

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Thai Fund Foundation
Project Title:	Maximising CEPF Participation of Civil Society in Thailand
Date of Report:	30 April 2010
Report Author and Contact Information:	Kanchit Sukjaimitr kanchit@tff.or.th

CEPF Region: Indo-Burma Biodiversity Hotspot Indochina Region

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 3 - Engage key actors in reconciling biodiversity conservation and development objectives, with a particular emphasis on the Northern Limestone Highlands and Mekong River and its major tributaries.

Grant Amount: US\$ 1,820

Project Dates: July – September 2009

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

- 1) Thai Environment Network (TEN)
- 2) NGO Coordinating Committee on Development (NGO-COD)
- 3) Regional Community Forestry Training Center (RECOFTC)

TFF is a member of the Thai Environment Network (TEN) and used to be in its committee for two terms. Mr. Gawin Chutima, its Senior Expert at the time of application for this small grant, was appointed by the Natural Resources and Environment Ministry's Environment Quality Promotion Department as one of its three Advisors for the Civil Society Sector. Also sitting in its board are a representative from the NGO Coordinating Committee on Development (NGO-COD), a national network of development-oriented NGOs – many of which also carry out natural resources and environment management and biodiversity conservation activities, and a Manager for Thailand of the Bangkok-based (Asia) Regional Community Forestry Training Center (RECOFTC) which has wide range connection with community groups and civil society organizations working on forest protection. With assistance of these partners, TFF is therefore uniquely positioned to help CEPF in reaching out, effectively and efficiently identifying and informing eligible, qualified non-governmental organizations, community groups and other civil society organizations at local level across Thailand that are potentially interested to apply for financial supports from CEPF Indochina.

Conservation Impacts

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

Significant opportunity exists for CEPF within China and Thailand to ensure local-level civil society involvement and development. Thailand has the most well-developed local civil society in the region. With the longest history in the region of local civil society involvement in conservation, Thailand has 80-120 government-registered 'green' non-governmental organisations with relatively high capacity but limited financial resources to invest in their own organisational development, let alone specific conservation projects. However, CEPF and the CEPF-RIT have no staff based in Thailand, and very limited knowledge of Thai language. Most national NGOs in Thailand lack the capacity to write proposals in English. Thus, the recently-launched call for Letters of Inquiry (LOIs) has not reached many potential grantees across Thailand.

Thai Fund Foundation's contribution were to have all related significant information being translated into Thai language and make it available and reaching out to a wide range of local-level non-governmental organisations, community groups and other civil society organisations that are likely eligible and qualified to apply for CEPF funding.

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

As expected in the approved proposal, three key documents that are Indo-Burma Ecosystem Profile Summary, LoI Form and the second Call for Lols, were translated into Thai language to form a CEPF information package. Then non-governmental organisations, community groups and other civil society organizations at local level, including particularly their networks that are eligible to apply for CEPF funding, in the Mekong Priority Areas were informed through mixed mass media, both printed and electronic ones. Details are provided in a table below.

Expected Results	Outcomes
1) Radio broadcasting through state-owned stations and community radio networks, particularly in Thailand's Mekong Priority Areas.	<p>On August 13-14, 2009, the CEPF information together with a TFF official letter was sent to 25 radio stations under the Mass Communication Organisation of Thailand public Company limited (MCOT) which broadcast the Government's public relation news to Thailand's Mekong Priority Area, and 382 community radio stations in seven provinces along Mekong River, that were Ubol Ratcha-thani, Amnart Charoen, Yasothorn, Nakhon Phanom, Nong Khai, Loei and Sakol Nakhon.</p> <p>TFF do not have any record of broadcasting, but random check through phone calls found that most of them did broadcast it for at least one day. However, there was no feedback from either the stations or their listeners.</p>
2) Short messages sent via GEO Chat (social network communication through cell phone and Internet) through TFF's community radio networks	<p>TFF had problems to use GEO Chat system.</p> <p>The channel was changed to the Short Messages Service (SMS), where the message was sent to 119 people in seven provinces, that were Ubol Ratcha-thani, Amnart Charoen, Yasothorn, Nakhon Phanom, Nong Khai, Loei and Sakol Nakhon, twice on August 15 and September 5.</p> <p>This approach received good feedback as many of the targets called back to ask for more information even if they could go to CEPF website themselves. Some of them noted that so far no organization was really keen to support development in Mekong Region that put grassroots groups/organizations as key actors or partners. Most of those who contacted TFF said that they needed more time than being given to develop and write a project proposal because they were small grassroots NGOs or community organizations.</p> <p>In addition we also sent e-mail through 427 NGO in that area from our ThaiNGO mailing list.</p>
3) Publicity through 5 national daily newspapers: three in Thai language - Matichon, Daily News and Kao Soad, and two in English language - The Nation and Bangkok Post.	<p>The CEPF information was sent to the five target national daily newspapers as expected. It was published in their available free advertisement areas. TFF, however, did not keep record of this publication.</p> <p>TFF also used 500 flyers inserted in an issue of the Folk Doctor Magazine which reached readers in the Mekong Priority Area as well.</p>
4) Specially designed webpages in at least 30 Thailand-based	TFF contacted as many as 30 Thailand-based environmental websites to present a specially design webpage for public relations of the CEPF

environmental websites	information package, but only one website gave cooperation as can be seen in the following URL: http://www.media4democracy.com/th/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2245&Itemid=25
5) Specially designed webpages in TFF website, www.thaingo.org , a award-winning civil society website / web portal for the community of Thai civil society organisations.	The webpage specially design for public relations of the CEPF information package was added to www.thaingo.org , a website of TFF, as expected.
6) Specially designed banner on the top of the homepage of www.thaingo.org	Similarly, a banner specially design to stimulate interest of viewers on CEPF and the second Call for Lols was put up on the top of the homepage of www.thaingo.org , as expected.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: no

Species Conserved: no

Corridors Created: no

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

There were no long-term impact objectives as the project covered a period of only two months. The main challenge faced by this project toward achieving its short-term impact objectives were to obtain cooperation from other media channels to help provide public relations for CEPF as the project was essentially low cost with no budget allocated to buy (printing) space or (air) time from the media. It was not surprise, therefore, that the national daily newspapers, which normally charge a very high commercial rate of several hundred thousand Baht for one-day full-page advertisement or announcement of any kind, gave only a small space for CEPF information in their free advertisement area that was crowded with many other free advertisement. TFF, however, was successful in our approach to the radio media, both the government and community-based ones, receiving very good response and also good feedback from their listeners similar to individuals who received direct SMS from TFF.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

One particular unexpected impact in implementing this project was negative – a near zero response or cooperation from Thailand-based environmental websites despite CEPF being a potential new source of funding for themselves, their partners and target groups should be of their interest and benefit.

Lessons Learned

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

Lessons learned, especially those that would inform project design for public relations in the future, are as follows:

- 1) To use mass printed media effectively, it is necessary to invest in buying their space. Payment rate could be negotiated down and more space given, especially if the public relation space is repeatedly printed. The PR piece would occupy not the best, but not poor location (like free advertisement areas) in the

printed media, and with larger size would attract more people and thus becoming more effective.

- 2) Direct approach, such as through SMS, also worked well with good feedback and should be expanded with more investment.
- 3) Among the mass media, radio looks to be the best channel to approach grassroots, local groups and organizations as can be seen from the good feedback, and thus should be a backbone for outreaching to local or grassroots target in case that only limited budget can be allocated for public relations.
- 4) In the future, if more funding can be allocated for preparation stage, an additional project proposal development service should be seriously considered as it would bring more positive response and more project proposals for CEPF.

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

For this kind of [project, use of mass media that already have certain connections with the implementer and the mass media which have already reach out to a large permanent audience would guarantee a higher success possibility and reduce risks/shortcomings.

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

TFF should communicate more with environmental website holders, explaining benefits from helping do public relations for CEPF and actively talk them to provide cooperation, not just take for grant that as they exist for the interest of the environment, they would automatically cooperate.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

Conservation community is likely to encounter similar challenges and risks/shortcomings as TFF in implementing a project of this kind. Lessons learned are therefore could be similar.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

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

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
(none)	(none)	(none)	(none)

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

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

Sustainability/Replicability

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

components or results.

It is difficult to say about 'sustainability' as it was a one-time project of short-term nature. However, lessons learned as mentioned above should make any similar project, such as for the third Call for Lols, replicated more easily, more efficiently and more effectively.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

(none)

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

No specific action was required.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

(none)

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

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

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Mr. Kanchit Sukjaimitr

Organization name: Thai Fund Foundation

Mailing address: 2044/23 New Phetburi Road, Huaykwang, Bangkok 10310, Thailand

Tel: 662 318 3959, 662 314 4112, 662 314 4113

Fax: 662 718 1850

E-mail: dsc@tff.or.th, kanchit@tff.or.th