

CEPF Final Project Completion Report

Organization Legal Name	Friends of Wildlife
Project Title	Promoting the conservation of Eld’s deer in Chatthin Wildlife Sanctuary through core zone management and community participation
CEPF Grant or Number	77636-000
Date of Report	21 st April 2017

CEPF Hotspot: Indo-Burma Hotspot

Strategic Direction: SD1: Safeguard priority globally threatened species by mitigating major threats

Grant Amount: US\$19,993

Project Dates: 1st November 2014 to 31st October 2016 (24 months)

PART I: Overview

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

- *Two local civil society organizations:*
Those are local communities and village councils/authorities who live in Singaung and Satthachaung villages located inside Chatthin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS). They participated in meetings, awareness-raising events, planting campaigns, etc. The village authorities helped us to arrange meetings, and accommodation for project staff.
- *Two Village Conservation and Development Committees (VCDCs):*
It was selected by villagers for the development and environmental conservation in two villages. Each VCDC consists of 10 people. They led and organized the community members for the meetings, trainings, joint-patrols, awareness-raising events, greening campaigns, stove contribution, Community Forest (CF) establishment, etc.
- *CWS staff:*
CWS staff especially field staff participated in community engagement meetings, trainings, CF establishment, education awareness, patrol and nature clubs, etc. A total of 12 field staff collaborated with the FOW team. Their main roles include law enforcement, and promoting compliance of local people with protected area laws, by improving their understanding on the role of protected areas, and their awareness of environmental conservation.
- *Kawlin Township FD:*
Partially collaborated in CF trainings and CF establishment.
- *Sagaing Regional Parliament and Government:*
Representatives from Sagaing Regional Parliament and Ministers from Regional Government had supported for better governance and policy of CWS management especially on law enforcement.

2. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

- Two VCDCs were set up in two villages for purposes of village conservation and development activities. The objectives and responsibilities of VCDC were well defined and function began, and they began to lead the environmental conservation.
- Understanding the socio-economic situation of two communities living inside the CWS
- Awareness-raising among the local communities and regional authorities on climate change, forest resource management, deer conservation and CWS ecosystem management.
- Focusing on Core zone patrolling and law enforcement and able to remove the snares and stopped hunting.
- Deer density dramatically increased from 1.88 Deer/sq.km in 2015 to 2.8 deer/sq.km in 2017.
- To reduce the dependency of CWS's natural resources, the project was able to set up two CFs and to introduce the practice on the use of fuel-wood efficient stoves to two community members.
- Good Policy and better governance supported by Regional government & parliament including site visits by Chief minister, Sagaing Regional Government and three representatives from Sagaing Regional Parliament.

3. Briefly describe actual progress towards the overall project goal (as stated in the small grant contract)

Description of the overall project goal	Summary of actual progress towards this goal
<p>The population of Eld's deer in Chatthin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS) increases, thanks to a reduction in threats associated with human activity in and around CWS.</p>	<p>The core zone was intensively managed by CWS staff partially participated by community members from 2 communities.</p> <p>The deer annual censuses indicated that the density of Eld's deer was increased in core 1. Transect lines and survey blocks were well marked for long term research and monitoring. Those were now using by patrol team and survey teams.</p> <p>Two Village Conservation and Development Committees were set up and building up the capacity of VECD members and village leaders were done for conservation of Eld's deer and CWS management for ecosystem services. 2 CFs have been establishing and the practice on the use of stove was introduced.</p> <p>The project was able to promote the awareness among the two communities and local authorities on environmental and ecosystem management, and biodiversity conservation through environmental talks and nature club practices.</p> <p>The Chief Minister from Sagaing Regional Government and 3 representatives from Sagaing Regional Parliament visited CWS 4 times. They are now supporting the Eld's deer conservation and CWS management for better governance and policy.</p>

4. Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its overall goal

The density of Eld's deer is increasing in the core zone. 2015 = 1.88 deer/sq.km. 2016 = 2.39 deer/sq.km. 2017 = 2.8 deer/sq.km. Please see below for information about challenges.

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

Two unexpected impacts (negative):

1. Local community members refused to participate in joint-patrol after 11 months later because of sanctuary staff's action on agricultural encroachment in CWS area.
2. Warden changed 4 times
 - I. At the beginning of the project, the warden was U Mg Win (10 days),
 - II. then U Kyaw Zin Tun for 13 months,
 - III. U Than Naing for 9 months, and
 - IV. U Min Swe is current warden.

FOW staff re-engaged with them, explaining our project goals, objectives, activities and expected outputs to understand the status and progress of project. Sometimes it was difficult to discuss with warden.

One unexpected impact (positive):

1. government changes (positive): National League for Democracy party won the election and elected-persons became government ministers and parliament representatives. They are interested in Eld's deer conservation and CWS management and supported.
 - arranging a policy force team to place at a forest camp to help law enforcement activities.
 - policy supported for encroachment problem through standing from the side of sanctuary officials.
 - supported infrastructure development: 24 hours electric supply to Sanmyaung camp; road construction from Chatthin village to Sanctuary; forest camp maintenance; etc.

PART II: Project Objectives and Activities/Deliverables

Objective 1: Conservation measures are in place to improve protection of CWS's Eld's deer population		
Activity description	Deliverable(s)	Summary of actual progress/results for this activity
<p>Activity 1.1 Carry out 10-15 day enforcement patrols each month, focusing on the CWS core zone. These will record and prevent human disturbance of the core zone, especially during the deer breeding season (Feb to May), and collect demographic data on the deer population.</p>	<p>Three patrol teams consisting of CWS staff established and operating.</p> <p>At least 50 person-days of patrolling carried out in the core zone per month</p> <p>Data on prevalence of illegal activities and deer sightings recorded and presented to Forest Department.</p>	<p>Three patrol teams were established, each consisting of 4 people, focused on preventing hunting, timber extraction and human disturbance within the core zone area. 3 villagers from Saththachaung and Singaung participated in it. Mostly community members from Saththachaung villages worked together with CWS team.</p> <p>In October 2015, community members stopped their participation in patrolling activities because CWS staff took actions against some villagers who encroached the land for cultivation, and all local people & officials were interested in Myanmar Government's election and the changes of government. The relationship between one of the target communities, Singaung villagers and CWS staff were still worse.</p> <p>But sanctuary staff conducted patrolling regularly. In collaboration with CWS staff, FOW is recording deer sightings and illegal activities such as timber extraction, hunter signs, etc.</p> <p>The patrol teams were able to remove the snares twice in core zones. The total number of snares was 450 (1000 feet). And they also restricted the cattle grazing done by local people. The patrol teams removed the snares again in core zones. The total number of snares was 356 (830 feet). Patrolling was as follows: In 2014. 16 times in November and 19 in December. In 2015 21 in January, 17 in February, 17 in March, 11 in April, 9 in May, 9 in June, 15 times in July, 12 in August, 14 in September, 10 in October, 7 in November, 9 in December In 2016 15 in January, 16 in February, 14 in March, 9 in April, 10 in May, 10 in June, 12 in July, 19 in August, 12 in September and 10 in October.</p> <p>The project findings were regularly presented to sanctuary wardens during the project period.</p>
<p>Activity 1.2 Produce and erect boundary pillars and signboards along the boundary of CWS's core zone. Signboards will include information about Eld's deer, and relevant laws (such as those prohibiting resource extraction within the CWS core zone)</p>	<p>20 boundary pillars erected.</p> <p>15 signboards produced and erected.</p>	<p>All 20 boundary pillars were erected along the boundary of the core zone.</p> <p>A total of 25 signboards were posted at main points, guard posts and field camps.</p>
<p>Activity 1.3 Re-establish the Block and Line transect system that was used in CWS core zone during the 1990s (sets of marked transects generating 54 1.5km² survey blocks), in order to aid long-term monitoring of CWS's Eld's deer population.</p>	<p>54 survey blocks re-marked</p>	<p>11 Transect lines and 54 survey blocks were re-marked using red paint on the trees. Survey/patrolling teams are using it.</p>
<p>Activity 1.4</p>	<p>1 census conducted</p>	<p>Two annual deer censuses were completed. We helped to prepare the annual Deer census report and discussed the</p>

In collaboration with CWS staff, conduct a census of CWS's Eld's deer population using the newly re-demarcated transects and distance sampling methods to record deer densities and distribution.	and brief report produced 2nd census conducted and brief report produced	results of census together with warden and his staff. We also helped a staff to prepare the annual Deer census reports. The results of Deer censuses were 1.88 deer/km ² in 2015, 2.39 deer/km ² in 2016, and 2.8 deer/km ² in 2017 (update data). These results showed that deer population is dramatically increasing in CWS.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Objective 2: CWS staff and village-level civil society have the capacity to better conserve CWS's Eld's deer population.

Activity description	Deliverable(s)	Summary of actual progress/results for this activity
Activity 2.1: Hold meetings between local communities and CWS staff. These will foster dialogue on the needs of local communities and the responsibilities and objectives of CWS, and should help resolve conflicts and improve compliance with CWS regulations.	Four meetings held for representatives of local communities and CWS staff.	Engagement meetings were conducted at two villages, Singaung and Sattachaung. FOW tried to help the local people understand the objectives of CWS and its important role in ecosystem and biodiversity conservation. We received the agreements from community members to protect the core zone of CWS as much as they can, and they will participate in patrolling if they were free from their agricultural field works. We had repeated community meetings at both villages (Sattachaung and Singaung). The focused topics were to understand the law enforcement action of sanctuary staff on encroachment issues, ecosystem services of CWS, etc. A total of 6 meetings were done during the project period.
Activity 2.2: Establish Village Conservation and Development Committees (VCDCs) in two target villages close to CWS (Singaung and Sattachaung). Each VCDC will be 5-10 individuals who are responsible for the management of sustainable forestry initiatives, organizing environmental talks, environmental education projects, and representing their communities when in dialogue with local authorities.	VCDCs established and functioning in two target villages	FOW in collaboration with CWS staff to set up VCDCs in two villages. We also defined the objectives of VCDCs and the responsibilities of VCDC members. They had been involving in leading village development conservation activities such as meetings, CF site selection, stove use practice, etc. During the project period, we also worked closely with VCDC members for establishment of CFs such as boundary demarcation, management plan writing, etc.
Activity 2.3: Carry out household socio-economic evaluation surveys, in collaboration with VCDCs, in order to guide the work of VCDCs.	Socio-economic surveys carried out in 271 households of 2 villages.	The survey was done in December 2014. The survey data were presented to community members. Summary results: The 4 categories of livelihoods were the same in both villages: 1) agriculture, 2) labor, 3) forest products selling/dependency, and 4) small business (small shop). Sattachaung. Of 121 families: Rich:28; Fair: 42; Poor: 51 Singaung. Of 173 families: Rich: 80; Fair: 39 Poor: 54 The FOW and VCDCs will focus on poor families (category c) for the income generating in future.
Activity 2.4: Carry out (in collaboration with VCDCs, CWS, and local government) 2 training events, for 50 people each, on civil society development.	First training event for at least 50 people conducted. Second training event for at least 50 people conducted	First training was done in April 2015. Only 41 community members participated in it. The second training was carried out in December 2015. A total of 35 community members participated in it.
Activity 2.5: Carry out a training event for CWS staff on monitoring techniques (line transect sampling) and data management.	Training event conducted.	It was done in December 2014. Dr. William McShea (Smithsonian scientist), Co-chairman of IUCN deer specialist group had led a one-day training. It was co-lead by two deer specialists from Thailand. FOW chairman also gave the lecture for data management in January 2015. FOW trained a forester, to carry out the data management.

<p>Activity 2.6: Carry out 2 training events for members of new and established Community Forestry (CF) committees, VCDCs, and CWS staff, on CF management (project management, sustainable natural resource management, bio-fertilizers, transparency, and accountability).</p>	<p>First training event for at least 30 people conducted. Second training event for at last 30 people conducted</p>	<p>FOW was able to accomplish two training courses in December 2015 and January 2016. The 1st training focused on CF establishment and its management. It was a two-days training course and 20 participants attended.</p> <p>The topics in 2nd training were natural resource management, soil management and bio-fertilizers, etc. It took 3 days and a total of 39 villagers attended.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Objective 3: Local communities surrounding CWS have increased awareness of the importance of environmental conservation, especially the sustainable management of dry dipterocarp forest.

Activity description	Deliverable(s)	Summary of actual progress/results for this activity
<p>Activity 3.1: With VCDCs, organize 4 lectures (in 2 villages and 2 schools) on locally-relevant environmental topics such as the importance of the biodiversity of CWS, natural resources management, the cessation of unsustainable forestry and hunting practices, and ways that local people can improve their environment</p>	<p>First lecture held Second lecture held Third lecture held Fourth lecture held</p>	<p>A total of four awareness-raising events were done in 2 villages and 2 schools. In addition, we introduced the nature club activities in both schools.</p> <p>We also supported and participated in warden's activities on awareness raising in other 9 villages.</p>
<p>Activity 3.2: Work with VCDCs and CWS staff to design, print, distribute and maintain educational signboards and posters in target villages.</p>	<p>A total of at least 20 signboards and posters on display in 2 villages</p>	<p>A total of 35 vinyl signboards were posted in 2 villages and schools collaborated by VCDC members and school headmasters.</p>
<p>Activity 3.3: Write and submit articles on project activities to national publications such as The Voice Weekly and Eleven Weekly.</p>	<p>At least 3 articles submitted to national publications.</p>	<p>One article had published in the voice journal, but the second one was rejected by journal editor.</p>
<p>Activity 3.4: Invite journalists and television reporters to visit the project site.</p>	<p>At least 3 journalists invited to visit the project site</p>	<p>One journalist visited the project site, in July 2015. In 2016, three journalists visited the project site, CWS and they wrote about decline of deer population. The updated information on sanctuary management and deer population was published in the Voice in 2017. It mentioned that deer population increased.</p>

Objective 4: Dependency of local people on park resources is reduced through the management of a sustainable forestry program

Activity description	Deliverable(s)	Summary of actual progress/results for this activity
<p>Activity 4.1: With 2 VCDCs and village councils, establish Community Forests in areas of degraded forest close to target villages. Mandates, roles and responsibilities of CF committees will be determined, and CF user groups will be defined.</p>	<p>2 Community Forests with active CF Committees and User Groups established near to 2 target villages</p>	<p>Both communities had done the site selection for CF establishment. It was supported by FD, CWS and FOW staff. FOW supported 6500 seedlings to 2 VCDCs. Leading by VCDCs, community members conducted planting campaigns during August + September 2015.</p> <p>CF applications were submitted to Kawlin Township FD.</p>
<p>Activity 4.2: Offer fuel-efficient stoves to members of 2 communities in order to reduce rate of fuel-wood consumption.</p>	<p>Fuel-efficient stoves being used by 271 households</p>	<p>FOW had made a presentation about the advantages of fuel-wood efficient stoves to two community members in May 2015. Then FOW were able to contribute the stoves to all members of two communities through VCDCs.</p>

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

We used FPIC to get the agreement from two communities for the protection of the core zone and joint-patrolling.

PART IV: Lessons, Sustainability, Safeguards and Financing

Lessons Learned

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

- To establish a successful CF, the township FD and sanctuary officials should work together and more collaboration is needed. We observed that both agencies are showing off their power and authority. It means closer communication and cooperation with the FD and CWS is needed to make the project more comfortable and achieve better results.
- Managing Protected Areas (PAs) has many difficulties. The situation of PA management in Myanmar is also complicated because of many reasons especially rapid changes associated with development and lack of comprehensive management plans. Due to a lack of a PA management plan since 1986, CWS wardens determined priorities for PA management on an ad hoc basis, and usually in response to problems that detract from pursuing long-range goals. Threats to biodiversity in the CWS include: unsustainable firewood extraction, harvesting Non-timber Forest Products (NTFP), forest clearance for agricultural expansion, illegal timber extraction and hunting, pollution due to waste disposal and agricultural run-off. The park management styles were changed based on wardens' knowledge, experiences, and decision. Mostly, it did not make effective and efficient outputs. Therefore, a comprehensive management plan for CWS is urgently needed.
- The negative attitude towards CWS management should be reduced. If we were able to arrange more incentive for communities and more awareness events, the results will be better. In addition, the CWS officials such as warden, ranger, etc., should keep working for at least 5-7 years, should not transfer to other parks frequently.
- Outside leaders (especially political leaders) may make a difference: Some (two persons) interrupted to change the attitude and behavior of local community members. After 11 months later, community members refused to participate in joint-patrol because of: 1) legal action on agricultural encroachment taken by CWS staff; and 2) outside leaders' interruption.
- FD headquarter's decision also make differences on CWS management
CWS management is not stable because park warden changed frequently.
Although we sent the message to FD that changing warden frequently is not good for CWS management. But FD headquarter did not pay attention to our suggestion. During this project period FOW deal with 4 wardens. At the beginning of the project, the warden was U Mg Win (10 days), then U Kyaw Zin Tun for 13 months, U Than Naing for 9 months, and U Min Swe is current warden.

Spending their times in the field was very much different among the wardens. Management practices and ideas were also not the same. The second warden spent most of his time in the office. The warden should be working in the field at least 50% of the time. If we were able to encourage him to work in the field more days, it would be more achieve better.

Other lessons include:

- All authorities, officials and local people had interested in political competition such as Myanmar Election 2015, its results, nomination of new ministers, really handover the power to new elected party from old government?, etc., during reporting period, and CWS staff and target communities were no exception. Therefore, it was very difficult to accomplish some activities such as training, CF plantation, etc.
- Communities were interesting in village-level chairman election during government changing period.
- According to instruction of FD headquarter, CWS staff tried to take action the local people (including villagers from Singaung and Saththachaung) who encroached sanctuary area for agriculture purpose. Oppositely, FD headquarter agreed one outside-community to establish CF inside CWS area. They did crop plantation instead of CF tree plantation. It made more problems among the local communities. Therefore, community members were angry and stopped their participation in patrolling (not willing for working together with sanctuary staff)

Sustainability / Replication

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

- Better governance has been coming out in CWS because higher policy supports is continuing.
- All staff including wardens recognized that core zone management is very important and essential for conservation of viable population of Eld's deer.
- We were able to build up the capacity and knowledge of representatives from two communities in terms of CF, role of civil societies, Natural resource management, soil conservation and bio-fertilizer methods, etc. In addition, our message sent to them that CWS staff are trying their best to sustain the nation's natural resources and should help them as much as they can. Some representatives accepted it and they said sanctuary staff are better than township FD staff in conserving the forest resources.
- We also introduced the practice on the use of fuel-wood efficient stove to target communities. It will reduce the dependency of sanctuary resource. According to our evaluation, 65% of Saththachaung and 48% Singaung families were using them.
- FOW had a courtesy call to meet with one minister - Sagaing Regional Government and two representatives from parliament. We explained about the project in detail. They encouraged us to conduct a multi-stakeholder consultation workshop at CWS. Therefore, we organized a Deer Conservation and CWS management Workshop. It was held in June 2016, a total of 106 stakeholders including local leaders from villages, CSOs, representatives from Sagaing Region Parliament and 1 minister from Sagaing

Regional Government had attended. It was a 2-days workshop and discussed all issues, problems, challenges, constraints of Eld's deer conservation and CWS management by participants. All village-leaders and representatives (including from Singaung and Satthachaung) agreed/consensus that "CWS should be forever". It indicated that local people had good attitudes towards conservation of CWS and endemic deer, although some of local people were taken action by sanctuary staff.

- The representatives from Sagaing Region Parliament and chief minister of Sagaing Regional Government visited CWS three times during 2016 before the end of project and they supported for law enforcement through a police team appointed there. They also tried to solve the agricultural encroachment problems which are facing among villagers including from Singaung and Satthachuang and sanctuary staff. It showed that CWS is getting the policy support.
- FOW were able to send a clear message to the field staff/wardens and community representatives that effective core zone management is very important for conservation of viable Eld's deer population and CWS ecosystem management.

Safeguards

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

This project triggers CEPF's safeguard policy on Involuntary Resettlement (restrictions on access to natural resources) as it aimed to improve Eld's deer conservation in Chatthin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS). In response we produced a Process Framework that described potential positive and negative impacts on local communities, plans for participatory implementation, measures to avoid negative impacts, how safeguard issues would be monitored, and how we would establish and manage a grievance mechanism. We followed this Process Framework throughout project implementation.

At the start of the project, the FOW team conducted initial meetings with the village authorities, and then conducted village meetings with the wider community in order to explain the project objectives and activities, and seek their feedback and agreement. We explained that we wanted to reduce their dependency on natural resources, improve the management of CWS's core zone, and establish Community Forests. After getting the agreement of the communities, we facilitated the establishment of VDCs in each of the two target villages. The rest of project implementation took place in close coordination with the village authorities, VDCs, and local communities.

We monitored safeguard issues continuously throughout the project period. This included regular meetings between project staff and local communities, and regular telephone communication between the project staff and local communities and local authorities. If community members were unhappy about the project, their first contact point would be the VDCs. The VDC Chairs could then inform the project staff.

Additional Funding

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

a. Total additional funding (US\$)

FOW received a 2-year grant (US\$49,990) (June 2016 to May 2018)

b. Type of funding

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

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
Conservation Force, USA	To support law enforcement, community capacity building and participation, assessing human impacts, protected area management plan	\$49,990	This fund was used as co-funding in some activities of CEPF project during June-October 2016.

* Categorize the type of funding as:

A Project Co-Financing (other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)

B Grantee and Partner Leveraging (other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project)

C Regional/Portfolio Leveraging (other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project)

Additional Comments/Recommendations

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

Communities want to protect deer habitats and CWS resources, but they also need to make a living. Therefore, there is a need of alternative livelihood options for local communities e.g. agriculture, ecotourism, etc.

PART IV: Impact at Portfolio and Global Level

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

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

Contribution to Portfolio Indicators

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

Indicator	Narrative
N/A	

Contribution to Global Indicators

Please report on all Global Indicators (sections 14 to 21 below) that pertain to your project.

13. Key Biodiversity Area Management

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

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

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

Name of KBA	# of Hectares with strengthened management *	Is the KBA Not protected, Partially protected or Fully protected? Please select one: NP/PP/FP
Chatthin	12,125 hectares (121.2 km2)	FP

14. Protected Areas

Number of hectares of protected areas created and/or expanded

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

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

15. Production landscape

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

Number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened biodiversity management.

Name of Production Landscape*	# of Hectares**	Latitude***	Longitude***	Description of Intervention
N/A				

17. Beneficiaries

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

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

# of men benefiting from formal training*	# of women benefiting from formal training*
34	7

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

# of men benefiting from increased income*	# of women benefiting from increased income*
None	None

17c. Total number of beneficiaries - Combined

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

Total # of men benefiting*	Total # of women benefiting*
34	7

18. Benefits to Communities

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

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

Name of Community	Community Characteristics (mark with x)							Type of Benefit (mark with x)							# of Beneficiaries			
	Subsistence economy	Small landowners	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Other*	Increased access to clean water	Increased food security	Increased access to energy	Increased access to public services (e.g. health care, education)	Increased resilience to climate change	Improved land tenure	Improved recognition of traditional knowledge	Improved representation and decision-making in governance forums/structures	Improved access to ecosystem services	# of men and boys benefiting	# of women and girls benefiting
Satthachaung	X	X									X			X	X		309	280
Singaung	X	X									X			X	X		403	388

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

18b. Geolocation of each community

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

Name of Community	Latitude	Longitude
Satthachaung	46Q 0754463	2612360
Singaung	46Q 0764547	2613573

19. Policies, Laws and Regulations

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

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

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

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

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

20. Best Management Practices

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

No.	Short title/ topic of the best management practice	Description of best management practice and its use during the project
1	Core zone management	There are 4 different zones in current CWS management practice; core zone, development zone, restoration zone and buffer zone. Of those, core zone is the best habitat of Eld's deer in the world. Therefore, it was restricted all human activities during project period such as NTFP collection, cattle grazing, transportation access, etc. The project tried to reduce all human impacts inside core zone. The project sent clear message to wardens/staff (who were not familiar with wildlife conservation) that core zone management is very important to conserve the viable population of Eld's deer.
2	CF establishment and the use of fuel-wood efficient stoves	The project targeted 2 communities, Sathhachaung and Singaung, located inside the CWS. The project encouraged them to establish own CFs for future use and to reduce the dependency of sanctuary's resources. In addition, the project introduced the practice on the use of fuel-wood efficient stoves to them to save their times, reduce the fuel-wood, and climate change (carbon release)

21. Networks & Partnerships

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

No.	Name of Network/ Partnership	Year established	Country(s) covered	Purpose
1	Deer Lovers	2016	Myanmar	Only local network in and around the CWS.

Part V. Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

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

Name: U Myint Aung
Organization: Friends of Wildlife
Mailing address: Room 15, Building 296, Yan-aung Lane (1), Yankin Township, Yangon
Telephone number: +95 9 1 555373
E-mail address: friendsofwildlife.mm@gmail.com