

CEPF Final Completion and Impact Report

Organization's Legal Name:	FISHBIO
Project Title:	Evaluating Cambodian Freshwater Conservation Projects in the Lower Mekong
Grant Number:	CEPF-110840
Hotspot:	Indo-Burma III
Strategic Direction:	4 Empower local communities to engage in conservation and management of priority key biodiversity areas
Grant Amount:	\$200,000.00
Project Dates:	September 01, 2020 - December 31, 2022
Date of Report:	February 27, 2023

IMPLEMENTATION PARTNERS

Young Eco Ambassadors (YEA) – The director of this local Cambodian organization – Lykheang Seat – was engaged as the lead field coordinator for this evaluation project. Along with his staff members, he coordinated the logistics of all on the ground activities, including biodiversity surveys, community surveys, and workshop organization. Notably, YEA led the baseline field data collection without FISHBIO staff being present due to travel restrictions associated with COVID.

Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute (IFReDI) – Multiple IFReDI staff accompanied the field team during both baseline biodiversity sampling and endline biodiversity and community sampling. Their support and knowledge of local species was instrumental for fish and habitat data collection, as well as community surveys. IFReDI staff, including the Director, also participated in the endline knowledge sharing workshop, where they provided a keynote introduction and assisted with workshop logistics.

Fisheries Administration (FiA) – Staff from provincial Fisheries Administration cantonments assisted with fish and community sampling in each project area. Their knowledge of local species and connections to local communities allowed them to provide significant assistance with fish and habitat data collection, and with organizing logistics and support from local villagers.

Dr. Vittoria Elliott – Dr. Elliott assisted with development of the original project proposal; aided in the development, execution, and analysis of the proposal and civil society evaluations; and led analysis of collected environmental DNA samples.

Dr. Joanne Millar – Dr. Millar coordinated the development of the community data collection tools; assisted with analysis of the collected community data; and presented and facilitated discussions at the endline knowledge sharing workshop.

CONSERVATION IMPACTS

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

Impact Description	Impact Summary
CEPF and other conservation donors in Cambodia integrate project recommendations into their solicitation and evaluation of future projects.	The recommendations developed through this evaluation effort have been shared with CEPF directly, and distributed more broadly through FISHBIO’s website and social media outlets, as well as through direct sharing with other conservation practitioners. FISHBIO will continue to provide reports to interested parties, and will field any questions by organizations interested in incorporating insights from this evaluation into their solicitation and evaluation practices. It is the hope of the evaluation team that this ongoing communication will facilitate the achievement of this long-term objective in the coming years.

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

Impact Description	Impact Summary
The eight evaluated grantees will receive information on project successes and suggested areas for improvement outside the scope of their proposed project outcomes and impacts.	Although the total number of grantee organizations subjected to this evaluation was reduced to six following discussions with CEPF, these six grantees received comprehensive reports on each component of the evaluation, including 1) proposal review, 2) organizational capacity evaluation, 3) evaluation of ecological and biodiversity impacts, and 4) evaluation of community perspectives and community impacts. Further, all grantees participated in a knowledge sharing workshop in December of 2022, where they were provided explanations of the evaluation tools developed for this project, as well as key findings. At the conclusion of this project, each grantee has received not only data and explanations on significant shared challenges faced by conservation organizations in Cambodia and notable innovations being implemented by these organizations, but has also received detailed evidence of their project impacts and specific suggestions for improvement to their organizations.
At least three future CEPF applicants reference the recommendations of this evaluation in their proposed project design or implementation.	At least one organization (Rising Phoenix) has used the findings of this evaluation to guide new projects related to their ongoing work. Specifically, they considered data on community perspectives

Impact Description	Impact Summary
	<p>collected by the evaluation team in order to develop a new community engagement and education project related to ongoing Siamese crocodile reintroduction work. Further, they are implementing a modified version of the ecological evaluation protocol used in this study as part of their long-term monitoring in Siem Pang Wildlife Sanctuary.</p> <p>The tools were shared with grantees once completed (by November 2022 all of them had been shared), and subsequently explained in more detail during the participative workshop that took place in December 2022. We believe that more grantees will use the recommendations of this evaluation in the longer term (2-3 years after the completion of this project). We believe more communication/sharing needs to continue to happen. FISHBIO will continue to share the tools with Cambodia partners that apply to CEPF grants, and FISHBIO recommends CEPF share a link on their website with such tools for organizations that seek funding for Cambodia projects with CEPF.</p>
<p>Recommendations from this evaluation are utilized as part of the EU-funded CAPFISH Capture Component 1 program.</p>	<p>The EU-funded CAPFISH Capture project is still ongoing, and is slated for completion in 2024. The results of this evaluation have been shared with individuals involved in the CAPFISH project, including project partner Dr. Vittoria Elliott and the director of the Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute, which has made insights and data from this effort available for incorporation or consideration in CAPFISH activities.</p>

Unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

One unexpected impact of this project was the development of connections among organizations that had not formerly interacted. Many of the grantees involved in this evaluation were not aware of the similar ongoing work by each of their respective organizations, and by bringing them together this project allowed for discussions of mutual challenges, sharing of novel solutions, and brainstorming about future collaborations. Similarly, another unexpected impact was connecting representatives of the Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute with the grantee organizations. The role of IFReDI was not clear to many of the grantees, and an improved understanding of their function as a monitoring and research branch rather than a regulatory branch of the Fisheries Administration will likely help facilitate future collaboration and knowledge sharing among these government researchers and the grantee organizations.

PROJECT RESULTS/DELIVERABLES

Overall results of the project:

The evaluations conducted for this project have provided a wealth of information that improves understanding of the impact of CEPF project investments, and the collected data represent an excellent opportunity for learning. The four components of this evaluation –

the proposal review, the civil society capacity assessment, the ecological assessment, and the community assessment – have individually provided insight into progress towards the four pillars of CEPF as well as towards the CEPF Strategic Directions for the Indo-Burma Region that were targeted by the grantees. By identifying successes and shortfalls at both the grantee level and at the regional level, this evaluation can inform the development of improved approaches and interventions in the Indo-Burma region and beyond.

Identified successes across each component of the evaluation provide evidence that CEPF's investments in the region are in many cases functioning as intended and having positive impacts. The proposal review indicated that grantee proposals are generally coherent, follow unified themes, consider other efforts in the region, and include enabling conditions for sustainability. Similarly, the civil society assessments showed that grantees are striving to meet the institutional standards set forth by CEPF, and are in most cases working towards developing or improving strategic plans, administrative procedures, community partnerships, and staff capacities. The assessments of biodiversity and aquatic habitat in the project areas also revealed promising trends, and for many of the evaluated projects the collected fish community data suggest that community-based management of protected areas may be having positive impacts on fish populations. Finally, the community surveys provided evidence that grantee projects were generally perceived by local people to have had positive impacts on both the environment and livelihoods, and in many cases demonstrated an improved understanding of conservation efforts among local communities.

In addition to identified successes, each evaluation component also identified areas that may be targeted for improvement. The findings of the proposal review suggest that the proposal process may be improved by integrating existing CEPF guides for proposal development into the grant portal itself, by providing grantees with grant development training tools, by facilitating peer-to-peer mentoring for proposal writing, and by having grantees explicitly (and literally) draw connections between their activities, components, and impacts by integrating conceptual diagrams into the grant creation process. The results of the civil society evaluation led to the recommendation that CEPF consider a revised approach to monitoring the capacity of their grantees. The existing tracking tool and the questionnaire developed by this evaluation effort may be combined to balance effort and the quality of data generated. This might involve complimenting the tracking tool scoring method with requirements for documentation or evidence of self-assigned scores, and also providing opportunities for grantees to include narrative responses where appropriate. Further, the allocation of CEPF staff to administer the evaluation would likely substantially improve the quality of data obtained, and would help grantees target critical aspects of their organizational capacity for improvement. The findings of the ecological assessment highlighted the challenges associated with connecting changes in biodiversity to management actions, and emphasized the significant value that would be provided by repeated, standardized monitoring. Many of the desired grantee impacts focus on ecosystem-level changes following establishment and strengthening of fisheries management systems, changes which are likely to take many years to become apparent. Although many of the grantees incorporate catch monitoring to evaluate their biodiversity impacts, the findings of this evaluation suggest that the data generated by standardized, fisheries-independent surveys is of far greater resolution. The value of long-term monitoring is significant, and consideration should be given to continuing application of a standardized sampling protocol such as that used in this evaluation. Maintaining long-term monitoring is challenging for grantees operating primarily on project-based funding, and CEPF may consider encouraging grantees to include monitoring in their projects and to develop means for sustaining such activities. The community evaluation provided a realistic perspective on how the projects are impacting the wellbeing, livelihoods, and conservation. This information is not necessarily reflected in grantee progress reports, final impact reports,

safeguards, or grievance mechanisms. CEPF may consider encouraging grantees to administer before and after community evaluations to gain perspective on people's perceptions.

Creating spaces for discussion and collaboration among grantees facing common challenges in the region may allow for leveraging complementary strengths and help to identify novel solutions. The creation of collaborative calls for proposals that seek to pool resources to address common problems may help achieve this. In addition, the development of grantee networks and communication platforms is warranted to encourage collaboration. The workshop conducted at the conclusion of this evaluation may be used as a launch pad for this effort, as it will provide an opportunity to highlight challenges common across the various project areas and the different approaches that the various grantees have pursued to address them.

Overall, the projects that CEPF has funded in Cambodia appear to be having significant impacts on biodiversity, human well-being, civil society capacity, and enabling conditions for conservation. Similarly, they have made progress towards the Strategic Directions for the Indo-Burma region, including the empowering of local communities to engage in conservation and management of priority key biodiversity areas; the engaging of key actors in mainstreaming biodiversity, communities and livelihoods into development planning in the priority corridors; and the strengthening of civil society to work on biodiversity, communities and livelihoods at regional, national, local, and grassroots levels. The findings and recommendations generated by this evaluation effort provide a roadmap for further improving these impacts, and identify key challenges that need to be addressed by future CEPF efforts. The continued use of the frameworks developed by this project to evaluate proposals, civil society capacities, biodiversity, and community perceptions is certainly warranted, as their repeated application would allow for monitoring of improvements, development of novel approaches to address recurring problems, and identification of new challenges as they arise. This evaluation establishes a valuable baseline against which future evaluations conducted by CEPF or the grantees themselves may compare. The opportunities for learning and improvement do not end with this project, and may be greatly expanded by future efforts.

To learn more, please refer to the Final CEPF Report submitted in the last progress report.

Results for each deliverable:

Component		Deliverable		
#	Description	#	Description	Results for Deliverable
1.0	Preparation for evaluation	1.1	Finalized evaluation concept/design document, including detailed methods, survey tools, and evaluation training materials	Achieved
1.0	Preparation for evaluation	1.2	Updated evaluation timeline	Achieved
1.0	Preparation for evaluation	1.3	Contracts for field data collection team	Achieved
2.0	Data collection and evaluation across the eight selected projects will be subdivided into comprehensive ecosystem, grantee, and community evaluations (5 projects) and condensed evaluations focused on grantees and community only (3 projects)	2.1	Data on Freshwater Biodiversity	Achieved
2.0	Data collection and evaluation across the eight selected projects will be subdivided into comprehensive ecosystem, grantee, and community evaluations (5 projects) and condensed evaluations focused on grantees and	2.2	Data on Human Well-being	Achieved

Component		Deliverable		
#	Description	#	Description	Results for Deliverable
	community only (3 projects)			
2.0	Data collection and evaluation across the eight selected projects will be subdivided into comprehensive ecosystem, grantee, and community evaluations (5 projects) and condensed evaluations focused on grantees and community only (3 projects)	2.3	Data on Civil Society Capacity	Achieved
2.0	Data collection and evaluation across the eight selected projects will be subdivided into comprehensive ecosystem, grantee, and community evaluations (5 projects) and condensed evaluations focused on grantees and community only (3 projects)	2.4	Data on Enabling Conditions and Impact Sustainability	Achieved
3.0	Analysis	3.1	Quantitative analysis of baseline results	Achieved
3.0	Analysis	3.2	Quantitative analysis of endline results	Achieved
4.0	Reporting and Dissemination	4.1	Individual grantee baseline reports	Achieved

Component		Deliverable		
#	Description	#	Description	Results for Deliverable
4.0	Reporting and Dissemination	4.2	Individual grantee endline reports	Achieved
4.0	Reporting and Dissemination	4.3	Consolidated endline report	Achieved
4.0	Reporting and Dissemination	4.4	Workshop materials	Achieved
4.0	Reporting and Dissemination	4.5	Prepare document on lessons learned, and monitoring and evaluation impact guidance	Achieved and sent.
4.0	Reporting and Dissemination	4.6	Outline of manuscript for future publication in peer-reviewed scientific journal	Ongoing. Our final CEPF report is actively being adapted for a potential manuscript.

Tools, products or methodologies that resulted from the project or contributed to the results:

This project resulted in the development of five different tools. Each of these is described in detail in the final project report submitted to CEPF, and they include 1) a rapid bioassessment procedure, 2) a grantee organizational capacity evaluation tool, 3) a community organization capacity evaluation tool, 4) a proposal review template, and 5) a semi-structured interview community evaluation framework. Each of these tools has also been provided to the grantee organizations and relevant government agencies, and was discussed in detail during the endline knowledge sharing workshop.

PORTFOLIO INDICATORS

Portfolio Indicator Number	Portfolio Indicator Description	Expected Numerical Contribution	Expected Contribution Description	Actual Numerical Contribution	Actual Contribution Description
3.5	Number of priority sites with third-party evaluation of project impacts on biodiversity and human wellbeing.	11	# of priority sites with evaluation: Ang Trapaeng Thmor; Stung/Chikreng/Kampong Svay; Upper Stung Sen	6	Included: Upper Stung Sen Catchment – community surveys conducted for the evaluation of CIYA’s project.

Portfolio Indicator Number	Portfolio Indicator Description	Expected Numerical Contribution	Expected Contribution Description	Actual Numerical Contribution	Actual Contribution Description
			Catchment; Chhep; Stung Sen/Santuk/Baray; Dei Ronneat; Lower Stung Sen; Mekong River from Kratie to Lao PDR; Sekong River; Sesan River; Western Siem Pang		Stung Sen/Santuk/Baray – site not included or subjected to data collection for the evaluation. Lower Stung Sen – community surveys and ecological sampling conducted for the evaluation of NLC’s project. Mekong River from Kratie to Lao PDR – community surveys and ecological sampling conducted in Kaoh Kei and Chom Thom. Sekong River - community surveys and ecological sampling conducted in Khan Makpheung and Nhang Sum for MyVillage, and in Kham Pourk and the O’Khampha River in Siem Pang for Rising Phoenix Western Siem Pang - community surveys in Kham Pourk and ecological sampling in the O’Khampha River for the evaluation of Rising Phoenix’s project. Not included: Dei Ronneat – community surveys and ecological sampling in Phat Sanday for Fact project evaluation (no sampling in Dei Ronneat

Portfolio Indicator Number	Portfolio Indicator Description	Expected Numerical Contribution	Expected Contribution Description	Actual Numerical Contribution	Actual Contribution Description
					<p>due to logistical constraints).</p> <p>Ang Trapaeng Thmor and Chhep – sites in WCS’s project, and through discussions with CEPF it was decided not to include their organization in the evaluation.</p> <p>Sesan River - conducted data collection efforts on the MyVillage Sekong River sites only due to logistical constraints.</p> <p>Stung/Chikreng/Kampong Svay – site in BirdLife’s project, and through discussions with CEPF it was decided not to include their organization in the evaluation.</p>
1	Number of civil society organizations, including domestic organizations, that actively participate in conservation actions guided by the ecosystem profile.	1	One civil society organization (FISHBIO) actively participates in conservation actions guided by the ecosystem profile.	1	Over the last two years, FISHBIO conducted an independent evaluation of six CEPF-funded grantee conservation projects and their impacts on local biodiversity, civil society, and human well-being in Cambodia.

GLOBAL INDICATORS

Protected Areas

Protected areas that have been created and/or expanded as a result of the project. Protected areas may include private or community reserves, municipal or provincial parks, or other designations where biodiversity conservation is an official management goal.

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID*	Latitude	Longitude	Country	Original Total Size (Hectares)**	New Protected Hectares***	Year of Legal Declaration or Expansion
-------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------	---	----------------------------------	---

*World Database of Protected Areas

**If this is a new protected area, 0 should appear in this column

*** This column excludes the original total size of the protected area.

Key Biodiversity Area Management

Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) under improved management—where tangible results have been achieved to support conservation—as a result of the project.

KBA Name	KBA Code	Size of KBA	Number of Hectares with Improved Management
----------	----------	-------------	---

Production Landscapes

Production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity as a result of the project.

A production landscape is defined as a site outside a protected area where commercial agriculture, forestry or natural product exploitation occurs.

Name of Production Landscape	Latitude	Longitude	Hectares Strengthened	Intervention
------------------------------	----------	-----------	-----------------------	--------------

Benefits to Individuals

- **Structured Training:**

Number of Men Trained	Number of Women Trained	Topics of Training
23	3	Endline grantee impact and evaluation tool-sharing workshop Field crew training on biodiversity and aquatic habitat evaluation procedure Field crew training on best practices for community data collection and semi-structured interviews

- **Cash Benefits:**

Number of Men – Cash Benefits	Number of Women – Cash Benefits	Description of Benefits
36	1	These individuals were members of the communities where evaluation activities were taking place, and they were paid daily rates to assist with a variety of tasks, including provision of food and housing for the field team, Lao to Khmer translation services, fish sampling and catch reporting, and boat transport of the field team. A total

Number of Men – Cash Benefits	Number of Women – Cash Benefits	Description of Benefits
		of 14 of these people were involved in baseline sampling in 2021, and 23 were involved in endline sampling in 2022.

Benefits to Communities

View the characteristics column below with the following corresponding codes:	View the benefits column below with the following corresponding codes:
1- Small Landowners	a. Increased Access to Clean Water
2- Subsistence Economy	b. Increased Food Security
3- Indigenous/ Ethnic Peoples	c. Increased Access to Energy
4- Pastoralists / Nomadic Peoples	d. Increased Access to Public Services
5- Recent Migrants	e. Increased Resilience to Climate Change
6- Urban Communities	f. Improved Land Tenure
7- Other	g. Improved Use of Traditional Knowledge
	h. Improved Decision-Making
	i. Improved Access to Ecosystem Services

Community Name	Community Characteristics							Type of Benefit									Country	Number of Males Benefitting	Number of Females Benefitting
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i			

Characteristics of "Other" Communities:

Policies, Laws and Regulations

View the topics column below with the following corresponding codes:			
A- Agriculture	E- Energy	I- Planning/Zoning	M- Tourism
B- Climate	F- Fisheries	J- Pollution	N- Transportation
C- Ecosystem Management	G- Forestry	K- Protected Areas	O- Wildlife Trade
D- Education	H- Mining and Quarrying	L- Species Protection	P- Other

No.	Name of Law	Scope	Topics															
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P

“Other” Topics Addressed by the Policy, Law or Regulation:

No.	Country/ Countries	Date Enacted/ Amended	Expected impact	Action Performed to Achieve the Enactment/ Amendment
-----	--------------------	-----------------------	-----------------	--

Companies Adopting Biodiversity-friendly Practices

A company is defined as a for-profit business entity. A biodiversity-friendly practice is one that conserves or uses natural resources in a sustainable manner.

Name of Company	Description of Biodiversity-Friendly Practice	Country/Countries where Practice was Adopted
-----------------	---	--

Networks and Partnerships

Networks/partnerships should have some lasting benefit beyond immediate project implementation. Informal networks/partnerships are acceptable.

Name of Network/Partnership	Year Established	Country/ Countries	Established by Project?	Purpose
Telegram Group	2022	Cambodia	Yes	A network created on the app “Telegram” of 30 individuals from all evaluated grantee organizations, the Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute, the Fisheries Administration, the Ministry of the Environment, and Young Eco Ambassadors

Name of Network/Partnership	Year Established	Country/Countries	Established by Project?	Purpose
				was established by the project, and continues to be used as a forum for discussion and collaboration.

Sustainable Financing

Sustainable financing mechanisms generate funding for the long-term (generally five or more years). These include, but are not limited to, conservation trust funds, debt-for-nature swaps, payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes, and other revenue, fee or tax schemes that generate long-term funding for conservation.

Name of Mechanism	Purpose	Date Established	Description	Country/Countries	Project Intervention	Delivery of Funds?

Globally Threatened Species

Globally threatened species (CR, EN, VU) on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, benefitting from the project.

Genus	Species	Common Name (English)	Status	Intervention	Population Trend at Site

LESSONS LEARNED

Successes:

The general structure of this evaluation was effective in providing the data necessary to achieve the objective of evaluating project impacts. Each of the components was designed in a simple and efficient manner, and these tools may be easily implemented by grantees in the future.

The inclusion of a local organization (Young Eco Ambassadors) for field coordination was key to the success of this project. If the data collection efforts had been led solely by US-based staff, the evaluation would likely have failed to meet objectives. Further, YEA specializes in community engagement and outreach, skills which proved critical to allowing collection of high-quality data on community perceptions. Their advice in structuring the social data collection efforts for this study was based on their comprehensive understanding of local culture, and was vital to the success of the evaluation.

The inclusion of fisheries experts from the Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute was of immense value for both the collection of ecological and community data. Their intimate knowledge of aquatic biodiversity and fishery practices of communities throughout the project area was critical for obtaining accurate data, and for the development of an informed sampling approach.

Another success was the knowledge sharing workshop conducted at the end of the evaluation project. It was important to this gathering to share information, build new connections, and brainstorm new ideas for innovative approaches to conservation. It also helped bridge the gap between the grantee organizations and IFRaDI by clarifying the roles of this government research agency and demonstrating how their expertise can be leveraged to improve monitoring and management efforts.

Things to do differently in the future:

The results of the proposal review would have been of value to the grantees prior to finalization of their proposals and beginning their projects. If an evaluation project such as this is to be repeated, it would be advisable to initiate it prior to a funding call so that the grantee proposal development process can be directly aided by the evaluation team. This is also true of the civil society component of the evaluation, as the insight yielded by the more detailed questionnaire developed for this project may have shifted the focus of proposed projects to target specific areas for organizational improvement.

Creating a network of grantees and allowing them to share experiences with each other was an unexpected value provided by this project. Although COVID restrictions made it impossible at the time, it would have been ideal to have performed this process at project outset as well as at the conclusion of the project, and to have encouraged ongoing grantee communication throughout the funding period. Establishing this network earlier in the evaluation process and holding repeated discussions throughout the project would also have improved grantee understanding of the purpose and goals of the evaluation.

SUSTAINABILITY/REPLICATION

Although this project was specifically focused on developing simple, repeatable evaluation protocols that require minimal equipment and training, the biggest impediment to the repeating of these procedures will be limited resources among the grantee organizations. Lack of funding was a frequently cited challenge by each of these organizations, and it is likely that many of them will not be able to allocate funds and personnel to repeating evaluations of the ecological, civil society, and community impacts of their projects. However, at least one organization (Rising Phoenix) is currently working to incorporate a modified version of the ecological evaluation protocol developed by this project into their management plan for Siem Pang Wildlife Sanctuary, and many of the grantee organizations expressed an interest in at least using the proposal evaluation template created by this project to help clearly structure their future projects. Overall, the insight yielded by this evaluation was of great value to the grantees, and it appears that many or all of them will utilize one or more of the evaluation tools in their future work. Other organizations may also find these tools useful. The information and tools have been shared with CEPF to share with grantees, and will also be disseminated through FISHBIO's website and social media channels. This will aid in making these tools readily available to interested parties.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS/STANDARDS

Our project did not trigger any safeguards.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the evaluation yielded specific suggestions for helping to improve the likelihood of success of future projects funded by CEPF. These are explained in greater detail in the final project report, but briefly, restructuring the civil society capacity tracking process and the proposal development process based on the formats developed by this project would likely contribute to greater grantee capacity improvements and a greater likelihood of achievement of desired project impacts. Further emphasizing or requiring the need for ecological and community monitoring as a part of future requests for proposals may encourage grantees to utilize the tools developed by this effort to continue collecting data to effectively track improvements in biodiversity and community well-being, thereby allowing for adaptive approaches to conservation.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Total Amount of Additional Funding Actually Secured (USD)	
Breakdown of Additional Funding	

INFORMATION SHARING AND CEPF POLICY

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. For more information about this project, you may contact the organization and/or individual listed below.

