

Conservation Needs Assessment

Tracking Tool Data Sheet

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Name of protected area | Lo Go Xa Mat National Park | |
| Location of protected area (if possible, map reference) | Tan Bien District. 30 km northwest of Tay Ninh Town. Adjoins Cambodia to the north and west. Latitude: 11°29' – 11°40'N Longitude: 105°49' – 105°59'E | |
| Date of establishment (distinguish between “agreed” and “gazetted”) | Decreed as a national park on 12 July 2002 under Decision no. 91/2002/QD-TTg of the Prime Minister. Originally decreed as a nature reserve on 9 August 1986 by Decision No. 194/CT of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers. | |
| Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights, etc.) | Management board of Lo Go Xa Mat National Park | |
| Management authority | People’s Committee of Tay Ninh Province | |
| Size of protected area (ha) | Core zone: 18,806 ha Buffer zone: 18,600 ha | |
| Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar, etc.) | National Park (IUCN Category II) | |
| Reasons why protected area was designated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To conserve the transitional ecosystem between the Lower Mekong Dry Forests and the Mekong Delta Ecosystems. • To preserve unique examples of forested wetlands remaining in Vietnam. • To conserve globally-threatened species, especially waterfowl and migrant waterbirds such as Lesser Adjutant Stork, Woolly-necked Stork, and Sarus Crane, and forest species, such as Germain's Peacock Pheasant and Black-shanked Douc Langur. • To protect the catchment of the Vam Co Dung River. | |
| Brief details of World Bank-funded project or projects in PA | None | |
| Brief details of other international donor-funded projects in PA | None | |
| Brief details of government projects in PA | Mainly national 661 Programme (previously 327 Programme) projects | |
| List of top two protected area objectives | | |
| Objective 1 | Effective conservation of lowland forest and wetlands mosaic. | |
| Objective 2 | Conservation of globally-threatened species, especially migrant waterbirds and lowland forest specialists. | |

D R A F T

| List of top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen) | |
|---|--|
| Threat 1 | Inappropriate management in place for key habitats, particularly wetlands, due to several factors, including: limited understanding amongst the management board members; long periods of inappropriate management preceding the very recent introduction of conservation-oriented management; and conflicting and unclear management responsibilities for key habitats. |
| Threat 2 | Exploitation of forest resources, including land, by local households and others from outside the area, including wealthy people and Cambodians living across the international border. This is partly due to a limited appreciation of the existence of the national park and its purpose. |

Date assessment carried out: 7-9 August 2003: Consultations with management board
10-13 August 2003: Consultations with local communities and leaders of two communes (Tan Lap and Hiep Hoa)

Names of SUF staff: Le Van Giao, Nguyen Huu Nghia, To Ngoc Dan, Ly Van Tro

Names of consultants: Le Trong Trai, Nguyen Cu

D R A F T

Tracking Tool Assessment Form

| Issue | Criteria | Score | Comments | Next steps |
|--|--|-------|--|---|
| 1. Legal status | The protected area is not gazetted | | Lo Go Xa Mat was gazetted as a national park in 2002 by government decision. | Raise awareness of existence and purpose of national park amongst stakeholders at all levels. |
| Does the park have legal status? | The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but has done nothing about it as yet | | | |
| | The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete | | | |
| <i>Context</i> | The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar) | 3 | | |
| 2. Protected area regulations | Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area are not in place | | There is land-use and encroachment on forest land inside the park by some households. Illegal cutting, hunting, and NTFPs collection are not controlled effectively. | Develop specific regulations for Lo Go Xa Mat National Park; strengthen law and regulation enforcement; coordinate with local communities and authorities on land-use planning. |
| Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled? | Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively | 1 | | |
| | Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them | | | |
| <i>Context</i> | Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented | | | |
| 3. Law enforcement | The staff have no effective capacity to enforce protected area legislation and regulations | | The capacity of the national park's staff is considered too low to implement effectively law enforcement (e.g. lack of skills, low patrolling capacities, inadequate equipment). | Train park staff, and provide them with essential equipment. |
| Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough? | There are major deficiencies in staff capacity to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, low patrol capacity) | 1 | | |
| | The staff have acceptable capacity to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain | | | |
| <i>Context</i> | The staff have excellent capacity to enforce protected area legislation and regulations | | | |

D R A F T

| Issue | Criteria | Score | Comments | Next steps |
|---|--|-------|---|--|
| 4. Protected area objectives Have objectives been agreed? <i>Planning</i> | No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area | | There were/are clear objectives for the establishment and management of the national park, but these were agreed to only by specific key persons, not by a wide range of stakeholders. | Give local communities the opportunity for input into the integrated objectives of the national park, through village meetings and awareness-raising programmes. |
| | There are some objectives, but these are out-dated and bear little resemblance to the way that the site is managed | | | |
| | There are clear objectives for the establishment and management of the protected area, but these were set by a few professionals | 2 | | |
| | The protected area has clear objectives agreed by a wide range of stakeholders | | | |
| 5. Protected area boundary design Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i> | Inadequacies in boundary design mean that achievement of major objectives of the protected area is impossible | | The boundary of the national park covers all key habitats and species of conservation concern. However, there are 12 families living inside the Strict Protection Zone who are involved in illegal cross-border trade. The management board of the national park has submitted a plan to relocate those families to MARD. | Speed up relocation of the 12 families, and promote coordination with Cambodia authorities on the protection of the forest resources of the national park. |
| | Inadequacies in boundary design mean that achievement of major objectives of the protected area are constrained to some extent | | | |
| | Boundary design is not constraining achievement of major objectives of the protected area | | | |
| | Reserve design features are significantly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area | 3 | | |
| 6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i> | The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents | | The boundary of the national park is demarcated, but about eight km of the boundary is not clear on the ground. Some local people do not know where the boundary of the park is. | Secure funding for boundary demarcation of the remaining eight km. |
| | The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents | | | |
| | The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not fully demarcated | 2 | | |
| | The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is fully demarcated | | | |

D R A F T

| Issue | Criteria | Score | Comments | Next steps |
|---|--|-------|---|--|
| 7. Management plan | There is no management plan for the protected area | | An Operational Management Plan for the national park is currently under preparation. | Finalise the Operational Management Plan in consultation with key stakeholders, introduce it to all national park staff, and begin implementation. |
| Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? | A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented | 1 | | |
| | An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems | | | |
| | An approved management plan exists and is being implemented | | | |
| <i>Planning</i> | | | | |
| Additional points | The planning process allows adequate opportunity for adjacent stakeholders to influence the plan | 1 | Local stakeholders are fully engaged in the Operational Management Planning process. | Initiate a process to periodically review and revise the Operational Management Plan. |
| | There is an established schedule and process for periodic review of the management plan | | | |
| 8. Annual work plan | No annual work plan exists | | An annual work plan has been developed on the basis of national 661 Programme funding, and funds are allocated by the province. | Develop a work plan based on funding sources from Government, the Vietnam Conservation Fund, and other sources. |
| Is there an annual work plan? | An annual work plan and actions but activities are not monitored against this | | | |
| | An annual work plan exists and actions are monitored against this, but many activities are not completed | 2 | | |
| | An annual work plan exists, and actions are monitored against this and most or all prescribed activities are completed | | | |
| <i>Planning/Outputs</i> | | | | |

D R A F T

| Issue | Criteria | Score | Comments | Next steps |
|--|--|-------|--|--|
| 9. Resource inventory | There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species, and cultural values of the protected area | | Staff of the park have a low capacity for carrying out surveys and improving information on habitats and species. The existing surveys and information on habitats and species were provided by BirdLife International in 1999 and 2001, HCMC National University, and the Vietnam-Russia Tropical Centre in 2002. | Provide training to staff on surveying, research, and analysis of information on habitats and species. Provide technical and scientific support for future management planning. Establish a long-term monitoring programme for wetland habitats. |
| | Information on the critical habitats, species, and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making | 1 | | |
| | Information on the critical habitats, species, and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained | | | |
| | Information concerning on the critical habitats, species, and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained | | | |
| 10. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Inputs</i> | There is no survey of research work | | Some surveys and research have been undertaken by HCMC National University, but not enough to be of much assistance in the developing of research plans. | Undertake research on wetlands management (priority). |
| | There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work | 1 | | |
| | There is considerable survey and research work but no overall programme | | | |
| | There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work | | | |
| 11. Resource management Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)? <i>Process</i> | Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed | | There is a lack of funding and staff for effective management and protection. Management of the park is, however, improving over time, and illegal activities are reducing. | Increase funding and staffing, to ensure active management of key habitats and species in the park. |
| | Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed | | | |
| | Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed | 2 | | |
| | Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed | | | |

D R A F T

| Issue | Criteria | Score | Comments | Next steps |
|--|---|-------|---|---|
| 12. Staff numbers | There are no staff | | Staff numbers are too low. Only 20 staff out of a requisite 37 have been assigned to the national park. | Recruit more staff, with suitable qualifications for addressing the management objectives of the park. |
| | Staff numbers are so inadequate that they seriously hamper site management | 1 | | |
| | Staff numbers are below optimum level | | | |
| | Staff numbers, are in tune with the management needs of the site | | | |
| 13. Staff training Is there enough training for staff? <i>Inputs/Process</i> | Staff are untrained | | Two staff are currently undergoing training on general biodiversity survey work. | Provide training for staff in different fields related to conservation work (high priority). |
| | Staff training and skills are inadequate for the needs of the protected area | 1 | | |
| | Staff training and skills are acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve the goals/objectives of management | | | |
| | Staff training and skills are perfectly in tune with the management needs of the site | | | |
| 14. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i> | There is no budget for the protected area | | The available budget is inadequate, and limited to staff salaries and forest protection contracts. | Secure outside funding (e.g. from the government, donors, international NGOs) to address the conservation objectives of the park. |
| | The available budget is inadequate and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage | 1 | | |
| | The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management | | | |
| | The available budget is sufficient and meets the management needs of the site | | | |

D R A F T

| Issue | Criteria | Score | Comments | Next steps |
|--|---|-------|--|---|
| 15. Security of budget | There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside funding | | Most of the budget is from the 661 Programme, while staff salaries are covered by the provincial budget. The Cat Tien National Park Conservation Project is providing \$25,540 for supporting wetland conservation management. | Secure more funding from outside (e.g. from the government, donors, international agencies) for addressing conservation objectives. |
| | There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding | 1 | | |
| | There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding | | | |
| | There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs | | | |
| 16. Management of budget Is the budget managed well enough? <i>Process</i> | Budget management is very bad and significantly undermines effectiveness | | The current budget from the 661 Programme is managed very effectively. | Increase the budget management capacity, in order to equip the national park to manage larger budgets and donor-funded projects. |
| | Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness | | | |
| | Budget management is adequate but could be improved | | | |
| | Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness | 3 | | |
| 17. Maintenance Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i> | No maintenance of equipment/facilities is undertaken | | No budget is available for maintaining equipment. | Allocate a budget for equipment maintenance. |
| | Maintenance is undertaken only on an <i>ad hoc</i> or emergency basis | 1 | | |
| | Most equipment/facilities are regularly maintained | | | |
| | All equipment/facilities are regularly maintained | | | |

D R A F T

| Issue | Criteria | Score | Comments | Next steps |
|--|---|-------|---|---|
| 18. Personnel management Is the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i> | Problems with personnel management significantly constrain management effectiveness | | The national park has only recently been established, and many management staff are newly-assigned. More time is required to develop personnel management procedures. | Provide training to national park management staff in personnel and organisational management. |
| | Problems with personnel management partially constrain management effectiveness | | | |
| | Personnel management is adequate but could be improved | 2 | | |
| | Personnel management is excellent and aids effectiveness | | | |
| 19. Communication and outreach Is there a planned communication and outreach programme? <i>Process</i> | There is little or no communication between managers and stakeholders involved in the protected area | | There is <i>ad hoc</i> consultation between the national park and local stakeholders (for example, during the Operational Management Planning process). | Develop a specific communications strategy. |
| | There is communication between managers and stakeholders but this is <i>ad hoc</i> and not part of a planned communication programme | 1 | | |
| | There is a planned communication programme that is being used to build support for the protected area amongst relevant stakeholders but implementation is limited | | | |
| | There is a planned communication programme that is being used to build support for the protected area amongst relevant stakeholders | | | |
| 20. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i> | There is no contact between managers and neighboring official or corporate land users | | Cooperation with land users in the buffer zone is quite good, but some difficulties are caused by land uses that have existed for a long time. | Increase cooperation with district and provincial authorities to solve problems of incompatible land uses in the buffer zone and core zone. |
| | There is limited contact between managers and neighboring official or corporate land users | | | |
| | There is regular contact between managers and neighboring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation | 2 | | |
| | There is regular contact between managers and neighboring official or corporate land users, and substantial cooperation on management | | | |

D R A F T

| Issue | Criteria | Score | Comments | Next steps |
|---|---|-------|--|---|
| 21. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i> | Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to its management | 0 | There has been no consultation with indigenous Khmer minority people living in the Rehabilitation Area. | Involve Khmer people in forest protection activities (priority). Provide Khmer language training to selected national park staff. |
| | Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to its management but no direct involvement in decisions | | | |
| | Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to its management | | | |
| | Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to all decisions relating to its management | | | |
| 22. Local communities Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i> | Local communities have no input into decisions relating to its management | | There are some inputs by key persons from two communes into management decisions, but not by a wide range of local communities. | Encourage involvement of a wide range of local communities in management of the park. |
| | Local communities have some input into discussions relating to its management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions | 1 | | |
| | Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to its management | | | |
| | Local communities directly contribute to most decisions relating to its management | | | |
| Additional points <i>Outputs</i> | There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers | 0 | The management board was established only one year ago, so communications with local stakeholders have only been undertaken in a few activities. | Build upon the open communications and trust already established between local stakeholders and protected area managers. |
| | Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented | 0 | | |

D R A F T

| Issue | Criteria | Score | Comments | Next steps |
|---|--|-------|--|---|
| 23. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i> | There are no visitor facilities and services | 0 | At the moment, there is no tourism infrastructure in the national park, and no visitors. | Develop strong mechanisms for involving local communities in conservation and strengthening the enforcement of management regulations (immediate priority). Tourism development should not be developed at the expense of conservation. |
| | Visitor facilities and services are inadequate for current levels of visitation | | | |
| | Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation | | | |
| | Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation | | | |
| 24. Commercial tourism Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i> | There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area | | Not applicable. | |
| | There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters | | | |
| | There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and protect park values | | | |
| | There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and protect park values | | | |
| 25. Tourism fees Does the protected area charge fees for tourists? <i>Outputs</i> | There is no fee for visiting the protected area | | Not applicable. | |
| | There is a fee for visiting the protected area, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the park or its environs | | | |
| | There is a fee for visiting the protected area, that ends up with the local authority | | | |
| | There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this or other protected areas | | | |

D R A F T

| Issue | Criteria | Score | Comments | Next steps |
|--|---|-------|--|--|
| <p>26. Condition assessment</p> <p>Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives?</p> <p><i>Outcomes</i></p> | Many of the most important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded | | <p>A few years ago, valuable timber species within the park were logged by local communities and Cambodians. Currently, this activity is much reduced. Wetlands still provide suitable habitat for large waterbirds.</p> | <p>In accordance with the Operational Management Plan, and with adequate funding and staffing, maintain the biodiversity and ecological value of the park.</p> |
| | Some of the most important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded | | | |
| | Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted | 2 | | |
| | Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact | | | |
| <p>27. Access assessment</p> <p>Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use?</p> <p><i>Outcomes</i></p> | Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives | | <p>Protection systems are moderately effective. However, access to the national park by people involved in illegal activities is still easy and frequent.</p> | <p>Strengthen the enforcement of regulations, and increase cooperation with local communities.</p> |
| | Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives | | | |
| | Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives | 2 | | |
| | Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives | | | |

D R A F T

| Issue | Criteria | Score | Comments | Next steps |
|--|---|-----------|---|---|
| 28. Economic benefit assessment | There is little or no flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area. | | A small benefit from the national park derives to local people from forest protection contracts. There is no economic benefit from tourist services, because the national park has no tourist programme so far. | Maximise opportunities from the 661 Programme to bring benefits to local communities, while involving them in forest protection. |
| | There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy | 1 | | |
| | There is a flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area and this is of moderate or greater significance to the regional economy but most of this benefit accrues from activities outside the park boundary (e.g. spending by visitors getting to the park) | | | |
| | There is a major flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area and a significant proportion of this derives from activities on the park (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours, etc.) | | | |
| 29. Monitoring and evaluation | There is no attempt at monitoring and evaluation in the protected area | | A simple evaluation and reviewing of the annual work plan occurs every six months. | Develop a plan for monitoring and evaluation of workplans, with reviews every six months for annual workplans, and every year for 5-year workplans. |
| | There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results | 1 | | |
| | There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management | | | |
| | A comprehensive monitoring and evaluation exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management | | | |
| <i>Planning/Process</i> | | | | |
| TOTAL SCORE (MAXIMUM POSSIBLE SCORE 91) | | 40 | only 27 out of 29 questions applied => weighted score = 43 | |

Worksheet 1

| Section I. Internationally-important elements of biodiversity supported by Lo Go Xa Mat National Park | |
|--|---|
| Element of Biodiversity | Justification |
| Key species | |
| Plants | |
| 1. several species in the Dipterocarpaceae and Leguminosae families | Several globally-threatened species. All are high value timber species threatened by over-exploitation. |
| Mammals | |
| 1. Pygmy Loris <i>Nycticebus pygmaeus</i> | Globally-threatened – Vulnerable. Confirmed to occur 2001 (Tordoff <i>et al.</i> 2002). |
| 2. Northern Pigtail Macaque <i>Macaca leonina</i> | Globally-threatened – Vulnerable. Confirmed to occur 2001 (Tordoff <i>et al.</i> 2002). |
| 3. Long-tailed Macaque <i>Macaca fascicularis</i> | Globally-threatened – Near-threatened. Confirmed to occur 2001 (Tordoff <i>et al.</i> 2002). |
| 4. Silvered Langur <i>Trachypithecus villosus</i> | Globally-threatened – Vulnerable. Unconfirmed reports from local people 2001 (Tordoff <i>et al.</i> 2002). |
| 5. Black-shanked Douc Langur <i>Pygathrix nigripes</i> | Globally-threatened – Endangered. Unconfirmed reports from local people 2001 (Tordoff <i>et al.</i> 2002). |
| Birds | |
| 6. Germain's Peacock-pheasant <i>Polyplectron germaini</i> | Globally-threatened – Vulnerable. Restricted-range species. Confirmed to occur 2001 (Tordoff <i>et al.</i> 2002). |
| 7. Siamese Fireback <i>Lophura diardi</i> | Globally near-threatened. Confirmed to occur 2001 (Tordoff <i>et al.</i> 2002). |
| 8. Sarus Crane <i>Grus antigone</i> | Globally-threatened – Vulnerable. Confirmed to occur 2001 (International Crane Foundation pers. comm. 2001). |
| 9. Great Hornbill <i>Buceros bicornis</i> | Globally near-threatened. Reported to occur by local people (Tordoff <i>et al.</i> 2002). |
| 10. Lesser Adjutant <i>Leptoptilos javanicus</i> | Globally-threatened species - Vulnerable. Confirmed to occur 2003 (Nguyen Dinh Xuan pers. comm. 2003). |
| 11. Grey-faced Tit Babbler <i>Macronous kellei</i> | Restricted-range species. Confirmed to occur 2001 (Tordoff <i>et al.</i> 2002). |
| Reptiles | |
| 12. Siamese Crocodile <i>Crocodylus siamensis</i> | Globally-threatened – Endangered. Unconfirmed reports from local fishermen (Le Trong Trai and Tran Hieu Minh 2000). |
| 13. Elongated Tortoise <i>Indotestudo elongata</i> | Globally-threatened – Endangered. Unconfirmed reports from local people (Tordoff <i>et al.</i> 2002). |
| 14. Wattle-necked Softshell Turtle <i>Palea steindachneri</i> | Globally-threatened – Endangered. Unconfirmed reports from local people (Le Trong Trai and Tran Hieu Minh 2000). |

D R A F T

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 15.Chinese Softshell Turtle <i>Pelodiscus sinensis</i> | Globally-threatened – Vulnerable. Unconfirmed reports from local people (Le Trong Trai and Tran Hieu Minh 2000). | |
| Key ecosystems | | |
| Seasonally-inundated grasslands and lake ecosystem | One of the last remaining examples of seasonally-inundated grasslands within forest in Vietnam. | |
| Lowland mosaic forest ecosystem (SEF and DDF) | One of the last remaining examples of forest on level lowlands in Vietnam. | |
| Section II. Direct threats to internationally-important elements of biodiversity identified in Section I. | | |
| Direct Threat | Description | 100% Reduction |
| Hunting and trapping | Mainly by local communities, both indigenous and in-migrants (mainly for subsistence use). | No hunting of controlled species within the boundaries of the park. |
| Illegal timber extraction | Small-scale extraction by local communities (for sale) and Cambodians from across the border (for subsistence use). | No illegal timber extraction within the boundaries of the park. |
| Conversion of seasonally-inundated grasslands to wet rice cultivation | Seasonally-inundated grasslands being converted into wet rice cultivation (one to two crops per year) by local communities (both Kinh and Khmer). | No loss of seasonally-inundated grasslands inside the park. |
| Over-exploitation of NTFPs | Mainly by local indigenous communities, to meet subsistence needs, but also for sale. NTFPs include rattan, resin, etc. | No unsustainable harvesting of NTFPs from within the park. |
| Conversion of forest land into agriculture | By some households (both indigenous and in-migrants) who are using forest lands inside the park for shifting cultivation of cassava, sugar cane, and rubber. | No further expansion of the area of shifting cultivation within the boundaries of the park. Complete conversion of all cash crop cultivation inside the national park into forest. |
| Forest fire | Mainly accidental fires associated with shifting cultivation, grazing, collecting of scrap iron, and hunting snakes and turtles. | No loss of forest due to fire within the park. |

D R A F T

Worksheet 2

| Direct Threat | Indirect Threat | Criteria Ranking | | | Total Ranking | Proposed Activities to Address Threats |
|---|---|------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--|
| | | Area | Intensity | Urgency | | |
| Hunting and trapping | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market needs/forces • Subsistence needs • Population increases | 6 | 4 | 6 | 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity-building for the park (training; equipment; infrastructure) • Improved coordination with other enforcement agencies (information transfers, strengthened coordination mechanisms, awareness-raising) • Alternative income generation (pilot sustainable livelihood initiatives) • Awareness-raising (for decision-makers, enforcement staff, and local communities) • Community co-management (strengthen Community Forest Protection Units, pilot community-based conservation incentives, joint community/FPD foot patrols) • Gun control programme |
| Illegal timber extraction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market and subsistence needs • Population increases | 4 | 2 | 5 | 11 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity-building for the park (training, equipment, infrastructure) • Improved coordination with other enforcement agencies (information transfers, strengthened coordination mechanisms, awareness-raising) • Encouraging villagers to plant diverse trees in the buffer zone to provide alternative sources of timber |
| Conversion of seasonally-inundated grasslands to wet rice cultivation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population increases • Lack of suitable land for irrigated rice by poor households | 2 | 5 | 4 | 11 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity-building for the park (training, equipment, infrastructure) • Improved coordination with other enforcement agencies (information transfers, strengthened coordination mechanisms, awareness-raising) • Awareness-raising (for decision-makers, enforcement staff, and local communities) • Community co-management (strengthen Community Forest Protection Units, pilot community-based conservation incentives, joint community/FPD foot patrols) • Establishment of a monitoring programme for wetland habitats and key species • Development of irrigation systems in the buffer zone • Family planning • Establishment of a credit fund programme for local communities to develop family economic plans |
| Over-exploitation of NTFPs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsistence needs (cash, needs) • Market needs | 5 | 3 | 3 | 11 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative income generation (pilot sustainable livelihood initiatives) • Awareness-raising (for decision-makers, enforcement staff, and local communities) • Research on sustainable NTFP harvesting levels |

D R A F T

| Direct Threat | Indirect Threat | Criteria Ranking | | | Total Ranking | Proposed Activities to Address Threats |
|--|--|------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--|
| | | Area | Intensity | Urgency | | |
| Conversion of forest land into agriculture | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population increases • Lack of land for wet rice cultivation • Lack of irrigation • Attitudes towards land ownership | 1 | 6 | 2 | 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative income generation (pilot sustainable livelihood initiatives) • Capacity-building for the park (training, equipment, infrastructure) • Improved coordination with other enforcement agencies (information transfers, strengthened coordination mechanisms, awareness-raising) • Awareness-raising (for decision-makers, enforcement staff, and local communities) • Community co-management (strengthen Community Forest Protection Units, pilot community-based conservation incentives, joint community/FPD foot patrols) • Development of irrigation systems in the buffer zone • Participatory boundary demarcation • Family planning • Establishment of a credit fund programme for local communities to develop family economic plans • Relocation of all households settled inside the boundary of the national park. |
| Forest fire | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shifting cultivation practices • Sugar cane planting in forest land • Hunting and grazing • Collecting of wasted iron | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity-building for the park (training, equipment, infrastructure) • Awareness-raising (for decision-makers, enforcement staff, and local communities) • Community co-management (strengthen Community Forest Protection Units, pilot community-based conservation incentives, joint community/FPD foot patrols) |

D R A F T

Worksheet 3

| Proposed Activities | Likelihood of Success | SUF Mandate | Existing Resources Available | Priority for VCF Support |
|--|---|--------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Alternative income generation (pilot sustainable livelihood initiatives) | Medium – activities may not have strong linkages with conservation, and may take time for benefits to be realised. | No | VND 326 million from the 135 Programme during 1999-2001. | Ineligible activity |
| Awareness-raising for decision-makers, enforcement staff, and local communities | High – support from decision-makers and other stakeholders essential to successful conservation in the national park. | Yes | Very small funds available from the WWF Small Grants Scheme for awareness-raising amongst provincial decision-makers and local communities. | High |
| Capacity-building for the national park | High | Yes | Very small funds available from the WWF Small Grants Scheme, for training for park staff in wetlands management and ecological monitoring. | High |
| Community co-management | High | Yes | None | High |
| Development of irrigation systems in the buffer zone | Medium – activities may not have a strong linkage with conservation. | No | VND 2.2 billion from the 135 Programme during 1999-2001. Funds from the forthcoming major irrigation project in the buffer zone as part of the MARD-ADB Phuoc Hoa Water Resources Project. | Ineligible activity |
| Encouraging villagers to plant diverse trees in the buffer zone to provide alternative sources of timber | Medium – linkages to conservation may not be strong, and it may take a long time before the planted trees provide an alternative to timber extracted from the forest. | Yes | None | Medium |
| Establishment of a credit fund programme for local communities to develop family economic plans | Medium – activities may not have strong linkages with conservation; and may take time for benefits to be realised. | No | None | Ineligible activity |
| Establishment of a monitoring programme for wetland habitats and key species | High | Yes | Very small funds available from the WWF Small Grants Scheme for training for park staff in ecological monitoring. | Medium-High |
| Family planning | Medium – there are economic incentives for large families, as well as cultural | No | Data not available. | Ineligible activity |

D R A F T

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----|---|---------------------|
| | resistance amongst local communities. | | | |
| Gun control programme (in coordination with local authorities) | High | No | None | High |
| Improved coordination with other enforcement agencies. | High | Yes | None | High |
| Introduction of new farming techniques | Medium – activities may not have a strong linkage with conservation. | No | VND 1.3 billion from the provincial budget during 1999-2001. | Ineligible activity |
| Participatory boundary demarcation. | High | Yes | VND 80 million from the provincial budget for 2001, with more funds expected for 2002. No funds available for village meetings. | High |
| Relocate all households settled inside the boundary of the national park. | High for the 12 households living inside the Strict Protection Area and trading illegally. Low potential for success for the 76 households near the boundary of the national park with farmland inside the Rehabilitation Area of the park. | Yes | Funding has already been requested from MARD to resettle the 12 households living inside the park. | Ineligible activity |
| Research on sustainable NTFP harvesting levels | High | Yes | No funding available for research. | Medium |