

## CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Center for Water Resources Conservation and Development (WARECOD)
<b>Project Title:</b>	Networking for Collective Civil Society Responses to Priority and Emerging Threats to Lao Rivers
<b>Date of Report:</b>	31 January 2015
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Nga Dao nga@warecod.org.vn

**CEPF Region:**

Indo-Burma Hotspot

**Strategic Direction:**

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

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

**Grant Amount:** \$20,000

**Project Dates:** May – December 2014

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

Not implemented with partners.

## **Conservation Impacts**

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

***Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.***

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

Through networking Laotian Non-profit Associations working in the environment issues, especially rivers and water, the project aims at improving the capacity for them to protect the rivers and resources they offer at all levels.

**Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:**

The project started in 2014 and ends in 2015. With short duration of 12 months, the project reflects more on initial steps to realize an idea about establishing a network. As a result, it will be more relevant and precise to evaluate the long-term impacts at a later date.

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

The project's objective is to raise attention and building an informed civil society for Laotian Non-profit Associations to work more effectively and collectively in water and river issues.

**Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:**

In general, the project has brought a positive change for the way Laotian NPAs work. The mutual space we created and the mutual interest we raised have enabled NPAs to understand an overall of the environmental issues and how they inter-relate. The project has driven the NPAs toward a working style through which collective voice is the key power of the success.

**Please provide the following information where relevant:**

**Hectares Protected: Not applicable**

**Species Conserved: Not applicable**

**Corridors Created: Not applicable**

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

The main successes of the project came from the power of assembling a group of dedicated people and facilitating them to spend time together in complete focus on one topic - in this case, water resources management and river protection in Lao PDR.

As usual, the main challenge was finding meeting dates that everyone could attend for both meetings. We did well with the support of GCA and Faculty of

Agriculture, National University of Laos. The lesson was to keep close contact with the main partners of the project.

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

None.

## Project Components

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

### **Component 1 Planned: Support the development of a Lao Rivers Forum**

#### **Component 1 Actual at Completion:**

##### Activity 1.1:

*Organize a 1-day preparation meeting with the National University of Laos and key civil society organizations, in order to hear their ideas and suggestions, and gather their input to build momentum towards the main meeting to follow.*

The preparation meeting was held on 29 May 2014 with the participation of 16 representatives from local NGOs and Lao Non-Profit Associations (NPAs), National University and MoNRE in Lao PDR. The meeting was a necessary pre-requisite to gathering ideas and suggestions to build substantial additional motivation for the technical meeting to follow with a wider array of stakeholders, especially from the meeting's host country.

The principal outcomes of the meeting were: (1) A consensus decision to immediately begin the necessary preparations for water resources management and river protection in Lao PDR; and (2) Institutions, date, venue etc for the technical meeting. The model of holding separate preparation meeting before the main meeting (instead of tacking on a large, multi-stakeholder meeting onto the end) seemed to work well, and we may repeat it at future Lao Water Resources and Rivers Network (LWRRN) meetings.

##### Activity 1.2:

*Organize a multi-day technical meeting between VRN members and potential future members of the LRF, at the National University of Laos in Vientiane.*

The technical meeting with Lao civil society, researchers, academics as well as local communities has been convened in 18-20 July 2014 in Vientiane. The meeting reflected the further consultation, planning and partnership-building process for the project. The meeting was attended by 35 representatives from local NGOs and NPAs, National University, National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute, provincial and district authorities in Lao PDR and Vietnam Rivers Network (VRN). One important objective was met from this meeting was to have successfully built the partnership among local NGOs and NPAs that will be deeply involved in future activities on water resources management and river protection in Laos. As a result, concrete commitments to support

of the development of LWRRN have been made by six local civil society organizations (alphabetical order):

1. Association for Community Training and Development (ACTD)
2. Center for Water Resources Conservation and Development (WARECOD)
3. Coalition for Lao Information, Communication and Knowledge (CLICKLAOS)
4. Green Community Alliance (GCA)
5. Lao Future Green (LFG)
6. Lao Wildlife Conservation Association (LWCA)

One of the most important outputs of the technical meeting, the one that best insures that the meeting will translate into practical action on the ground, is the 24-month worklist we drafted at the end of the meeting, with participating organizations assigned specific tasks and dates of completion and follow-up. This is the mechanism that translates the meeting's good ideas into action. This worklist represents the principal outcome of the meeting, and the mechanism to turn the good ideas of the meeting into action and changes on the ground. The worklist can be found in meeting minutes.

Activity 1.3:

*Seek further funding support towards the development of a LRF.*

A Lol was drafted by WARECOD and circulated to the key Lao partners for comment, and a final was issued and submitted to CEPF on 18th July 2014 by GCA.

Under this project, WARECOD will play an advisory role and promote networking activities and facilitate peer-to-peer exchange between VRN and LWRRN members building on past initiatives, lessons learned and established working relationships of VRN and WARECOD.

After the Technical Meeting and submission of the Lol, there has been constant exchange of information between Laotian focal point (GCA) and WARECOD. Both parties update for each other the mutually interested issues such as VRN's activities in Vietnam and the hydropower projects in Lao PDR. Also, the discussion also mentioned the possible actions for the Lao Rivers Network and potential donors.

When GCA was asked to develop a full proposal for CEPF small grant, GCA was discussing with its Laotian partners and WARECOD staff to prioritize the activities to be implemented in 2015. Laotian team will take the leading role in doing this important work in the future. WARECOD's staff will assist if requested.

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

None.

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

- Lol drafted by WARECOD and circulated to the key Lao partners for comment, and a final was issued and submitted to CEPF on 18th July 2014 by GCA.
- With support from WARECOD, GCA developed the final full proposal for CEPF Small grant submitted on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2015

## **Lessons Learned**

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

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

The project employs stakeholders from two countries Vietnam and Lao PDR, and the communication often cost extensive time and effort. We have learned the importance of keeping close contact and good preparation so that we could get things done by deadlines.

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

The main lesson-learned from the project is the paramount importance of ending the technical meeting by drafting a detailed, specific 24-month worklist to move the results and decisions of the meeting forward on the ground. We applied the lesson to this meeting, and implementation of the worklist has been incorporated into the Lol submitted to CEPF on 18 August 2014.

Potential invitees need to be kept closely informed during development of the objectives and invitation list for such meetings. Specifically, a few partners felt there were some people who should have been invited but were not.

The most positive unexpected experience was the project partner - National University of Laos, which changed their mind not to host the technical meeting at its office in Vientiane in the last minute as they insisted having their staff time paid and could not work without money for any purposes. We have learned that GCA and other NPAs become excellent supporters of the project activities without financial support on staff time to planning, attendance and follow-up of the project activities and could also mobilize technical support on sensitive issues such as water resources management and river protection in Lao PDR from research institutions including National University of Laos.

***Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:***

At this phase no direct contacts with local community have been realized yet.

## Additional Funding

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

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
None			

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

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

## Sustainability/Replicability

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

***Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.***

The success of this project was to introduce with Lao fellows about a model of people having mutual interests working together. After the project, the model of VRN, which was new to them, has been of known to Lao fellows who care about and work in the environment sector. Through two meetings in Vientiane, we have identified the Laotian NPAs having interested in our initiative. With the support from them, we expect the a River Network will soon be established and grow.

## Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

No required action toward the environment and social safeguard policies was conducted within the project.

## **Additional Comments/Recommendations**

When organized the meeting with interested stakeholders in Vientiane, we forgot to invite representatives from IUCN/CEPF. Therefore, we accidentally opted out a chance to listen directly from the team. If the initiative continues in Lao PDR, we will connect closely with the team in order to receive recommendations, feedbacks or ideas on our 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:**

Name: Nga DAO

Organization name: Center for Water Resources Conservation and Development  
(WARECOD)

Mailing address: Suite 801, Building Hacisco, No 15 Lane 107 Nguyen Chi Thanh Street,  
Hanoi, Vietnam

Tel: (+84) 4 3773 0828

Fax: Fax: 84 (0)4 3 7739 491

E-mail: [nga@warecod.org.vn](mailto:nga@warecod.org.vn)

## Performance Tracking Report Addendum

### CEPF Global Targets

### (Enter Grant Term)

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

Project Results	Is this question relevant ?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	NO			Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	NO			Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	NO			
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	NO			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	NO			

**If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table**

**Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities**

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics							Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit																			
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased Income due to:				Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of collectivization, 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	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society	Other						
									sustainable natural resources management	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services															

Total																																						
<p>If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit:</p>																																						