



## CEPF Final Project Completion Report

Organization Legal Name	Myanmar Bird and Nature Society (MBNS)
Project Title	Identifying Priorities for Wetland Conservation in Myanmar's Dry Zone
CEPF Grant or Number	CEPF-070 (IUCN Ref.) / SG75819 (CEPF Ref.)
Date of Report	02 February 2020

**CEPF Hotspot:** Indo-Burma

**Strategic Direction:** 4

**Grant Amount:** US\$ 19,996

**Project Dates:** 1 May 2017 to 31 August 2019

### **PART I: Overview**

#### **1. Implementation Partners for this Project**

By supporting of CEPF grant, firstly we had to obtain permission to work in Mandalay Region from the **General Administration Division, Forest Department, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation and Irrigation Department**. MBNS could carry out the assessment on the status of 10 wetland sites in central Myanmar, the water bird survey in the wetlands, ecosystem services of wetlands and public awareness and consultation meeting in collaboration with **Wild Wing Photography, Biodiversity And Nature Conservation Association (BANCA)** and **Shwe Kan-thayar Nature Conservation Association (SKNCA)** and **Paleik Lover Association**.

MBNS hosted a stakeholder meeting in the city of Mandalay on 24 August 2019. It was attended by Forest Department, Fishery Department, Irrigation Department, Mandalay City Development Committee, **MBNS, BANCA, Fauna and Flora International (FFI), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Paleik Lover Association (CSO working in Paleik Inn), Shwe Kan Thayar Nature Conservation Association (working in Pyu Lake), Mandalay University, Private sector (Tourism company) and village heads.**

**2. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project**

The project carried out an assessment on status of 10 wetland sites in central Myanmar including their biodiversity richness, ecology of fauna, ecosystem services provided, and management of wetland area in participation with Mandalay University.

During the survey of monitoring of bird species in wetland areas, four individuals of the Critically Endangered Baer’s Pochard (*Aythya baeri*) were recorded in Pyu Lake and Paleik Inn. We have built common trust on conservation of wetlands with the local based organization, Shwe Kan-thayar Nature Conservation Association (SKNCA) especially for Pyu Lake conservation and local communities.

Mandalay Government has encouraged greater participation in long-term conservation of wetlands in Mandalay by establishing the Mandalay Regional Wetlands Conservation Committee, organizing discussion of committee meeting with members (relative government departments such as Fishery Department, Agriculture Department, Land Record, Irrigation Department, General Administration Department, Forest Department, MBNS, BANCA, WCS and IUCN). This committee is chaired by the Minister, Ministry of Natural Resource and Environmental Conservation, Mandalay and its Secretary is the Director, Forest Department, Mandalay Region.

The achievement of the stakeholder meeting in Mandalay City was that the relative government, technical experts, private sectors and communities were engaged for the first time in discussing the conservation of wetlands in central Myanmar. It was also clear that Mandalay Wetland Conservation Committee wants a long-term management plan for wetlands specifically Paleik Inn, Pyu Lake, Taung ta man Inn and Sun ye Inn, as this would ensure stable land tenure and secure livelihoods for the local communities.

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

Description of the overall project goal (as stated in the small grant contract)	Summary of actual progress towards this goal
<p>The wetlands of the Dry Zone of Mandalay and Sagaing Divisions, Myanmar (and the species that depend upon them) are better conserved.</p>	<p>An assessment on the status of 10 wetland sites in central Myanmar was completed in collaboration with Mandalay University. This includes information on their biodiversity richness, ecology of fauna, ecosystem services, and management of wetland areas.</p> <p>The project prepared recommendations for wetland conservation in central Myanmar and advocated the establishment of some of them for protective designation as Ramsar Site, EAAPP site or Community Conservation Area in central Myanmar.</p> <p>A stakeholder consultation meeting was hosted in Mandalay in August 2019 to discuss wetland</p>

	conservation in collaboration with Mandalay Wetland Conservation Committee chaired by the Minister (Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation) and with the participation of Mandalay University, private sector, NGOs, INGOs and villager leaders.
--	--

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

In recent decades, collaborative approaches to ecosystem management have received attention among resource management science and policy researchers elsewhere. Yet the institutional dimensions of ecosystem management remain less understood. Illegal fishing, encroachment for cultivation, using pesticide and chemical fertilizer, waste disposal is largely blamed on destruction of wetlands in central Myanmar. Besides, weak law enforcement and poor knowledge on wetland conservation issues are leading to the degradation of wetland ecosystem services to human beings.

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

The project generated positive communication with Community Based Organisation such as Paleik Lover Association especially for Paleik Inn conservation and Shwe Kan-thayar Nature Conservation Association for Pyu Lake conservation during the project implementation.

The bird photographers and ornithologist communities have an increased interest in the conservation of Paleik Inn and Pyu Lake because there were 4 individuals of the Critically Endangered Baer’s Pochard, in Pyu Lake and Paleik Inn recorded during this project.

Even government authorities who are managing these two wetlands have noticed the importance of urgently protecting them.

The Zoology Department of Mandalay University have received more information for thier long term conservation needs for wetland areas in central Myanmar through the meetings at the World Wetland Day event in Mandalay University.

**PART II: Project Objectives and Activities/Deliverables**

**6. Objectives (as stated in the small grant contract)**

<b>Objective 1: Key stakeholders have a better understanding of and appreciation for the role that wetlands play in delivering benefits to society (with a focus on 12 wetland sites in the Dry Zone of Mandalay and Sagaing Divisions).</b>		
<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Deliverable(s)</b>	<b>Summary of actual progress/results for this activity</b>
<b>Activity 1.1:</b> Conduct a desk-based study of existing information on wetlands and their associated wildlife in Mandalay and Sagaing Divisions.	Study conducted.  Results included in report	Desk-based study was carried out in September 2017 from existing information on Myanmar wetland inventory (2004) and Monitoring of the population of Baer’s Pochard in central Myanmar. (Aung, T.D, et al 2016). The wetland

		information was collected from 25 wetland sites of central Myanmar.
<p><b>Activity 1.2:</b> Conduct field visits during three seasons (July-Aug, Oct-Nov, and Jan-Feb) to 12 sites (Ayeyarwady [Mandalay area]; Ba Naw; Butar; Kaung Mu Taw; Kyaung Phyu; Myitha Lake; Peleik Inn; Pyu; Sakyin; Sun Ye; Taung Thaman; and Ye Myetgyi) in order to collect data on wetland characteristics, wildlife diversity and populations, threats to wildlife/wetlands, human use of wetlands, and ecosystem services provided by wetlands.</p>	<p>First set of surveys conducted.</p> <p>Second set of surveys conducted.</p> <p>Third set of surveys conducted.</p> <p>Survey results included in report.</p>	<p>In the first survey, a baseline on the knowledge on the wetland and conservation of biodiversity in local communities was determined using questionnaires. The survey was carried out in 2 wetland sites, Banaw Inn and Pyu Lake. The status of waterbird species in 12 sites of wetland area was monitored.</p> <p>In second surveys, knowledge on the wetland and conservation of biodiversity in local communities were carried out in 10 wetland sites such as Paleik Inn, Ba Nae, Butar, Kaung Phyu, Myitha Lake, Sakyin, Sun Ye, Taung Thaman, Ye Myetgyi Inn and Kaung Hmu Taw Inn in November 2017. Monitoring on the population status of bird species were conducted in November 2017.</p> <p>In third surveys, wetland ecosystem services and population of bird species including other fauna were carried out in 10 wetland sites such as Banaw, Pyu, Paleik, Taung Thaman, Ye Myetgyi Inn, Yit Lake, Sagyin, Sunye Inn, Kaung Hmu Taw and Kyaung Phy in February 2018.</p> <p>The report was prepared in Myanmar language and submitted to regional government.</p>
<p><b>Activity 1.3:</b> Assess the potential importance of the sites for wetland conservation based on Ramsar Site Criteria 1, 5 and 6 (and KBA/IBA criteria), and additional information gathered during field studies.</p>	<p>Sites assessed. Results included in report.</p>	<p>The site assessment mainly focus on ecosystem services, knowledge level of local villagers in and around 12 wetland sites and bird monitoring survey (bird is indicator of biodiversity richness) in 12 wetlands. Baer's Pochard, critically endangered bird species was recorded in Paleik Inn. Paleik Inn is very important wetland in central Myanmar not only for migratory water bird species but also for the livelihood of local communities. The result of site assessment was prepared the report in Myanmar language and distributed to regional government.</p>
<p><b>Activity 1.4:</b> Use the results of the desk-based study and field surveys to produce a detailed report on the wetlands of the Dry</p>	<p>Report produced, and shared with relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>As a result of bird survey the project recorded a total of 77 bird species in Yae Myet Gyi Inn, 76 species in Banaw Inn, 75 species in Pyu Lake. This was the highest recorded number of bird</p>

<p>Zone of Mandalay and Sagaing Divisions, to be shared with national, regional, and local stakeholders including the Myanmar Forest Department, Mandalay and Sagaing Divisional Forest Departments, iNGOs such as FFI, BirdLife, and WCS, and local CSOs such as Friends of Wildlife.</p>		<p>species at the 12 wetland sites in Mandalay and Sagaing Region.</p> <p>The assessment of knowledge, attitude and practice of wetland conservation in local communities and status of socio economic survey was conducted with 118 persons of 39 villages who are living around the wetland area. As a result of knowledge, attitude and practice of wetland conservation in local communities, the communities have awareness of the value of wetlands on their livelihoods especially agriculture but very weak in long term sustainable of agriculture eg. use of pesticide, chemical fertilizer and unsustainable land use in wetland area. Besides, they also have poor knowledge on wetland policy and conservation and also the value of biodiversity.</p> <p>As a result of socio economic survey, most of the villagers who are living near wetland are working in agriculture (55%) and the second largest proportion of villagers are working in fisheries (14%).</p>
<p><b>Activity 1.5:</b> Write short summaries of the report in Myanmar language, and share them with local community leaders adjacent to the 12 wetland sites.</p>	<p>Myanmar language summary report produced, and shared with at least 5 community leaders.</p>	<p>The brief report on the recommendation of wetland conservation has been prepared in Burmese version and shared with the government stakeholders related to the wetlands, and NGO and INGOs.</p>

<b>Objective 2: MBNS has increased institutional capacity to design, implement, report on, and disseminate information about internationally-funded projects.</b>		
<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Deliverable(s)</b>	<b>Summary of actual progress/results for this activity</b>
<p><b>Activity 2.1:</b> MBNS chairman and members design the project in collaboration with the Harrison Institute, including learning how to respond to requests for information from CEPF.</p>	<p>Completed application and subsidiary forms submitted to, and accepted by, IUCN</p>	<p>Members of MBNS have been closely communicating with Dr. Paul Bates of Harrison Institute throughout the process of implementing the CEPF small grant for this project.</p>
<p><b>Activity 2.2:</b> MBNS team draws up a coherent and feasible plan for the implementation of Activities under Objective 1, and carries out this plan in accordance with the timeline specified in Annex 2.</p>	<p>Work-plan produced, and published on MBNS website.</p>	<p>The work plan was set up and the implementation of activities was done as much as possible in accordance with the timeline established.</p>

<b>Objective 3: MBNS and the University of Mandalay (UoM) (staff and students seconded to the project for specific periods) have increased capacity to undertake a gap analysis project focusing on a particular habitat type (in this case, wetlands), and target species (in this case, birds).</b>		
<b>Activity description</b>	<b>Deliverable(s)</b>	<b>Summary of actual progress/results for this activity</b>
<p><b>Activity 3.1:</b> MBNS and UoM staff and students learn techniques for gathering information on wetland habitats (including location, description, human use, wildlife use, threats, and ecosystem services) through participation in field surveys.</p>	<p>At least 3 MBNS staff participate in first set of surveys.</p> <p>At least 3 MBNS staff and UoM students participate in second set of surveys.</p> <p>At least 3 MBNS staff participate in third set of surveys.</p>	<p>Four staff of MBNS and three staff of University of Mandalay participated in the second survey on knowledge of wetland conservation in 12 wetland sites and also in the third survey of wetland ecosystem services and management on 10 wetland sites in November 2017, January and February 2018 respectively.</p> <p>The team conducted survey of Knowledge assessment on wetland conservation in local villagers in 39 villages in and around the 12 wetlands of Mandalay Region and Sagaing Region. A total of 118 villagers were selected and interviewed by using the questionnaires of ecosystem services and knowledge and attitude of villagers. It was found that most of the villager have poor knowledge on effect of pesticides and chemical fertilizer, law enforcement and value of wetland and biodiversity. Most the villagers are working for agriculture first and fishery in second.</p>
<p><b>Activity 3.2:</b> MBNS and UoM staff and students learn techniques for gathering information on wildlife, especially wetland birds.</p>	<p>At least 10 MBNS and UoM students participate in a jointly organized workshop hosted at the Zoology Department, University of Mandalay.</p>	<p>The stakeholder meeting was conducted in Mandalay city Hall jointly organized by Mandalay University on August 2019. Over the years, MBNS has helped train staff and students the University of Mandalay in bird identification. There is a good relationship between the two institutions, students of the university and MBNS staff for some of the field surveys.</p>

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

- Report for Identified Priorities for Wetlands Conservation in Central Dry Zone Myanmar Workshop – 24 August 2019 (submitted as **Annex 1** to this report).
- Report for assessment of birds in wetlands, ecosystem services of wetlands and knowledge of villagers in conservation of wetlands and biodiversity in 12 wetlands of central Myanmar.
- Submitted the Burmese reports to regional governments.

- Brochure (distributed to local stakeholders): Information about World Wetland Day 2019, wetland value and conservation of wetland. (submitted as **Annex 2** to this report).

To get the result of identifying priorities for wetland conservation in Myanmar's Dry Zone, the following contributed activities.

### **Biodiversity Survey**

- Conducted a desk-based study of existing information on wetlands within the Dry Zone
- Conducted field visits in December 2017 and February 2018 to 12 sites (Ayeyarwady [Mandalay area]; Ba Naw; Butar; Kaung Mu Taw; Kyaung Phyu; Myitha Lake; Peleik Inn; Pyu; Sakyin; Sun Ye; Taung Thaman and Ye Myetgyi)
- Collected data at all sites visited relating to: bird diversity, ecosystem services and threats
- Assessed the potential importance of the sites to wetland conservation based on: 'The Ramsar Site Criteria; 1, 5 and 6 and additional information gathered during field studies.
- Summarized desk-based study and field study information such as monitoring of bird survey, ecosystem services and knowledge assessment of villagers on conservation of biodiversity and wetlands in a Burmese report to be submitted to national, regional and local stakeholders. Findings of biodiversity survey, ecosystem services and knowledge assessment of villagers on wetland conservation was prepared Burmese report and sent to all relative governments of wetlands in Mandalay.

### **Enhanced capacity within MBNS in (a) designing, (b) implementing, (c) reporting on, and (d) disseminating an international, externally funded project.**

Harrison Institute staff assisted in preparation of project designation, implementing in socio economic assessment and preparation of report to MBNS staff/volunteers.

### **Stakeholder meeting for identifying of important wetland for conservation**

To strengthen Wetland conservation in central Myanmar, MBNS and Mandalay University jointly organized a stakeholder workshop with participants from relative governments, conservation organisations, Kyaukse and Yadanarpon University and 7 village representatives such as Pyu, Taung ta man, Paleik, Myauk Kaing, Seik ta ya and Banaw village in Mandalay on 24 August 2019. More than 80 participants participated and discussed for long term sustainable wetland conservation and identified the priority site of wetlands in central Myanmar. The objective of the workshop were to identify the important wetland for conservation in Myanmar and make stakeholders aware of the threats facing the wetlands and migratory water bird species and livelihoods of villagers, to involve stakeholders in developing solutions for the conservation of wetlands and migratory water birds species and to motivate stakeholders to get involved in conservation.

## **PART III: Lessons, Sustainability, Safeguards and Financing**

### **Lessons Learned**

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

Challenges faced included:

- policy failure;
- lack of baseline information of ecosystem service;
- lack of awareness between stakeholders;
- unclear land ownership within wetland ecosystem;
- Inadequate community participation;
- variability of climate condition;
- lack of wetland management plan in that areas to guide towards wise use of wetlands.

Several lessons were learnt during the implementation of the project that could guide future interventions in wetlands. These include:

- taking care to ensure participatory approaches and mainstreaming of gender in order to reduce resource use conflict and
- careful selection of alternative livelihood activities.

Another important lesson learned concerns the design phase of the project. Activities should be planned with complete knowledge of the attitude of the community towards the resource in question and the level of literacy of the stakeholders to be involved.

It is also important to share information, identify all stakeholders and form partnerships for collective success.

### **Sustainability / Replication**

- 9. 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.**

The project successes can be further maintained and made sustainable through the following:

- a. Designation of community conservation area for Paleik, Pyu, Banaw, Taung ta man, Sunye and Sagar Inn in Mandalay;
- b. Enforcement of the illegal bird hunting legislation by Forest Department, Mandalay and Mandalay City Development Committee;
- c. Community support and engagement using stakeholder meeting.

### Safeguards

10. 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.

Not applicable – No safeguards were triggered by this project

### Additional Funding

11. 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\$) 2,150

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
Wild Wing Photography	Partially contributed to meeting cost	USD 1,350	Food and Accommodation for stakeholder meeting
Swallow Construction	In Kind	USD 800	Hiring meeting venue

\* 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

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

None.

**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**

- 13. 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
None	

**Contribution to Global Indicators**

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

- 14. 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
Paleik Inn	60 ha	NP

*Comment on the above:* Mandalay Government formed Mandalay Wetland conservation Committee mainly for Paleik Inn with the respective government departments and NGO/INGO including MBNS, BANCA, WCS and IUCN. The grant was used for the stakeholder meeting for

Paleik Inn and other wetland conservation in central Myanmar involving this Mandalay Wetland conservation committee.

*\* Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were improved due to implementation of a fire management regime in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were improved due to invasive species removal in the second year, the total number of hectares with improved management would be 500.*

## 15. 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**

*\* If possible please provide a shape file of the protected area to CEPF.*

*\*\* Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. 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).*

## 16. 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

*\* If the production landscape does not have a name, provide a brief descriptive name for the landscape.*

*\*\*Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were strengthened due to certification in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were strengthened due to new harvesting regulations in the second year, the total number of hectares strengthened to date would be 500.*

*\*\*\* Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. 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).*

**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*

*\*Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men benefited from training in beekeeping, and 3 of these also benefited from training in project management, the total number of men who benefited should be 5.*

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

# of men benefiting from increased income*	# of women benefiting from increased income*

*\*Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men benefited from increased income due to tourism, and 3 of these also benefited from increased income due to handicrafts, the total number of men who benefited should be 5.*

**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*

*\*Do not count the same person more than once. For example, if Paul was trained in financial management and he also benefited from tourism income, the total number of people benefiting from the project should be 1 = Paul.*

### 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
Local Communities	x	x				x		x			x	x		x			28	2
Mandalay Wetland Conservation Committee												x	x	x	x		10	2
Mandalay University							x				x		x		x		7	4

\*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
Paleik	21.8338451°N	96.0554886°E
Pyu	21.7707844°N	95.8976288°E
Taung ta man	21.9061909° N	96.07358855°E
Banaw	21.8258362°N	96.0225296°E
Yae Myet Gyi Inn	22.0749989°N	95.8746109°E
Ayeyarwaddy (Mandalay Area)	21.8634453°N	95.9670410°E
Butar	N21.81006	E96.06702
Kaung Mu Taw	N21.92843	E95.93696
Kyaung Phyu	N22.19639	E95.93859
Myitha Lake	21.383333°N	95.966667°E
Sakyin		
Sun Ye	21.6756344°N	96.2163391°E

### 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
1																			
2																			
3																			

**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				
2				
3				

## 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		
2		

## 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	Shwe Kan Thayar Nature Conservation Association	2017	Mandalay, Myanmar	To conserve Baer's Pochard and other migratory bird conservation in wetlands through community led conservation in central Myanmar.
Although not created by this project, we would like to also mention the organization below, as they were very active and participated in this project as resource person.				
2	Paleik Lover Association	2004	Mandalay, Myanmar	To conserve the bird species in natural wetlands. To raise the public awareness of wetlands.

## **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](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

**Name:** Dr. Thein Aung  
**Organization:** Myanmar Bird and Nature Society  
**Mailing address:** No. 78, Shwe Hinthta Street, Hleiing Township, Yangon, Myanmar  
**Telephone number:** +95-9-5024002  
**E-mail address:** [theinaung58@gmail.com](mailto:theinaung58@gmail.com)