies monitored and reported to CEPF | Social safeguard has been completed regularly based on one result of a series of village consultation meetings and awareness raising. All concerns raised by local communities (i.e. nest searching and guarding) were taken to consideration and finding impact mitigation approach was a priority. The social safeguard report was developed and submitted to CEPF according to the work plan. |
| | | 13.7 | Sub-grants awarded to WWF Cambodia, WCS Cambodia and ACCB and progress monitored | <p>Since June 2014 a sub-grant agreement has been signed with WWF, WCS, and ACCB to deliver project activities in Chhep wildlife sanctuary, Phnom Prich wildlife sanctuary, Srepok wildlife sanctuary, Mekong Flooded Forest, and Sesan. CEPF contracting format was used in order to ensure all requirements are fulfilled.</p> <p>Coordination and communication between BirdLife and all sub grantees has been generally good. Each partner submitted their six month technical reports to the vulture project coordinator and a three-month financial report to BirdLife financial officer. These reports were later compiled as one report to be submitted to CEPF, according to the online report schedule.</p> |
| | | 13.8 | Minutes of FPIC consultation meetings with indigenous communities at the project sites | Consultation and awareness raising have been organized at indigenous villages where discussed topics included is nest finding and protecting scheme. All concerns raised by these indigenous communities where taken into consideration and identifying an approach to mitigate the negative impacts was required. The minutes of these meetings were submitted to CEPF together with periodically project progression report. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|------|---|---|
| | | 13.9 | An anti-poisoning campaign is delivered by a professional agency | <p>Two professional agencies were engaged in the delivery of such campaign. Women Media Center, a professional education film maker, was hired as a service provider to develop an anti-poisoning movie. This movie was screened to the local communities, school kids, conservationists and decision makers on occasion village meeting, school classes, river festivals, world biodiversity day and SAVE during workshops. Cambodia's Minister of Environment also contributed his message and video to the film.</p> <p>The Khmer Designing Group was hired to design and publish a big billboard about the harmful effects of eating poisoned bush meat, which was later installed at strategic points of five vulture provincial sites. These information boards will become reminders to the local communities and passenger who travel within vulture distribution provinces about the negative impacts of eating wild meat and hopefully will contribute to reducing the poisoning activities.</p> <p>In addition, BirdLife Cambodia programme manager and vulture project coordinator were invited as guest of TV talk show programme at least four times on topic of Cambodia vulture conservation.</p> |
| 14 | The long-term conservation of three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Red-headed Vulture and | 14.1 | Transition of the CVCP (Cambodia Vulture Conservation Project) into a larger Working Group for Vulture Conservation in Cambodia, endorsed by relevant IUCN/SSC SGs and at least | Cambodia vulture working group was established as result of the consultation meeting. This working group is comprised by the existing CVCP partners, academic institutes, individual experts, a wildlife rehabilitation center and important focal points from two government agencies (Forestry Administration and Ministry of |

| | | | |
|--|------|---|---|
| Slender-Billed Vulture) is better guaranteed through the establishment of a more active Working Group for Vulture conservation in Cambodia with multiple national and international partners | | two relevant government ministries in Cambodia | Environment). This working group significantly contributes to the development of Cambodia's vultures action plan and promote the vulture conservation action. BirdLife International continued its role as the working group coordinator and after presenting this working group to SAVE (Save Asia Vulture from Extinction network) and input on regional work towards vulture conservation in Asia, Cambodia vulture working group was elected as a core member of SAVE. Cambodia vulture working group members provided their endorsement on Cambodia vulture action plan for period from 2015-2026. The focal point from Ministry of Environment used result of Cambodian vulture project to develop the National Biodiversity Status report for decision makers and submit to Biodiversity International Convention. |
| | 14.2 | At least one local civil society organisation identified and invited to join the working group, who actively and demonstrably contributes to vulture conservation in Cambodia | Sam Veasna Center and Biodiversity Conversation Center (CBC) of Royal University of Phnom Penh were invited to be members of the Cambodia vulture working group. Sam Veasna Center, through their ecotourism service, provided a significant income for support vulture restaurant and other vulture conservation activities in Chhep wildlife sanctuary. Within the project live period, CBC sent one student to conduct her Masters decree study about vulture nest reference with BirdLife. All of these efforts contribute to priority mentioned in Cambodia vulture action plan. |
| | 14.3 | By December 2016,10 quarterly meetings of the working group held | Within the project period at least seven meeting were organized; however, only three meetings were joined by 70+% of the working |

| | | | |
|--|------|--|---|
| | | with at least 70% of members in attendance at each meeting | <p>group members, the remaining were composed by the key members of this working group such as representative from Birdlife, WCS, WWF, ACCB, Forestry Administration and Ministry of Environment.</p> <p>The topics of big meetings, joined by at least 70% of the working group members, included the input and endorsement of Cambodia's vulture action plan and finalization of the material for anti-poisoning campaign.</p> <p>The small working group meetings mostly focused on progress of vulture conservation and work plan discussion, final data collection protocol and monitoring methodology, finalizing reportd, long term funding mechanism, information sharing, finding solution to address threats etc.</p> |
| | 14.4 | Six summaries of quarterly meetings produced and distributed to project partners and stakeholders | As mentioned in section 14.3, the working group meetings have been organized quarterly. The minutes of such meetings have been compiled by the project coordinator for its distribution to key members. These minutes were also submitted as annexes for the project progress report submitted to CEPF. |
| | 14.5 | Two annual reports for the Working Group produced and distributed to project partners and stakeholders | Within the project period, two annual reports of vulture conservation project have been drafted. The first report covered the period from July 2013 to December 2014 and the second report covered the period from January 2013 to February 2016. The reports were developed based on the analyzed results of key vulture conservation action and information collected during working group meetings. The project coordinator was responsible to draft |

| | | | |
|--|------|--|---|
| | | | these reports and then submit to the key working group members for its finalizing. These reports were distributed to all members of the working group, government partners and SAVE. These two reports were also submitted to CEPF as annexes of progression report. |
| | 14.6 | At least two partners staff will join international meetings (i.e. SAVE working group meeting) to present project findings inform international vulture conservation efforts | Mr. Sum Phearun, project coordinator, attended the 5 th and 6 th SAVE meetings in Dhaka, Bangladesh in October 2015 and Mumbai, India in November 2016. The Cambodia vulture project's conservation achievements and priority conservation actions were present during this regional vulture networking meeting. These meetings also provide a platform to link the Cambodia vulture conservation to Asian vulture conservation actions, especially integrating the key concerns and the need for priority regional action. This meeting also provided the opportunity for the Cambodia working group to lobby for more support from the regional initiative on Cambodia conservation action. Some significant results came up from joining this network such as having the Asian vulture project coordinator visit Cambodia and contribute to the Cambodian vulture action plan, having Bangladesh conduct a partner exchange visit to Cambodia and promise to support the Cambodia working group as a core member of SAVE and finally, during the last quarter of 2016, Cambodia's vulture working group finally become a core partner of SAVE. |
| | 14.7 | At least two government technical officers from Forestry Administration and Ministry of Environment will join SAVE working group meeting and | There were two government officers (one from Forestry Administration and another from Ministry of Environment) who attended the 6 th SAVE meeting in Mumbai, India in November 2016. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|------|--|---|
| | | | more engage in Cambodia vulture conservation effort. | |
| | | 14.8 | Cambodia Vulture Conservation Project partnership memorandum of understand will be signed for next three years (2016-2019) | <p>BirdLife, WCS, WWF, and ACCB has renewed the partnership MoU covering the period from 2017 to 2019. The objective of this agreement is to coordinate conservation activities for Critically Endangered vulture in Cambodia. Each partner responsible to implement activities at following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . WCS for Chhep Wildlife Sanctuary (former Previhear protected forest) . BirdLife for Lomphat Wildlife Sanctuary and Siem Pang Kang Lech Wildlife Sanctuary (former Western Siem Pang IBA) . WWF for Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and Mekong flood plain . ACCB for Seasan IBA |
| 15 | Sustainable mechanisms that could support the long-term conservation of three Critically Endangered Vulture species (White-rumped Vulture, Red-headed Vulture and Slender Billed Vulture) at all seven project sites in Cambodia are successfully identified | 15.1 | A peer-reviewed scientific paper on the effectiveness of nest protection methods for vulture species produced | A peer-reviewed scientific paper on the effectiveness of nest protection methods and carcass availability for vulture species have been submitted to Bird Conservation International and got some feedback from independents reviewers to improve the gaps. If no more comments, we expect this paper will be published in August 2017. |
| | | 15.2 | A peer-reviewed scientific paper on carcass availability in Cambodia and what short-term and long-term interventions are needed to maintain and improve food availability produced | See 15.1 |
| | | 15.3 | 100 copies of an updated action plan for vulture conservation in Cambodia | Cambodia vulture action plan was translated to Khmer and design to make it more attractive and easy to read. In addition, six- |

| | | | |
|--|------|--|--|
| | | (English and Khmer), endorsed by key stakeholders produced | hundred copies (300 copies of Khmer version and 300 copies of English version) of this action plan are printed for circulating. Designed Cambodia vulture action plan in both Khmer and English version is provided as attachment to this report. |
| | 15.4 | A second CEPF LoI developed to support the next phase of this long-term project; the implementation of identified sustainable mechanisms that can support Vulture conservation | Project partners support BirdLife to develop phase II of CVCP project for submit to CEPF however we could not apply due to in two calls of CEPF, there was no budget allocate for strategic direction one (Safeguard priority globally threatened species by mitigating major threats). |
| | 15.5 | At least three fund-raising project proposals to help implementation of the vulture action plan will be submitted | <p>There were two proposals have been developed and submitted to continue implementation of another ten-year vulture action plan. First proposal for covering the bridging period was submitted to SAVE and another one to the Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund (proposal is provide as attachment of this report). Until now we got no confirmation on these funding request proposal yet. One more proposal is in process develop for submit to National Geography and it will be submitted before deadline in July 2017. In June 2017, Mohamed bins Zayed confirm funding Cambodia vulture conservation activities in amount 10000 US\$.</p> <p>From 20 to 23 March 2017, BirdLife Cambodia hosted a visit of Bird Conservation Society of Thailand (BCST) to Western Siem Pang in purpose to lobby them to a species champion for vulture due to this BirdLife's partner right now involved in vulture captive breeding activities in their country. After finish this trip, even BCST could not accept the offer to be vulture species champion but they promise to provide more collaboration in vulture work</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>near future (i.e. poisoned vulture necropsy, share information related to vulture trade across the border ..)</p> <p>In March there was internal meeting of BirdLife senior officers at Cambridge to finalize the vulture conservation strategy in Asia, as result meeting decided to submit a regional funding proposal to potential donors (Segre Foundation, Wildlife Reserve Singapore) to cover vulture work in Cambodia.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|

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

All supported documents have been submitted time by time with project six-month progress report and last three months of project request for no cost extension report.

PART IV: Lessons, Sustainability, Safeguards and Financing

Lessons Learned

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

Consider lessons that would inform:

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

Project Design Process

The project's short term impacts were unrealistic and never achievable within the lifetime of the project. It needs more time, effort and resources to short some of these big issues. In reality, the project was too complex and included too many deliverables within a very tightening time table. It's recommended that next project design must consult clearly and very detail with field implementation to make sure all deliverable activities are delivered effectively, timely and measurable. During project design the scale of landscape conversion and was logging issues were not foreseen. This was greatly effect to short-term achievement of the project. Too much emphasis was placed on possible impacts of diclofenac poisoning that the project had invest time and effort to find out the reality use of this drug for veterinary purposes while the survey was proofed that the drug had not been used in the landscape. The issue was placed by secondary poisoning that harm vulture population throughout dry forest landscape. It's disappointed that during project design had not put strong emphasis on this.

Project Implementation

Adhere to what mentioned in project design process above, some deliverables were unrealistic and could not achieve within project lifetime. The process of getting endorsement from SSC IUCN Specialist group could not process within project time period, otherwise, BirdLife International as project led institution had tried best and tried hard to coordinate project with all partners with highly remarkable. Cambodia vulture working group established by this project was recognized as core member of Save Asia's Vulture from Extinction (SAVE), an existing IUCN vulture specialist group for Asia and a partner of Raptor MoU, Multi (vultures)-species Action Plan (MsAP) for Eurasia and Africa. The nest protection methodology was flexible changed base on real situation of conservation practice in the ground to minimize the impact and maximize the success rate rather than strongly fix to what written in the project proposal.

Lessons Learned Relevant to the Conservation Community

A key lesson learnt from this project is strong partnership and facilitate role of project coordinator. Each project partner is responsible to implement the activities in their

managed sites with sub-grant support from this project and leverage more human, equipment and financial resources from other donors. To ensure good communication within network, quarterly meetings were organized regularly and project data storing system was established with proper maintain and eligible all partners to use and update.

The ability of project to influence the decision makers and policy development peoples was seen increased through establish the Cambodia vulture working group which include members from two key government departments (Forestry Administration and Ministry of Environment) who in charge to develop strategy for protected area management and biodiversity conservation and hosting a visit of Cambodian Minister of Environment to see vulture at Western Siem Pang. A plan to build a road across the core area of Western Siem Pang was stopped because of intervention from Minister of Environment. Vulture conservation status was updated in the official national biodiversity status report.

During project period, the commercial scale illegal loggings were happened at all key vulture sites and the price and demand of wild orchid was increased which encouraged more local people to collect this wild product. These were the main reason contribute to increase the rate of nest failure during 2015-2016 breeding season and it effect to result of nest protection scheme analysing.

The project partners had limited capacity in produced the professional awareness raising material and organized the effective awareness raising events. We relied on Media Company to produce education film and business advertising agencies to design the signboard. It may useful in future to partner with education and awareness raising NGOs so that we have expertise in place.

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 this project is depend on functioning of Cambodia Vulture Conservation Project partnership and newly created Cambodia Vulture Working Group. The partnership MoU was signed at the at end for 2016 for next 3 years and it is a safeguard to ensure the priority vulture conservation activities will be continued after this CEPF funded project ended. The output of project and capable of human resources within Cambodia Vulture Working Group made SAVE felt more confident and finally invite us to be core member of SAVE. Being a core member of SAVE, Cambodia vulture working group will has more chance to input on regional vulture strategic and mobilize more resources to support Cambodia vulture conservation.

The Cambodia vulture conservation action plan was developed and adopted by all partners. This action plan is a significant guidance for future funding proposal development and advocate government to invest for conserving this species.

Donor invest in species conservation is decreased, which left the vulture conservation in unsecure status at the end of this project period. In future, it may useful to approach the

individual or small donors for support part of Cambodian vulture action plan. Initiative to secure cost of vulture conservation activities (i.e. vulture restaurant) such as ecotourism in Chhep Wildlife Sanctuary and cow bank in Western Siem Pang should do more detail review and replicate.

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.

The project was strongly focused on the conservation actions that strived to conserve and secure long-term conservation of three critically endangered vulture species throughout north and north-eastern Cambodia where most of project activities on research and monitoring were held. Therefore, the entire project had no negative impact to social or environmental safeguard that described in the World Bank investment policy.

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\$)

US\$ 215,788

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 |
|------------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| WWF | A | 17,490 | WWF donors are: BMZ- the German Development Bank and WWF- Switzerland |
| WCS | A | 11,600 | WCS donors are: Margaret A Cargil Foundation and private donation |
| ACCB | A | 11 840 | ACCB donors are: Germany – ZGAP, and GIZ |
| BirdLife | A | 11,600 | BirdLife donors are: MacArthur Foundation and private donor |
| WWF-in kind | A | 69,898 | |
| WCS-in kind | A | 21,600 | |
| ACCB-in kind | A | 36,660 | |
| BirdLife-in kind | A | 34,100 | |

* 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 |
|-----------|-----------|
| N/A | |
| | |
| | |

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 |
|-------------|--|---|
| N/A | | |
| | | |

* 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** |
|-------------|------------|---------------|--|-------------|------------|
| N/A | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

* 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 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| N/A | | | | |
| | | | | |

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

** 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* |
|--|--|
| 20 community rangers and field staff received training vulture nest searching and monitoring and vulture restaurant protocol | N/A |

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

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

| # of men benefiting from increased income* | # of women benefiting from increased income* |
|---|---|
| 8 nest guardian in WSP | N/A |
| 4 nest guardians in MFF | N/A |
| 8 nest guardians in Northern Plains | N/A |

**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* |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| N/A | |

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

18. Benefits to Communities

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

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | N/A | | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

20. Best Management Practices

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

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

21. Networks & Partnerships

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

| No. | Name of Network/ Partnership | Year established | Country(s) covered | Purpose |
|-----|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Cambodia Vulture Working Group | 2016 | Cambodia | To conserve the Cambodian vulture |
| 2 | SAVE | 2011 | Asia | To respond to the vulture crisis in Asia by striving to halt vulture population declines and working to minimise their negative impacts on ecological and human health |

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: Sum Phearun and Bou Vorsak

18. Organization: BirdLife International Cambodia Programme

19. Mailing address: #2, Street 476, Toul Tompoung 1, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

20. Telephone number: +855 23 993 631

21. E-mail address: phearun.sum@birdlife.org and vorsak.bou@birdlife.org