

## CEPF Final Project Completion Report

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

<b>Organization Legal Name</b>	Mekong Watch
<b>Project Title</b>	<i>Enhancing Civil Society Capacities to Work on Biodiversity, Communities, and Livelihoods in Regional Networks Across Major Tributaries in the Lower Mekong River Basin</i>
<b>CEPF GEM No.</b>	64122
<b>Date of Report</b>	30 May 2016
<b>Report Author</b>	Toshiyuki Doi
<b>Author Contact Information</b>	<a href="mailto:info@mekongwatch.org">info@mekongwatch.org</a>

**CEPF Region:** Indo-Burma

**Strategic Direction:** Strategic Direction 6. Engage key actors in mainstreaming biodiversity, communities, and livelihoods into development planning in the priority corridors

**Grant Amount:** 100,000.00 USD

**Project Dates:** 01 April 2014 – 31 March 2016

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

- (1) Champasak Provincial TV Station in Champasak, Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR): Worked with Mekong Watch (MW) to produce and broadcast environmental documentary programs related to local biodiversity and natural resources, especially fish species and fishing activities;
- (2) Network for Local Fishery Groups in the Middle Mun River Basin in Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand: Worked with MW in carrying out action research on fish species and migration/spawning behaviors, drafting recommendations to restore the Mun River basin's biodiversity, and sharing their experiences, as well as research results, with other communities/CSOs (Civil Society Organizations) at the other target sites. Their advisory group, Committee for Rehabilitation of Ecology and Livelihood on Mun River, also worked with us; and
- (3) 3 Rivers (Sesan-Srepok-Sekong) Protection Network (3SPN) in Ratanakiri, Cambodia: Worked with MW on a day-to-day basis in researching the Mekong's biodiversity/natural resources and their utilization/management in local communities, sharing knowledge/experience, networking with other CSOs regionally and internationally, and carrying out advocacy activities towards key policy/decision-makers.

### **Conservation Impacts**

## **2. Describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile**

*Enhancing Civil Society Capacities to Work on Biodiversity, Communities, and Livelihoods in Regional Networks Across Major Tributaries in the Lower Mekong River Basin (“the Project”)* contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile by mainstreaming biodiversity, communities, and livelihoods into basin-wide decision-making processes regarding large-scale development, in particular hydropower along major tributaries of the Mekong River, to ensure that the Mekong’s natural resources and biodiversity can continue to support people’s lives, especially those of the economically poor and socially vulnerable, without being damaged in any irreversible or irreplaceable manner.

The Project strengthened existing CSO networks by facilitating active participation of the indigenous/minority communities at the target sites in the networks, as well as by building their capacities to analyze development impacts and alternatives, and articulate their ideas and views effectively. The Project, while foreseeing a basin-wide multi-stakeholder engagement mechanism, also created opportunities through which both the CSOs and local communities could work with other key actors, especially government officials, policy-makers, and media representatives, towards decisions that were better informed of biodiversity conservation perspectives.

The network-building strategy was effective because the anticipated hydropower impacts were often of a trans-boundary nature and had to be understood and addressed regionally. The monitored hydropower projects were complex, involving various actors and encompassing different issues. Focusing on the tributary communities was also meaningful. They were well-placed in informing decision-making processes as they lived in close contact with the Mekong’s biodiversity and were able to ascertain its value and the impacts of development on the ground. And yet, their views were not given due attention. The impacts of the Mekong’s tributary dams were even less debated than those on the mainstream.

Furthermore, the Project conformed to two of CEPF’s investment priorities defined under Strategic Direction 6. As Priority 6.1 (“Support Civil Society Efforts to Analyze Development Policies, Plans and Programs, Evaluate their Impact on Biodiversity, Communities and Livelihoods, and Propose Alternative Development Scenarios and Appropriate Mitigating Measures where Needed”) suggests, the Project monitored impacts of hydropower development and related policies, and researched and promoted alternatives and mitigation measures. In line with Investment Priority 6.4 (“Engage the Media as a Tool to Increase Awareness and Inform Public Debate of Environmental Issues”), the Project also provided the media with critical analyses so that they could raise the general public’s awareness of the socio-environmental implications of hydropower, and increase the quality of public debate on conservation of the Mekong’s biodiversity.

## **3. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project**

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

*List each long-term impact from Grant Writer proposal*

- 1) Long-term impact 1

“A basin-wide mechanism is considerably strengthened, or re-established, where decisions regarding large-scale development, such as hydropower, are made on the basis of (1) sound scientific knowledge and evidence, especially relating to the values of the Mekong River Basin's biodiversity and natural resources, (2) past development experiences and lessons, and (3) full assessment of alternatives, through processes that are truly transparent, accountable, and participatory, especially in the eyes of local communities.”

2) Long-term impact 2

“Much wider and stronger recognition is gained over (1) the values of Mekong's biodiversity/natural resources and sustainable aspects of local communities' natural resources utilization/management, as well as (2) irreversible negative impacts that large-scale development might cause to them and its implications to critical regional issues, such as food and national security, and is shared among key actors, including Mekong governments, conventional and emerging donors, the private sector, the media, CSOs, local communities, and general public.”

3) Long-term impact 3

“More effective policies and measures are agreed upon and implemented to protect and restore Mekong's biodiversity and natural resources, especially fish and other water species, so that they can be accessible, made use of, and managed not only at present but also among future generations.”

#### **4. Actual progress toward long-term impacts at completion**

1) Long-term impact 1

The Project contributed to the 1<sup>st</sup> long-term impact in that it strengthened the existing regional CSO networks (e.g., Save the Mekong Coalition, River Coalition in Cambodia, and 3SPN) by linking the target communities with them, as well as by creating opportunities through which the communities could meet and discuss among themselves the value of the Mekong's biodiversity, impacts of large-scale hydropower, and development alternatives. The Project also enabled the communities to make use of scientific evidence and lessons from the past to act as effective and responsible participants at meetings and in other processes, the outcomes of which might impact their lives and livelihoods. That the communities became empowered was important because it would ensure that the envisioned basin-wide engagement mechanism became more transparent, accountable, and participatory.

On the other hand, the Project did not create enough opportunities for the target communities to communicate their views on how to protect the Mekong's natural resources and biodiversity with government officials and corporate representatives who were promoting hydropower development.

2) Long-term impact 2

The Project achieved the 2<sup>nd</sup> long-term impact to a large degree, especially with regard to the target communities and the regional media. The Project produced a bulk of knowledge and analysis on the value of the Mekong's biodiversity, sustainable aspects of community-based conservation initiatives, and the irreversible impacts large-scale hydropower might have on them. These intellectual resources were created by participatory means (e.g., through team research and community map-making) and disseminated in ways that were readily accessible

(e.g., posted on the website in multiple Mekong languages), especially to the communities. Some communities have utilized these resources to raise concerns about impacts of hydropower projects in their campaign activities. A number of journalists have published news reports and articles based on the information and analyses provided through the Project.

On the other hand, the Project's products and deliverables did not adequately reach key development actors, especially government officials both in Mekong countries and among emerging donors, as well as among private sector representatives. The Project's analyses were not often used by these actors to change their views on the value of the Mekong's biodiversity and/or devastating impacts of large-scale hydropower.

### 3) Long-term impact 3

The Project did not materialize into concrete policies to ensure conservation of the Mekong's biodiversity for the future. It stopped at generating a set of recommendations which could lay the foundations for viable policies. In this respect, the Project did not achieve the 3<sup>rd</sup> long-term impact.

That being said, the Project was able to promote a community-based fish conservation zone as a workable measure and option for protecting the Mekong's biodiversity. The Project documented one particular case (i.e., the Tholathi Island community) in detail and encouraged local communities, NGO workers, academics/researchers, and journalists to learn lessons from that case. The villagers from the Mun River basin became more inspired and accelerated their efforts to establish fish conservation zones in their community immediately after their visit to Tholathi Island. The Project thus contributed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> long-term impact by identifying an effective conservation measure and facilitating its implementation.

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

*List each short-term impact from Grant Writer proposal*

#### 1) Short-term impact 1

"Local communities, especially those in Cambodia and Lao PDR, have stronger recognition over the values of biodiversity and natural resources in the Mekong River Basin, develop better ideas on development impacts and alternatives (as measured, e.g., by the quality of issued statements, including the number of innovative ideas expressed in such statements), work more closely with other communities/CSOs domestically and regionally (as measured, e.g., by the number of new participating and active community/CSO representatives at relevant meetings), and establish clearer strategies to achieve their needs and demands."

#### 2) Short-term impact 2

"Local communities and CSOs in the Mekong Region can access more opportunities and channels through which to articulate and communicate their views, concerns, and ideas to contribute to and influence decisions relating to development projects (as measured, e.g., by the number of accessed opportunities and improved decisions)."

#### 3) Short-term impact 3

"More cases of development threats, in particular destructive hydropower projects, are cancelled, delayed, or significantly redesigned to avoid or mitigate negative impacts on Mekong's biodiversity and natural resources (as measured, e.g., by the number of such cases,

the quality of proposed mitigation measures, and the extent to which such measures are implemented).”

#### 4) Short-term impact 4

“More knowledge and information on biodiversity and natural resources, as well as traditional natural resources utilization/management, in the Mekong River Basin are gathered in manners that are readily usable and effective in campaign/advocacy work as well as regional decision-making processes (as measured, e.g., by the number of relevant products and how often they are actually utilized).”

### **5. Actual progress toward short-term impacts at completion**

#### 1) Short-term impact 1

The Project achieved the 1<sup>st</sup> short-term impact to a large extent. It helped the local communities at the target sites, especially in northeastern Cambodia, gain stronger recognition of the value of the Mekong’s biodiversity and impacts of hydropower on that biodiversity. For instance, the villagers affected by the Lower Sesan 2 (LS2) Dam highlighted negative impacts on the local natural resources when they challenged the project. The Tholathi Island community also clearly articulated the value of their fish to visitors on field trips. The local communities’ recognition of the value of the Mekong’s natural resources and the threats of hydropower was enhanced by information and analysis provided through the Project’s outputs, especially documentaries and participatory activities (e.g., team research and community map-making) as well as community-to-community exchange visits.

The Project also helped the target communities to work among themselves, such as by establishing a youth group, and reach out to other communities and CSOs domestically, regionally, and internationally. The community exchange programs were especially effective between the Mun River and Tholathi Island villagers. Both communities became more confident about and developed ideas on community-based fish conservation as a viable development alternative.

On the other hand, it was very difficult for the LS2-affected communities to develop ideas on alternatives based on the experiences of the Mun River and Tholathi Island communities. This was because they were under increasing pressure from the developers to accept relocation to places far away from rivers and forests. This distracted them from discussing ideas for securing their access to natural resources. For them and the Mun River communities, networking with Tonle Sap communities was not as meaningful as had been expected. Many fish conservation activities around Tonle Sap Lake, as far as we could see, were initiated and administered by NGOs on behalf of the local communities. Furthermore, the Tonle Sap communities were more concerned about the Don Sahong Dam than LS2, even though the impact from the latter might be larger.

#### 2) Short-term impact 2

The Project achieved the 2<sup>nd</sup> short-term impact to some extent. It helped the target communities, especially the LS2-affected villagers both downstream and upstream, access Cambodian and Thai journalists, Cambodian National Assembly members, the developers, and CSO representatives from China, and convey their concerns over LS2’s impacts and insufficient compensation to these actors. Several journalists whom the communities approached produced

reportage on the impacts of the Pak Mun, Don Sahong, and LS2 Dams on the Mekong's biodiversity.

These efforts, however, did not clearly lead to better decisions over the large-scale projects of concern such as the Don Sahong and LS2 Dams. It was also difficult to assess positive impacts of the documentaries produced and broadcasted by the Champasak Provincial TV Station. We asked an external evaluator to address this issue. Although the evaluator noted the possibility that the programs had been viewed and well received by the Lao general public, he was unable to access sufficient samples to further substantiate this impression.

### 3) Short-term impact 3

The Project achieved the 3<sup>rd</sup> short-term impact in very limited ways. Scientists' warnings over devastating basin-wide impacts and local villagers' protests were not enough to convince the developers to review LS2. The Project might have contributed to delaying the dam's construction to adopt more mitigation measures and improve the resettlement/compensation program. The outcome of Save the Mekong Coalition's campaign against the Don Sahong Dam, which MW joined through this Project, was similar. The campaign contributed to delaying the construction and installing mitigation measures. Details about the design changes and their positive effects on the Mekong's biodiversity for either the LS2 or Don Sahong Dam have yet to be confirmed, however. Also, the Project probably contributed to the continued seasonal opening of the Pak Mun Dam gates now and for the future.

### 4) Short-term impact 4

The Project achieved the 4<sup>th</sup> short-term impact to a considerable degree. It produced numerous documentary programs, booklets and briefers, webpages, newspaper articles, and other outputs. Many of them were made in and/or translated into Mekong languages (i.e., Khmer, Lao, Thai, and Vietnamese) as well as in English so as to be accessible not only to the target local communities but regionally and internationally. They were also disseminated widely and used in campaign/advocacy activities, especially by the communities at the project sites. However, they did not adequately reach out to such key actors as government officials and corporate representatives.

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

The Project encountered the following challenges in achieving its short-term and long-term impacts.

Building the capacities of and creating advocacy opportunities for the LS2-affected communities were much more resource-consuming than had been anticipated. This was partly because the River Coalition in Cambodia (RCC), a national CSO network, did not develop clear, coherent strategies to support the communities who were urging the government to review the project on biodiversity and livelihood protection grounds. 3SPN was much more consistent in its approaches to LS2 and support to the affected communities. 3SPN, however, was headquartered in Ratanakiri and was disadvantaged in working in Stung Treng, where many project-related activities were taking place, and Phnom Penh, where most of the key actors, including government officials and policy-makers, were based. 3SPN also faced organizational challenges, including financial management.

More fundamentally, the LS2 Dam was (and still is) framed largely as a domestic hydropower project built on one of the Mekong's tributaries inside Cambodia, despite scientists' caution over its impacts on the Mekong basin's biodiversity and natural resources, especially fish, from the beginning. The Project attempted to reframe LS2 by highlighting its regional implications, for instance, by taking up the case at Save the Mekong Coalition meetings and other basin-wide opportunities. Little due attention was given, however, to the dam's impacts on conservation of the Mekong's biodiversity/natural resources.

The overall shrinking political space inside the three target countries was another challenge facing the Project. The Cambodian government passed legislation to further regulate CSO operations. CSOs based inside the Lao PDR largely stayed away from the topics that could appear sensitive, including hydropower and land. As Thailand was under the military-led administration, its civil society was not able to play as active a role as otherwise in response to regional issues such as hydropower and biodiversity conservation. The current political situations in these countries seemed to reduce the possibility of establishing basin-wide mechanisms and policies to manage the Mekong's biodiversity, at least from CSOs' perspectives. Many CSOs and local communities became dissatisfied with the outcomes of the MRC's handling of the Xayaburi and Don Sahong dams, which added confusion to the task of envisioning workable policies and procedures for building a consensus to protect the Mekong's natural resources/biodiversity.

#### **7. Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?**

None.

#### **Project Components and Products/Deliverables**

##### **Component 1 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

*List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer*

##### 1) Component 1 [Research & documentation]

"Key species and natural resources, especially fish, as well as sustainable ways to manage them, are recorded and analyzed in manners to set baselines, design measures to avoid/mitigate impacts, and enhance understanding over Mekong's biodiversity and ecology."

##### 1-1)Product/deliverable [Cambodia]

"A community catalog on fish species and non-timber forest products (NTFPs), as well as an almanac to show livelihood activities, is made for at least three communities along the Sesan and Srepok Rivers, especially those affected by the Lower Sesan 2 Dam. 200 hard copies in Khmer and English are distributed to communities, CSOs, the media, and development proponents. Soft copy is posted on website."

##### 1-2)Product/deliverable [Laos]

"Video clips on fish species and fishing activities in Siphandone are made and posted on website. A more comprehensive 20 to 30-minute documentary is produced and broadcast in Lao PDR. A version with English subtitles is also made. 300 DVDs are distributed to communities, CSOs,

policy-makers, the media, and development proponents at national, regional, and international meetings. Also posted on website.”

1-3)Product/deliverable [Thailand]

“A Thai/English written report to record fish migration and spawning behaviors, and to identify significant changes after the construction of the Pak Mun and Rasi Sarai Dams and the gate-opening of the former, alongside a list of recommendations to restore fish species and other natural resources in the Mun River Basin. 200 hard copies are distributed to government officials, the media, and general public. Also posted on website.”

1-4)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

“Local wisdom is analyzed and re-framed to promote views of Mekong’s biodiversity and natural resources as regional commons through a digital archive of 60 traditional stories and other oral performances, collected at least in three communities, to highlight ethical and aesthetic aspects of protecting biodiversity and natural resources in multiple languages with English annotation. Also, a collection of 15 to 20 representative stories with a synthetic chapter to explain the significance of the work in English. 200 hard copies are distributed to communities, development proponents, academics, and general public. Posted on website, too.”

## **8. Describe the results from Component 1 and each product/deliverable**

1) Component 1 [Research & documentation]

MW documented and analyzed a good amount of the Mekong’s biodiversity, especially fish species, and community-based sustainable ways of managing them at the target sites. We disseminated the information widely not only in English but also in Khmer, Lao, and Thai, which helped enhance understanding of the region’s biodiversity, as well as develop ideas on how to protect it.

1-1)Product/deliverable [Cambodia]

MW completed a catalog/almanac on natural resources and livelihood activities for Kbal Romeas Village in Stung Treng in Khmer and English (see (1)). We distributed the document to Kbal Romeas and other villages in Stung Treng and Ratanakiri which were affected by the LS2 Dam. We also presented the information to participants at an international NGO meeting in Stung Treng in January 2015 and an international workshop in Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand in February 2016.

MW also helped the Sraekor and Kbal Romeas villages in Stung Treng make a community natural resource map. The villagers exhibited the map at a community hall and Buddhist ceremonies and used it to explain their concerns over LS2 to project proponents, NGOs, and the general public during such events as a press conference and a peace-walk. We created a webpage to explain the purposes and procedures of the map making, with the hope that it would be replicated elsewhere (see (2)). In September 2015, we helped Sieng Sai Village in Ratanakiri make a resource map, as they had indicated interest in the activity.

(1) *Introduction to livelihoods in Kbal Romeas Village, Northeast Cambodia:*

[http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/Intro\\_KR\\_Village.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/Intro_KR_Village.pdf)

(2) *Making a community resources map in Kbal Romeas and Sraekor villages in Stung Treng*

*Province, Cambodia:* [http://www.mekongwatch.org/english/projects/MM\\_LS2.html](http://www.mekongwatch.org/english/projects/MM_LS2.html)



### 1-2)Product/deliverable [Laos]

MW worked with Champasak Provincial TV Station and completed five Lao-language documentaries on fish species and fishing activities in Siphandone. Two of them were made with English subtitles (see (1)). We also produced *20 years of conservation on Tholathi Island*, a 12-minute video program to show local villagers' efforts to preserve fish species of Tholathi Island in Champasak (see (2)). Champasak Provincial TV Station broadcasted these documentaries through their network. We screened *20 years of conservation on Tholathi Island* in Tholathi Village and distributed DVDs to the villagers in January 2015. We worked with the Children's Culture Center (CCC) and distributed 60 DVD copies of the above documentaries throughout the Lao PDR.

MW also completed *Hoo Sahong, a fish corridor threatened by dam development*, a documentary on the Don Sahong Dam's social and environmental impacts in English, Thai, Vietnamese, and Japanese (see (3)). We screened it at the February 2016 international workshop in Ubon Ratchathani and distributed 40 DVD copies to the participants.

#### (1) Documentaries on fish species and fishing activities in Siphandone:

- (a) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1iIVHHSjx9k>
- (b) *The pa soy has to adapt*: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iAT81K0yClI>
- (c) *If the fish change, the food changes, too*:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QqsVlbgGR7Y>
- (d) *The pa soy has to adapt* (with English subtitles):  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RUH0pK2VGpk>
- (e) *If the fish change, the food changes, too* (with English subtitles):  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=keduirqJKiA>

#### (2) *20 years of conservation on Tholathi Island*:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oc0AcaSP6ss>.

#### (3) *Hoo Sahong, a fish corridor threatened by dam development*:

- (a) English: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ws5KJSamhTY>
- (b) Thai: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4qm1scCm03A>
- (c) Vietnamese: <https://youtu.be/-yPF98jwwQ>
- (d) Japanese: <https://youtu.be/oIHWdybL7sw>

### 1-3)Product/deliverable [Thailand]

MW worked with the villagers affected by the Pak Mun, Rasi Salai, and Hua Na dams along the Mun River and formed a village research team. We trained the team to collect fish species and other data in the down- and mid-stream areas along the river. The team reported results of its research at meetings with the local fishery agency and resident groups in July 2015. We also helped the team draft a research report in Thai and English (see (1)).

#### (1) *Proposal for the gathering of data and survey method on local residents' knowledge of freshwater fish spawning in the middle Mun River Basin, Thailand*:

[http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/Proposal\\_for\\_Survey\\_Method\\_Fish\\_Mun.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/Proposal_for_Survey_Method_Fish_Mun.pdf)

### 1-4)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

MW coordinated a team of seven researchers from Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand, and Japan, who collected more than 100 folktales and legends related to the environment and natural

resources from five indigenous/minority communities at the target sites. We created a digital database of the collected stories (see (1)) and published *Plants, animals, salt and spirits: How people live with and talk about the environment in rural Cambodia, Laos and Thailand*, a compilation of 17 selected stories in English (see (2)). We also developed an environmental education handbook from the database in Khmer, Lao, and Thai (see (3)) and held training workshops for children, local teachers, and NGO workers in Vientiane, Lao PDR and Udon Thani, Thailand in March 2016. We distributed 300 copies each of the story book and handbook to academics/teachers, NGO workers, and the general public. We also published two articles explaining links between the stories and natural resource/biodiversity conservation (see (4)).

- (1) *The people's stories project*: <http://www.mekongwatch.org/peoplestory/index.html>
- (2) *Plants, animals, salt and spirits: How people live with and talk about the environment in rural Cambodia, Laos and Thailand*:  
<http://www.mekongwatch.org/resource/publication.html#Story>
- (3) *Handbook for environmental education: Let's learn about nature through stories*:
  - (a) Thai: [http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/PeopleStory\\_Thai.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/PeopleStory_Thai.pdf)
  - (b) Lao: [http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/PeopleStory\\_Lao.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/PeopleStory_Lao.pdf)
  - (c) Khmer: [http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/PeopleStory\\_Khmer.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/PeopleStory_Khmer.pdf)
- (4) Related articles:
  - (a) "From stories to policies: Reflections on API collaborative grant research". In *The Asian Public Intellectuals*. September 2015, pp. 16-17.
  - (b) "Commons are telling: People's folktales and legends on their environment". In *Mekong Commons*. January 2016: <http://www.mekongcommons.org/commons-are-telling-peoples-folktales-and-legends-on-their-environment/>

## **Component 2 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

*List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer*

### 2) Component 2 [Networking]

"Local community and CSO networks are strengthened both domestically and regionally through expansion into new members and mutual learning of relevant experiences, different perspectives, and good practices/alternatives."

#### 2-1)Product/deliverable [Cambodia]

"Short (3 to 5-minute) video clips of 20 to 30 villagers, especially women and girls, affected by the Lower Sesan 2 Dam, to express their views on natural resources, livelihoods, and development impacts are produced in Khmer/Lao with English subtitles through collaboration with a youth network across at least five communities in Ratanakiri and Stung Treng Provinces. Posted and disseminated on website."

#### 2-2)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

"An analysis to map out key actors, including local communities, and their activities on biodiversity conservation and natural resources management (e.g., a community-based fish conservation zone in Siphandone)."

#### 2-3)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

“A field trip to learn from alternatives (identified in Deliverable 2.2.), co-hosted by Ubonratchathani University and/or the National University of Laos, and joined by representatives from communities, NGOs, and academics from Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand.”

2-4)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

“A regional workshop to report results of site visits in Deliverable 2.3. The meeting is held in the region (e.g., in Ratanakiri Province) where community/CSO experiences and ideas are shared regionally. It is attended by additional community representatives and NGOs, including those from China and Korea, regionally, and internationally.”

2-5)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

“Compliance with CEPF Social Safeguard Policies, especially in the 3S River Basin, is monitored and reported to CEPF. Monitoring and reporting includes gender mainstreaming and child protection.”

## 9. Describe the results from Component 2 and each product/deliverable

2) Component 2 [Networking]

MW widened and strengthened the Mekong’s local community/CSO networks by linking the LS2-affected communities in Stung Treng with other LS2-affected communities in Ratanakiri, the communities affected by the Pak Mun Dam in Thailand, and CSO members of Save the Mekong Coalition. We also hosted two meetings between the Mun River community representatives and Tholathi villagers on Tholathi Island to discuss community-based fish conservation zones.

2-1)Product/deliverable [Cambodia]

MW helped form youth groups at three LS2-affected villages, worked with them, and produced six short video clips (in Khmer/Lao with English subtitles) to capture the villagers’ concerns over losing access to natural resources due to the LS2 construction (see (1)). We screened these documentaries and distributed DVDs to the LS2-affected communities in Stung Treng and Ratanakiri.

(1) Video clips on the concerns of LS2-affected villagers:

- a) *Sesan River and our life: A villager's voice on LS2, Vernsai District (Part 1):*  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rwYwFJden\\_w](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rwYwFJden_w)
- b) *Sesan River and our life: A villager's voice on LS2, Vernsai District (Part 2):*  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FFR0ggEe904>
- c) *Sesan River and our life: A villager's voice on LS2, Andoung Meas District:*  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DXdj-Rr2L1s>
- d) *Enjoying the blessings of nature: Kbal Romeas Village, Cambodia – Andeng Flower:*  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hEkiYWejOxU>
- e) *Enjoying the blessings of nature: Kbal Romeas Village, Cambodia – Fishing:*  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0WROGviHk1g>
- f) *Enjoying the blessings of nature: Kbal Romeas Village, Cambodia – Forests:*  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HIk9yKmFdws>

2-2)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

MW analyzed several cases of community-based natural resource management through documents and interviews. They included *Thai Baan Research* and fish conservation zones along

the down/midstream of the Mun River, various biodiversity conservation projects in Stung Treng and Ratanakiri, and a community-based fish conservation zone at Tholathi Island and Khong District. We decided to choose the Tholathi case for further analysis and field visits.

#### 2-3) Products/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

MW hosted field visits to Tholathi Island three times with: academics/researchers, journalists, and NGO workers from Thailand, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Japan in March 2015; Pak Mun Dam-affected community representatives in July 2015; and community representatives, journalists, academics/researchers, and NGO workers from Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand, China, and Korea in February 2016. Ubon Ratchathani University co-hosted a workshop prior to the February 2016 field visit. We made video footage of the Pak Mun community's visit in July 2015 for Champasak Provincial TV Station.

#### 2-4) Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

MW held a regional workshop in Stung Treng in February 2016. Community representatives, journalists, academics/researchers, and NGO workers from Thailand, Lao PDR, Cambodia, China, and Korea attended and discussed various issues relating to the Mekong, including reflections on their visit to the Tholathi Island community. The LS2-affected villagers presented their concerns over the project's impacts on the Mekong's biodiversity to the participants. This was broadcasted as part of Thai Public Broadcasting Service's (PBS) program *People's voice: Dams on the Mekong* (see (1)). The participating journalists also produced a number of news dispatches after the regional workshop (see (2) – (5)).

- (1) *People's voice: Dams on the Mekong*. 17 March 2016:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MGAeRjJDwDY&nohtml5=False>
- (2) "Pak Moon dam still a dilemma 25 years on". *Bangkok Post*. 22 February 2016:  
<http://www.bangkokpost.com/print/872044/>
- (3) 25 ปี เขื่อนปากมูล: อาชญากรรมในเงาการพัฒนา *Prachathai*. 06 March 2016:  
<http://prachatai.com/journal/2016/03/64461>
- (4) Thai PBS
  - (a) ژیรัฐทบทวนโครงการผันน้ำโขง ระบุได้รับผลกระทบมานับสิบปีทั้งระบบนิเวศ-ความหลากหลายพันธุ์ปลา. 23 February 2016:  
<http://news.thaipbs.or.th/content/250381>
  - (b) เขื่อนคอนสะโฮง" จุดชนวนความขัดแย้งในลุ่มแม่น้ำโขงตอนล่าง. 07 March 2016:  
<http://news.thaipbs.or.th/content/250717>
  - (c) ผลกระทบข้ามพรมแดน เขื่อนแม่น้ำโขงตอนล่าง. 17 March 2016:  
<http://news.thaipbs.or.th/content/251028>
  - (d) เสี่ยงสะท้อนของชาวบ้านริมแม่น้ำโขงตอนล่างกับการสร้างเขื่อน. 18 March 2016:  
<http://news.thaipbs.or.th/content/251063>
- (5) TNN 24
  - (a) เขื่อนกั้นโขง กับวิถีชีวิตที่ต้องเปลี่ยน 1. 10 March 2016:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q3S0UbLkFs0>
  - (b) เขื่อนกั้นโขง กับวิถีชีวิตที่ต้องเปลี่ยน 2. 11 March 2016:  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T\\_msl8wWYk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T_msl8wWYk)
  - (c) เขื่อนกั้นโขง กับวิถีชีวิตที่ต้องเปลี่ยน 3. 13 March 2016:  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wS5p\\_PoVDqo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wS5p_PoVDqo)

#### 2-5) Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

MW made three types of assessment reports to ensure that the Project complied with CEPF Social Safeguard Policies, especially with regard to indigenous communities in northeastern Cambodia, and other relevant policies (see (1) to (3)).

- (1) Four six-month safeguard monitoring reports submitted to CEPF;
- (2) Four matrices of six-month internal evaluations of MW's activities submitted to and approved by MW's board of directors; and
- (3) An external evaluation carried out by an independent consultant in December 2015.

**Component 3 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

*List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer*

3) Component 3 [Advocacy]

"Various opportunities are created to communicate community and CSO perspectives on development impacts and biodiversity/natural resources conservation to key actors, including Mekong governments, traditional and emerging donors, the private sector, the media, and general public."

3-1)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos]

"Khmer and Lao translations of Chinese government's guidelines to protect environment in overseas investments, coupled with a 4 to 5-page introduction for local communities, are completed and distributed at community workshops and CSO meetings in Cambodia and Lao PDR. A kit includes briefing papers, particularly those on Mekong's biodiversity and natural resources."

3-2)Product/deliverable [Cambodia]

"Two documentaries, (1) a 15 to 20-minute video on already emerged hydropower impacts along the Sesan and Srepok Rivers; and (2) a 20 to 30-minute video on potential impacts of and communities' concerns over the Lower Sesan 2 Dam are made in Lao/Khmer with English subtitles. 200 DVDs are distributed among others to government officials, Chinese authorities/companies, and other project proponents."

3-3)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

"Recommendations on measures and alternatives to protect biodiversity, communities, and livelihoods are submitted in writing to Mekong governments, MRC, donors (in particular the Japanese government), and emerging donors on such occasions as MRC meetings (e.g., of Joint Committee, Council, and development partners), as well as ASEAN and Japan-Mekong Summit meetings."

3-4)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

"Briefing papers on Mekong's biodiversity/natural resources and their sustainable management, an initial set of which was completed in November 2013 in several Mekong languages, are expanded into other languages (e.g., Burmese and Vietnamese), used as reference materials in the project's advocacy activities, and distributed among key actors, including the media."

3-5)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

“An analysis of policies and practices to hinder biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resources management in the Mekong River Basin is made. Recommendations for improvement are drafted.”

3-6)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

“An international workshop is held to report results in Deliverable 3.5. either in the Mekong Region (e.g., in Ubonratchathani) or in Tokyo. At the meeting, opportunities, alternatives, and obstacles to protect Mekong's biodiversity and natural resources are discussed. It is attended by community representatives, CSOs, including those from China and Korea, academics, the media, and government officials. A conference report and presentations are posted on website.”

## 10. Describe the results from Component 3 and each product/deliverable

3) Component 3 [Advocacy]

MW created a number of opportunities (e.g., a press conference and a public statement) for the LS2-affected villagers to communicate their concerns over the dam's impacts on natural resources/biodiversity to government officials/parliamentarians, journalists, and CSOs from China. We helped the Tholathi villagers directly communicate their ideas on natural resource management to various visitors, including Mekong journalists and CSOs from China and Korea. Lao local communities' views and concerns over biodiversity and environmental conservation were also captured in the documentaries produced and broadcasted in collaboration with Champasak Provincial TV Station. We provided the Pak Mun Dam-affected villagers with opportunities to meet with local government officials and voice their concerns over the Mun River's ecology to a number of Thai journalists.

3-1)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos]

MW in collaboration with EarthRights International (ERI) and 3SPN made a community guide on the Chinese government's *Guidelines for environmental protection in foreign investment and cooperation* and translated both the guide and guidelines into Khmer (see (1) and (2)). We held skill workshops on how to use the guidelines and distributed them alongside the community guide to five LS2-affected villages in Stung Treng and Ratanakiri. About 300 villagers participated in the workshops. We also translated the community guide into Lao and disseminated it through the listserv of Laos' Land Issues Working Group (LIWG). We created a webpage to explain the guidelines and how they could be used by communities affected by China's investments (see (3)).

- (1) *Guidelines for environmental protection in foreign investment and cooperation (Khmer translation)*: [http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/ChinaENVguideline\\_KM20140326.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/ChinaENVguideline_KM20140326.pdf)
- (2) *A community guide on China's guidelines for environmental protection in foreign investment and cooperation*
  - a) Khmer:  
[http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/ChinaENVguideline\\_CommunityGuideKM20140326.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/ChinaENVguideline_CommunityGuideKM20140326.pdf)
  - a) Lao:  
[http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/ChinaENVguideline\\_CommunityGuideLAO20140326.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/ChinaENVguideline_CommunityGuideLAO20140326.pdf)
- (3) *China's guidelines for environmental protection in foreign investment and cooperation*:  
[http://www.mekongwatch.org/english/policy/ch\\_env\\_guide.html](http://www.mekongwatch.org/english/policy/ch_env_guide.html)

### 3-2)Product/deliverable [Cambodia]

MW completed *3S dam impacts*, an eight-minute documentary (with Khmer subtitles) to capture the Ratanakiri villagers' experiences with hydropower's trans-boundary impacts along the Sesan and Srepok Rivers (see (1)). We also completed *The tragedy of the Lower Sesan 2 Dam*, a documentary on LS2's impacts, in Khmer (with English subtitles) and Japanese (see (2)). We showed these documentaries to communities in Ratanakiri's Andong Meas and Ta Veang Districts in September 2015. We screened the documentaries twice in Stung Treng in March 2016. We distributed about 50 DVD copies to the LS2-affected villages in Stung Treng and Ratanakiri, as well as to communities around Tonle Sap Lake.

- (1) *3S dam impacts*: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gT\\_Qzmv8P-I&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gT_Qzmv8P-I&feature=youtu.be)
- (2) *The tragedy of the Lower Sesan 2 Dam*:
  - (a) Khmer with English subtitles: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vpmlKSxAI-E>
  - (b) Japanese: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l30tIzb0tyY>

### 3-3)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

MW submitted three sets of recommendations to various governmental bodies. They were: recommendations to the Japanese government to urge the Mekong River Commission (MRC) member governments to reconsider the Mekong mainstream dam projects at the MRC Summit in April 2014 (see (1)) (with follow-up discussions with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs); *Comments on Don Sahong Dam's 2013 Environmental Impact Assessment* to MRC in December 2014 (see (2)) with a Japanese summary sent to government officials, academics, and journalists based in Japan; and *Recommendations to protect the Mekong River's environment* to MRC in March 2016 (see (3)).

MW also hosted a public seminar regarding the deteriorating human rights situation in ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) countries in May 2015. In collaboration with members from Thailand's National Human Rights Commission, Amnesty International Japan, and Human Rights Watch (HRW) Japan, we communicated our concerns that large-scale development like hydropower often brings about human rights violations, such as blocking local communities' access to natural resources, to representatives of Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the private sector.

- (1) *MW's recommendations to the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to urge the Mekong governments to cooperate*. 03 April 2014 (in Japanese):  
[http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/rq\\_20140403.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/rq_20140403.pdf).
- (2) *Comments on Don Sahong Dam's 2013 Environmental Impact Assessment*:  
[http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/DonSahongEIA\\_Comments\\_by\\_MW\\_201412.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/DonSahongEIA_Comments_by_MW_201412.pdf)
- (3) *Recommendations to protect the Mekong River's environment*. March 2016:  
[http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/suggestions/20160314\\_english.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/suggestions/20160314_english.pdf)

### 3-4)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

While slightly revising the November 2013 briefing papers (see (1)), MW publicized new briefing papers on the Pak Mun Dam (in English, Khmer, and Thai) (see (2)) and LS2 Dam (in English and Khmer) (see (3)), and *Twenty years of Tholathi Island: Factors in the success of the fish conservation area* (in English and Thai) (see (4)), as well as factsheets on the Rasi Salai, Don Sahong, and LS2 Dams (all in English) (see (5), (6), and (7)). We distributed these documents on

various occasions, including the March 2015 and 2016 field visits to Champasak/Stung Treng and the February 2016 regional and international workshops.

- (1) *Nature and our future: The Mekong basin and Japan:*  
<http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/index.html>
- (2) *Briefing paper on Pak Mun Dam:*
  - (a) English: [http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/english-PakMun\\_20160218.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/english-PakMun_20160218.pdf)
  - (b) Khmer: [http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/khmer-PakMun\\_20160218.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/khmer-PakMun_20160218.pdf)
  - (c) Thai: [http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/thai-Pak%20Mun\\_20160218.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/thai-Pak%20Mun_20160218.pdf)
- (3) *Briefing paper on Lower Sesan 2 Dam:*
  - (a) English: [http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/english-LS2\\_20151112.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/english-LS2_20151112.pdf)
  - (b) Khmer: [http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/khmer-LS2\\_20151112.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/khmer-LS2_20151112.pdf)
- (4) *Twenty years of Tholathi Island: Factors in the success of the fish conservation area:*
  - a) English: [http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/english-Tholathi\\_20160218.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/english-Tholathi_20160218.pdf)
  - b) Thai: [http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/thai-Tholathi\\_20160218.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/platform/bp/supplement/thai-Tholathi_20160218.pdf)
- (5) *Factsheet: Rasi Salai Dam:* [http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/RasiSalai\\_FS2016\\_eng.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/RasiSalai_FS2016_eng.pdf)
- (6) *Factsheet: Don Sahong Dam:*  
[http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/DonSahong\\_FS2016\\_eng.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/DonSahong_FS2016_eng.pdf)
- (7) *Factsheet on Lower Sesan 2 Dam:*  
[http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/LS2\\_FactSheet\\_ENG\\_20151110.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/LS2_FactSheet_ENG_20151110.pdf)

3-5)Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

MW worked closely with International Rivers (IR) and completed the briefer *Greater Mekong Sub-region energy investments: Concerns and recommendations* in English, Khmer, Lao, Thai, and Vietnamese (see (1)). We also analyzed Japanese private banks' compliance with the Equator Principles and other guidelines, using Laos' Nam Ngiep 1 Hydropower Project as a case and contributed a chapter to Fair Finance's report (see (2)).

- (1) *Greater Mekong Sub-region energy investments: Concerns and recommendations:*
  - (a) English: [https://www.internationalrivers.org/files/attached-files/gms\\_energy\\_investments\\_briefing\\_-\\_english\\_0.pdf](https://www.internationalrivers.org/files/attached-files/gms_energy_investments_briefing_-_english_0.pdf)
  - (b) Khmer: [http://www.internationalrivers.org/files/attached-files/gms\\_energy\\_investment\\_briefing\\_khmer\\_3\\_final.pdf](http://www.internationalrivers.org/files/attached-files/gms_energy_investment_briefing_khmer_3_final.pdf)
  - (c) Thai: [https://www.internationalrivers.org/files/attached-files/gms\\_energy\\_investments\\_briefing\\_-\\_thai.pdf](https://www.internationalrivers.org/files/attached-files/gms_energy_investments_briefing_-_thai.pdf)
  - (d) Vietnamese: [https://www.internationalrivers.org/files/attached-files/gms\\_energy\\_investments\\_briefing\\_-\\_vietnamese.pdf](https://www.internationalrivers.org/files/attached-files/gms_energy_investments_briefing_-_vietnamese.pdf)
- (2) "Nam Ngiep 1 hydropower project (Laos)". In: Fair Finance Guide Japan (ed.) *A second case study report: How are Japanese financial agencies involved in environmental destruction?*, pp. 18-24 (in Japanese): [http://fairfinance.jp/media/60863/ffg\\_casestudy\\_nature\\_1002.pdf](http://fairfinance.jp/media/60863/ffg_casestudy_nature_1002.pdf)



3-6) Product/deliverable [Cambodia/Laos/Thailand]

MW organized an international workshop in Ubon Ratchathani in February 2016 (see (1)). Community representatives, academics/researchers/students, journalists/media representatives, NGO workers, and the general public from the Mekong region and East Asia (i.e., China, Korea, and Japan) participated, presenting and discussing obstacles, opportunities, and alternatives for protecting the Mekong's biodiversity (see (2)).

(1) *A summary: Reconsidering the development of the Mekong and its tributaries - Food security and rivers:* <http://www.mekongwatch.org/english/projects/EnhancingCBO.html#No3>

(2) *Impacts of dam construction on the Mekong: The experience of the Mun River:* February 2016:

(a) Revised handout:

[http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/MekongDam\\_20160223\\_report.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/MekongDam_20160223_report.pdf)

(b) PowerPoint presentation:

[http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/MekongDam\\_20160223\\_PPT.pdf](http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/MekongDam_20160223_PPT.pdf)

#### **Component 4 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

*List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer*

n/a

#### **11. Describe the results from Component 4 and each product/deliverable**

n/a

#### **12. If you did not complete any component or deliverable, how did this affect the overall impact of the project?**

MW completed all the planned components and deliverables. Some activities in a few components, however, remained incomplete. They included the following:

- (1) We only got as far as drafting a final written report based on the results of the research on fish migration and spawning grounds in the Mun River basin (Product/deliverable 1-3)). As soon as it is finalized both in English and Thai, it will be submitted to local government offices as planned;
- (2) We did not translate the November 2013 briefing papers on the Mekong's biodiversity/natural resources and their sustainable management into Burmese (Product/deliverable 3-4)). We did not see a high priority for the activity as Burma/Myanmar was not the Project's target country. We had no plan to work directly with local communities in Myanmar. The English original informing CSOs working on issues related to Myanmar was sufficient; and
- (3) We were not able to disseminate many of the Project's products/deliverables among developers of large-scale hydropower projects, namely government officials and private sector representatives, as widely as we had wanted. We will continue to use the materials for future campaign activities, especially when engaging the developers.

The first two activities did not affect the Project's overall impact. The third reduced the 4<sup>th</sup> short-term impact and the 2<sup>nd</sup> long-term impact.

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

See the list at the end of each Product/deliverable section above.

**CEPF Global Monitoring Data**

Respond to the questions and complete the tables below. If a question is not relevant to your project, please make an entry of 0 (zero) or n/a (not applicable).

**14. Did your organization complete the CEPF Civil Society Tracking Tool (CSTT) at the beginning and end of your project? Yes/No**

No.

If yes, please be sure to submit the final CSTT tool to CEPF if you haven't already done so.

**15. List any vulnerable, endangered, or critically endangered species conserved due to your project**

n/a

**Hectares Under Improved Management**

<b>Project Results</b>	<b>Hectares*</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>16. Did your project strengthen the management of an existing protected area?</b>	n/a	<i>List the name of each protected area</i>
<b>17. Did your project create a new protected area or expand an existing protected area?</b>	n/a	<i>List the name of each protected area, the date of proclamation, and the type of proclamation (e.g., legal declaration, community agreement, stewardship agreement)</i>
<b>18. Did your project strengthen the management of a key biodiversity area named in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile (hectares may be the same as questions above)</b>	n/a	<i>List the name of each key biodiversity area</i>
<b>19. Did your project improve the management of a production landscape for biodiversity conservation</b>	n/a	<i>List the name or describe the location of the production landscape</i>

*\* Include total hectares from project inception to completion*

**20. In relation to the two questions above on protected areas, did your project complete a Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), or facilitate the completion of a METT**

by protected area authorities? If so, complete the table below. *(Note that there will often be more than one METT for an individual protected area.)*

n/a

Protected area	Date of METT	Composite METT Score	Date of METT	Composite METT Score	Date of METT	Composite METT Score

**21. List the name of any corridor (named in the Ecosystem Profile) in which you worked and how you contributed to its improved management, if applicable.**

The Project took place in and contributed to managing Priority Corridor 2 (“Mekong River and Major Tributaries”). It tried to mainstream biodiversity, communities, and livelihoods into basin-wide decision-making processes over large-scale hydropower along the Mekong’s major tributaries to ensure that their natural resources and biodiversity would continue to support the lives of local communities without being damaged in any irreversible or irreplaceable manner.

**Direct Beneficiaries: Training and Education**

<i>Did your project provide training or education for . . .</i>	Male	Female	Total	Brief Description
<b>22. Adults for community leadership or resource management positions</b>	36	36	72	LS2-affected villagers in northeastern Cambodia
	4	0	4	Village research team along the Mun River
<b>23. Adults for livelihoods or increased income</b>	0	0	0	
<b>24. School-aged children</b>	92	108	200	Environmental education through local wisdom in Lao PDR
	127	143	270	Environmental education through local wisdom in Thailand
<b>25. Other</b>	24	43	67	For adults on how to use local wisdom in environmental education in Lao PDR and Thailand

**26. List the name and approximate population size of any “community” that benefited from the project.**

*Community name, surrounding district, surrounding province, country Population size*

- (1) Cambodia
  - (a) Kbal Romeas, Kbal Romeas Commune, Sesan District, Stung Treng Province: 714
  - (b) Sraekor, Sraekor Commune, Sesan District, Stung Treng Province: 1,902
- (2) Lao PDR
  - (a) Tholathi Village, Khone District, Champasak Province: 576
- (3) Thailand
  - (a) Khotai, Phosri Sub-District, Phibunmansahang District, Ubon Ratchathani Province: 300
  - (b) Huaymaktai, Khamkuankaeo Sub-District, Sirinthorne District, Ubon Ratchathani Province: 200
  - (c) Phung, Nongkhae Sub-District, Rasi Salai District, Sisaket Province: 600

## 27) Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Based on the list of communities above, write the name of the communities in the left column below. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes.

Community Name	Community Characteristics								Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit												
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty line	Other	Increased income due to:				Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance	Other
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services									
Kbal Romeas		X	X																X	X	
Sraekor		X	X																	X	
Tholathi		X										X							X	X	
Khotai	X																		X		
Huaymaktai							X												X		
Phung							X												X		

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit:  
Huaymaktai and Phung villagers mostly catch fish to trade for income generation.

## Lessons Learned

### **28) 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**

Although resource-intensive, it was more meaningful to focus on the local communities in close collaboration with 3SPN in coping with LS2 than playing a more active role in national CSO networks, RCC in particular, as suggested by some RCC member CSOs during the external evaluation. MW found a huge gap between the communities' needs for support and the devastating basin-wide impacts of the hydropower project on the one hand and RCC's lack of solid assessment and coherent strategies to respond to the situations on the other. Encouraging the local communities to take the lead in engaging the CSOs/RCC to meet their needs seemed more effective.

The Project recognized the community-based fish conservation zone at Tholathi Island as one of the few success cases of its kind with many lessons to offer. We attributed the success to the combination of environmental and social factors. First, the conservation area covers not only places for raising fry but more crucially fish spawning grounds, giving it an effective protective function. Second, the traditional animistic beliefs and folktales regulate the villagers' behaviors. They fear divine consequences of overexploiting fish and lodge criticism against violators. Third, the Tholathi case has been established as an official sanctuary with recognition from the national government, allowing the villagers to restrict access to outsiders who may not follow the local norms. The Project's output *20 years of conservation on Tholathi Island* (Product/deliverable 1-2)) played an unexpected role in this. The 2014 broadcasting of the documentary drew the attention of the Lao government, which approved funding to support the community initiative in 2015. More detailed research on the Tholathi case can be carried out in the future. A quantitative analysis to measure the conservation effects has yet to be conducted.

The results of a fish-catch survey along the Mun River showed differences in the amount of fish caught between upstream and downstream of the Pak Mun Dam. A larger amount of fish was found in the downstream area, which clearly indicated that the dam was blocking fish migrations into the Mun River from the Mekong mainstream. As the Pak Mun Dam gate-opening is only seasonal and must be approved each year by the government, the Mun River is likely to continue to be disconnected from the mainstream. It may be useful, from the viewpoint of preserving the Mun River's biodiversity, to examine spawning behaviors of the fish species currently found upstream of the dam and adopt measures to conserve as many of them as possible.

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

The Project could have carried out more thorough and detailed analyses of major CSOs, including the affected communities, involving the LS2 case, and incorporated the results into the Project's design. Such analyses could have covered, among others, each group's approaches and goals in LS2-related campaign activities, working relationships with the local communities, and strengths as well as challenges. That way, we could have anticipated some of the difficulties (e.g., of 3SPN's challenges in working in Stung Treng) and responded to them more systematically (e.g., working more closely with the affected communities in Ratanakiri).

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

The Project could have focused less on the communities downstream of the LS2 Dam and collaborated more with the communities upstream. The upstream communities had already suffered from severe impacts of hydropower development in Vietnam, including considerable fish reduction, and were not entitled as the affected population in LS2's EIA. We could have encouraged them to join forces with the downstream communities much earlier and more systematically so that they could address biodiversity and livelihood issues based on their experiences. Similarly, we could have used part of the Project's resources to collect more first-hand evidence to substantiate LS2's impacts, for instance, through fish species surveys in the downstream area after the construction had begun. In short, we could have adopted a more flexible and multi-pronged strategy in implementing the Project, in particular the parts related to northeastern Cambodia.

### **31) Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community**

While the networking strategy is both necessary and effective in the Mekong River basin, member CSOs will encounter more occasions where they must define their positions with and provide answers to increasingly complex and potentially divisive issues such as "sustainable hydropower", compensation and restoration for resettled communities, and MRC/PNPCA's (Procedures for Notification, Prior-Consultation, and Agreement) effectiveness. The CSOs working in the various existing networks domestically, regionally, and internationally should not hesitate to spend time and energy, perform good analyses and careful consideration, and engage in frank and open mutual debates over these issues before establishing common understandings and positions to move on as a network. Without such deliberate efforts, the existing networks will also become weakened and less effective.

### **Sustainability / Replication**

### **32) Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated**

The Project built on the previously existing CSO networks to maximize their potentialities to mainstream biodiversity, communities, and livelihoods into regional decision-making processes. It was also in part based on the historical and socio-cultural ties among the indigenous/minority communities, especially the ethnic Lao groups, living across the Mekong's major tributaries in northeastern Cambodia, southern Laos, and northeastern Thailand. The CSO and community-to-community networks that were established and enhanced based on the regional realities and needs are likely to be sustained.

The Project also produced numerous tangible outputs and products, including quality documentaries, factsheets and briefing papers, and research reports with sets of recommendations. Many of them were made in Mekong languages and remain available through the Internet. They can be used for other campaign and advocacy activities as they are and/or viewed as stimuli to develop similar materials. We created a webpage on community resource map making (Product/deliverable 1.1)) and the Chinese government's *Guidelines for environmental protection in foreign investment and cooperation* (Product/deliverable 3.1.)), with the exact hope that the activities would be replicated elsewhere.

On the other hand, civil society space is likely to remain narrow or become even narrower in Lower Mekong countries, especially in the Lao PDR. If this turns out to be the case, the lack of space for CSOs

and communities at the target sites, as well as for CSO efforts to address the Mekong’s biodiversity and livelihood issues in general, may make it difficult to see the Project’s impacts sustained or replicated. Other factors which may override the Project’s positive impacts include the acceleration of hydropower development across the Mekong River basin. This will considerably weaken the CSO and community networks which have been built under the common goal of mainstreaming biodiversity and livelihood issues into decision-making processes. To ensure the sustainability of the Project and similar endeavors, it seems crucial that the basin be free of destructive hydropower.

**33) Summarize any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability**

The Project originally did not plan to create the webpage on community resource map making (Product/deliverable 1.1)) and the Chinese government’s *Guidelines for environmental protection in foreign investment and cooperation* (Product/deliverable 3.1.)), at least in the ways they turned out. While speaking with many Cambodian CSO colleagues, we discovered that they had already conducted similar or even exactly the same activities but that they were not necessarily aware of why they had carried them out. We thus decided to detail our rationale for these activities as well as the procedures for producing the output and ways to make use of it on these pages. We hope that this way the websites will increase the possibility for these activities to be replicated elsewhere, especially in Cambodia.

**Safeguards**

**34) If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social, environmental, or pest management safeguards**

Safeguard compliance was listed as a separate Project Component (see Product/deliverable 2-5)).

**Additional Comments/Recommendations**

**35) Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF**

None.

**Additional Funding**

**36) 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**

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount (USD)	Notes
The McKnight Foundation	A	105,919	
Oxfam Australia	A	24,026	
Mekong Watch	A	7,323	In-kind contribution (membership fees, donations,



			etc.)
--	--	--	-------

\* 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)

### **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:

- 37) Name:** Toshiyuki Doi
- 38) Organization:** Mekong Watch
- 39) Mailing address:** 3F Aoki Building 1-12-11 Taito, Taito, Tokyo 110-0016 Japan
- 40) Tel. number:** 81-3-3832-5034
- 41) E-mail address:** [info@mekongwatch.org](mailto:info@mekongwatch.org)