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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Biodiversity monitoring is an important part of protected area management, and is used to inform conservation action strategies and assess the effectiveness of conservation measures. Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary (KSWS) has a diverse and mature biodiversity monitoring program, with the assessment of key species population statuses forming a significant part of this programme. Here we report on the 2022 population survey, updating the previously published 10-year assessment covering 2010-2020 published previously. This update includes the distribution and population size of 13 key species within KSWS.

The population trends of four primate species are encouraging. Populations of black-shanked douc, Germain’s silvered langur, yellow-cheeked crested gibbon, and pig-tailed macaque have all remained stable over the past 12 years (Fig 1). Considering these species are thought to be in decline globally, maintaining stable populations in KSWS represents a significant conservation success.

Populations of long-tailed macaque, red muntjac, green peafowl, and wild pig have declined significantly in KSWS, with all four species experiencing population reductions of 40-85% since 2010 (Fig 1). Without urgent improvements in protection and conservation effort, these declines are likely to continue. In the 2020 assessment, populations of long-tailed macaque, green peafowl, and wild pig were considered healthy. In only two years, their population trends have worsened, highlighting the intensity and immediacy of the threats that wildlife faces in KSWS.

Populations of banteng, gaur, stump-tailed macaque, Eld’s deer, and sambar have completely collapsed in KSWS over the past 12 years (Fig 1). Their densities are now too low to be accurately monitored using line transect methods. Across Cambodia, these species have been lost from areas outside of protected areas for many decades. However even within KSWS, given current population trends and the intensity of threats, it is likely that these species have fallen below the population size threshold needed to support their persistence. Completely removing the drivers of decline may only stall the local extinction of these species within KSWS. However, pairing the removal of drivers with drastic ex-situ conservation work and reintroduction may still provide opportunity for recovery.

Rates of declines in KSWS are likely to be significantly slower than those outside of the protected area, illustrating KSWS’ success in mitigating certain threats. In addition, maintaining stable populations of four globally threatened primate species demonstrates the positive impact of KSWS’ management. Despite the near total loss of four ungulate and one primate species, urgent action has the potential to reverse declines in long-tailed macaque, red muntjac, green peafowl and wild pig. Interventions should focus on reducing the use of snares and hunting with dogs, tackling illegal forest clearance, decreasing wildlife trafficking and consumption, and stopping further granting of land concessions in KSWS to private companies. In some cases, ex-situ measures may be needed. Improving the capacity of law enforcement personal and KSWS’ managers will accelerate the progress of these interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English name</th>
<th>Global trend</th>
<th>IUCN status</th>
<th>KSWS trend</th>
<th>2022 estimate (Number of individuals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black-shanked douc</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Critically Endangered</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>20,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-cheeked crested gibbon</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germain’s silvered langur</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>4,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig-tailed macaque</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>2,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-tailed macaque</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Peafowl</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild pig</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Least Concern</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red muntjac</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Least Concern</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banteng</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaur</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stump-tailed macaque</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eld’s deer</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Decreasing*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambar</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Decreasing*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Population assessments and trends for key species in the REDD+ project area of KSWS from 2010-2022. Black lines show population trend, dotted lines show 95% trend confidence intervals. Grey dots show conventional distance sampling estimates and vertical lines show confidence intervals. In the bar charts blue bars represent conventional distance sampling individual annual estimates, adjoined black vertical lines present annual standard error estimates. Red bars show years where sufficient data was not collected to estimate population size.
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<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>តោកស្វោ</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ស៊ុក</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ស្រៀមសុំ</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ស្រៀម</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
<td>ប្រឹងស្រុង</td>
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Figure 2. Habitat type and location of survey transects in Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary. Inset displays the location of Keo Seima within Cambodia.
INTRODUCTION

Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary

Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary (KSWS) is a 292,690 ha protected area (PA) located in Mondulkiri and Kratie provinces of eastern Cambodia (WCS Cambodia, 2015). The PA forms part of the Eastern Plains Landscape protected area complex. KSWS is comprised of a mosaic of habitat types, producing a diverse ecosystem rich in contrasting habitats. In the east the Annamite Mountains, recognised as one of Asia’s great centres of endemism (Stattersfield et al, 1998), support rich evergreen and semi-evergreen forests. The west of KSWS is comprised of deciduous dipterocarp forest, thought to be one of the most threatened and least effectively protected forest types globally (Janzen, 1988; Hoekstra et al, 2004). Bamboo dominated forests are found in the south and pockets of semi-natural grassland constitute the northwest of the park (Mann, 2010).

With more than 1,000 species, KSWS holds the highest number of species recorded within any Cambodian PA (Griffin, 2019). This includes 85 globally threatened species (including 13 Critically Endangered and 27 Endangered); for many of these, the populations in KSWS are globally or regionally important (WCS Cambodia, 2015). Of particular importance are populations of Asian elephant and the diversity of carnivore, bird, primate, deer, and cattle species.

Accompanying the diversity of wildlife is a rich cultural heritage, with KSWS being the homeland of the Bunong indigenous ethnic group. The Bunong are mostly animists with strong cultural beliefs, who traditionally practise swidden agriculture and natural resource extraction (Pollard and Evans, 2009). Bunong remains the traditional spoken language though Khmer fluency is increasing, mirroring the in-migration of Khmer settlers seen throughout Mondulkiri (Pollard and Evans, 2009).

Key Species Monitoring

Recognising the importance of KSWS’s biodiversity and the threats it faces, regular line transect monitoring assessments were initiated in 2005, aiming to monitor the distribution and population of 13 key species (Griffin and Nuttall, 2020). Methodological changes were made in 2010, standardising and increasing the spatial extent of data collection. These methods are still used, with surveys occurring every two years. The strength of this continued monitoring lies in its potential to inform PA management, advise targeted conservation efforts and provide long-term species population trend data. It has become one of Asia’s longest running species population monitoring datasets.

In 2020, a 10-year assessment of key species population and distribution trends in 2010-2020 was completed, with the results detailed in Nuttall et al, 2021. The success of the KSWS in protecting arboreal species (those living in trees) was confirmed, with observation of stable population trends. However, populations of most terrestrial species (those living on the ground) declined, with snaring and hunting with dogs identified as the main drivers of declines. The 2022 survey comes at a critical time when the drivers of land use change and species population declines continue to intensify KSWS.
METHODS

Annual population size estimates

In KSWS 39 square transects, each 4km long, are positioned systematically throughout the REDD+ project area, providing an unbiased sample of KSWS’ habitats and species distributions (Fig 2). During assessment years, each transect is sampled eight times, using distance sampling methods to collect data when key species are observed. Data are used to model species-specific detection functions, representing the proportion of groups of individuals observed at increasing distances from the transect. Observational data and detection functions are then used to calculate species densities. To refine species density calculations covariates, such as habitat type or time of day are modelled to account for analogous variables. Multiplying species densities by the survey area extrapolates the values to provide density estimates of groups or individuals across the REDD+ project area. For species seen in groups, this value is then multiplied by the average group size to provide individual-level population estimates.

Population trends

Generalised additive models (GAMs) and bootstrapping are used to estimate smoothed population trend curves. The detailed methods used to produce species-specific population trends can be found in Nuttall et al. (2021) https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.614

Spatial distribution

Using survey effort adjusted species observations, species specific encounter rates are calculated. Encounter rates are interpolated across the REDD+ project area using Kernel density estimates (KDEs), to produce distribution heat maps. Encounter rates are assigned to each transect centroid, giving weight to the species distributions being plotted. Standardised kernel radius is calculated using the number of sampling points and the standard distance between them. Using the same methods, range contractions are calculated using 2010 and 2022 data subsets. Based on the equal interval binning method of encounter rates within the 2010 heat maps, 2022 encounter rates are scaled to fit these the 2010 bins, making the two periods comparable.
RESULTS

This 2022 assessment focuses on the current condition and population trends of key species in KSWS.

STABLE POPULATIONS

Cambodia is a challenging conservation landscape, with the drivers of land use change and the pressures of wildlife exploitation widespread throughout the country. KSWS is able to relieve some of these pressures, though wildlife populations within the PA boundary remain threatened. In this context, maintaining a stable population can be considered a conservation success.

Table 2. Summary of key species with stable populations in KSWS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English name</th>
<th>Khmer name</th>
<th>Cambodian Law</th>
<th>Global distribution</th>
<th>Importance of KSWS population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black-shanked douc</td>
<td>ស្វាយកាម្ោស</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-cheeked crested gibbon</td>
<td>នោច្ថ្ពារល់នលឿង</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germain’s silvered langur</td>
<td>ស្វាយម្ារ</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig-tailed macaque</td>
<td>ស្វាយន្ោស</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© Filip Agoo & Everland
© Allan Michaud
© Eleanor Briggs

© Jean Agood Everland
Population trend

The global population of black-shanked douc is thought to have decreased by more than 50% in the last 36 years (Duc et al, 2021). Within KSWS their populations have remained stable over the past 12 years. An estimated 20133 black-shanked douc individuals inhabit KSWS as of 2022, with their KSWS range thought to be the species’ stronghold holding the largest global population (Fig 3).

Distribution

Black-shanked douc range widely in KSWS within evergreen and semi-evergreen habitats. Within KSWS their highest density is around Andoung Kraloeng village (Fig 4).
YELLOW-CHEEKED CRESTED GIBBON (Nomascus gabriellae)

Population trend

Populations of southern yellow-cheeked crested gibbon are thought to be decreasing globally (Rawson et al, 2020). An estimated 1129 individuals occupy KSWS, with their populations remaining stable over the past 12 years. This stability makes the KSWS population particularly important as populations decline outside of this range. In addition this population is thought to be the largest globally (Fig 5).

Distribution

Southern yellow-cheeked crested gibbons range widely in KSWS, in evergreen and semi-evergreen habitats. Their highest densities are found around O’Khtung and Andoung Kraloeng villages (Fig 6).

Figure 5. Estimated number of yellow-cheeked crested gibbon individuals in KSWS’ REDD+ project area in 2010-2022. The black line represents the population trend, with dotted lines denoting 95% confidence intervals. Grey dots show conventional distance sampling estimates, with vertical lines representing estimate confidence intervals.

Figure 6. Distribution of southern yellow-cheeked crested gibbon within KSWS’ REDD+ project area in 2022.
GERMAIN’S SILVERED LANGUR (*Trachypithecus germaini*)

**Population trend**

The global population of Germain’s silvered langur is thought to have declined by 50% over the last 36 years (Duc et al, 2022), and KSWS represents an important site for this species. Within KSWS populations have fluctuated but remained **stable** over the past 12 years, with an estimated 4,095 individuals inhabiting KSWS in 2022 (*Fig 7*).

**Distribution**

Germain’s silvered langur have a restricted range in KSWS, with populations confined to the northern semi-evergreen forests around O’Khtung where they are found in very high densities. Individuals have been reported outside of these areas, however these scattered individuals are likely to be at low densities (*Fig 8*).

---

*Figure 7. Estimated number of Germain’s silvered langur individuals within KSWS’ REDD+ project area in 2010-2022. The black line represents the population trend, with dotted lines denoting 95% confidence intervals. Grey dots show conventional distance sampling estimates, with vertical lines representing estimate confidence intervals.*

*Figure 8. Distribution of Germain’s silvered langur within KSWS’ REDD+ project area*
**PIG TAILED MACAQUE** (*Macaca leonina*)

**Population trend**

Northern pig-tailed macaques are thought to have declined by over 30% globally in the last 36 years (Boonratana et al, 2022). The KSWS population has remained **stable** over the past 12 years. In 2022 an estimated 2,702 pig-tailed macaque individuals inhabit KSWS (Fig 9).

**Distribution**

Northern pig-tailed macaques range widely within KSWS’s evergreen and semi-evergreen habitats. Their highest densities are found near O’Khtung village (Fig 10).

*Fig 9. Estimated number of northern pig-tailed macaque individuals within KSWS’ REDD+ project area in 2010-2022. The black line represents population trend, with dotted lines denoting 95% confidence intervals. Grey dots show conventional distance sampling estimates, with vertical lines representing estimate confidence intervals.*

*Figure 10. Distribution of northern pig-tailed macaque within KSWS’ REDD+ project area in 2022.*
Declining populations

Although KSWS is able to reduce the impact of certain threats, for some species this mitigation is inadequate. These are the species to watch closely as management decisions are made.

Table 3. Summary of key species with declining populations in KSWS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English name</th>
<th>Khmer name</th>
<th>Cambodian Law</th>
<th>Global distribution</th>
<th>Importance of KSWS population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-tailed macaque</td>
<td>ស្វ វ ក្ត ា រ</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green peafowl</td>
<td>ហ្វ ួក</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red muntjac</td>
<td>ម្លូស</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild pig</td>
<td>ម្ជូកព្ម្ៃ</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Very wide</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© Everland
LONG-TAILED MACAQUE (*Macaca fasciularis*)

Population trend

Though wide ranging in southeast Asia, long-tailed macaque populations are thought to be slowly declining (Hansen et al, 2022). Their population in KSWS appeared stable in 2020, but the 2022 KSWS reassessment has clarified fluctuations and confirmed that the population is gradually declining. In 2022, the KSWS population consists of and estimated 1,344 individuals (Fig 11).

Distribution

Long-tailed macaques are habitat generalists, but in the south of KSWS sites around Sre Lvi and Kati represent important areas. O’Khtung also supports high densities (Fig 12).

![Figure 11. Estimated number of long-tailed macaque individuals within KSWS’ REDD+ project area from 2010-2022. The black line represents the population trend, with dotted lines denoting 95% confidence intervals. Grey dots show conventional distance sampling estimates, with vertical lines representing estimate confidence intervals.](image)

![Figure 12. Distribution of long-tailed macaque within KSWS’ REDD+ project area in 2022.](image)
GREEN PEAFOWL (*Pavo muticus*)

**Population trend**

The global population of green peafowl is thought to be 10,000-20,000 mature individuals, and decreasing (Birdlife International, 2018). The 2020 KSWS population assessment categorized green peafowl as increasing. However, the 2022 survey revealed that the sharp decline in population size after 2018 has continued. KSWS now contains an estimated 234 individuals, the lowest population size since the beginning of the key species population assessment in 2010 (Fig 13).

**Distribution**

Green peafowl favor dry deciduous dipterocarp and open forest types. In KSWS their distributions are patchy, with high densities around the Sre Pleng area, which contains one of KSWS’ largest trapaengs (Fig 14).

**Figure 13.** Estimated number of green peafowl individuals within KSWS’ REDD+ project area from 2010-2022. The black line represents the population trend, with dotted lines denoting 95% confidence intervals. Grey dots show conventional distance sampling estimates, with adjoined vertical lines representing estimate confidence intervals.

**Figure 14.** Distribution of green peafowl within KSWS’ REDD+ project area in 2022.
Range contraction

Significant populations were once found in the dry deciduous dipterocarp and semi-evergreen forests of the Sandal and Sre Chhouk areas. Now reduced densities are confined to the areas surrounding Sre Chhok and Sre Pleng (Fig 15).

Figure 15. Distribution of green peafowl in 2010 (top) and 2022 (bottom). Distributions in lower panel adjusted to match the scale used on the 2010 map to facilitate direct comparison.
NORTHERN RED MUNTJAC (*Muntiacus vaginalis*)

DOWN 80-86% in 12 years

Population trend

The global population of red muntjac is unknown but likely large, though it is thought to be declining across its range (Timmins et al, 2016). The consistent decline of red muntjac in KSWS since 2013 is continuing, with an estimated 535 individuals currently inhabiting KSWS (Fig 16).

Distribution

Red muntjac range widely at low densities in dry deciduous dipterocarp and open forest types in KSWS. Their highest densities are found in the areas surrounding Roka Thmei and Sre Ronyav (Fig 17).

*Figure 16. Estimated number of northern red muntjac individuals within KSWS’ REDD+ project area from 2010-2022. The black line represents the population trend, with dotted lines denoting 95% confidence intervals. Grey dots show conventional distance sampling estimates, with vertical lines representing estimate confidence intervals.*

*Figure 17. Distribution of red muntjac within KSWS’ REDD+ project area in 2022.*
Range contraction

Once widely distributed within dry deciduous dipterocarp and semi-evergreen forests, population declines have led to harsh range contractions, with the remaining largest distribution near O’Khtung area (Fig 18).

*Figure 18. Distribution of red muntjac in 2010 (top) and 2022 (bottom). Distributions in lower panel adjusted to match the scale used on the 2010 map to facilitate direct comparison.*
WILD PIG \textit{(Sus scrofa)}

Population trend

The global population of wild pig is unknown but likely large given its broad global range (Keuling and Leus, 2019). Wild pig populations naturally fluctuate, however the consistent decline seen since 2016 in KSWS is likely a response to increasing pressures on the population. An estimated 282 wild pig individuals inhabit KSWS in 2022 (Fig 19).

Distribution

The distribution of wild pigs in KSWS is now restricted. Remaining individuals are clustered around O’Am, Sre Andaol and O’Khtung (Fig 20).

Fig 19. Estimated number of wild pig individuals within KSWS’ REDD+ project area in 2010-2022. The black line represents the population trend, with dotted lines denoting 95% confidence intervals. Grey dots show conventional distance sampling estimates, with vertical lines representing estimate confidence intervals.

Figure 20. Distribution of wild pig within KSWS’ REDD+ project area in 2022.
Range contraction

The stronghold of the species is now restricted to southern KSWS, north of the O’Am area (Fig 21), although wild pig are likely to exist at very low densities outside of this range.

Figure 21. Distribution of wild pig in 2010 (top) and 2022 (bottom). Distributions in lower panel adjusted to match the scale used on the 2010 map to facilitate direct comparison.
NEAR LOCAL EXTINCTION

The population densities of the four species included in this section are very low; no detections were made during the 2022 survey, despite observers walking a total of 1,260km. This yields an encounter rate of less than 0.0008 individuals per kilometre. The size of such small populations cannot be reliably estimated, therefore it is difficult to apply the standardised metrics that have been used to estimate trends for other key species in KSWS. Without considerable conservation effort and expenditure, or in some cases ex-situ breeding programmes, these population crashes are likely to be irreversible.

Threats: Deforestation and degradation, Hunting for consumption, Snaring, Hunting with dogs.

Table 4. Summary of key species with stable populations in KSWS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English name</th>
<th>Khmer name</th>
<th>Cambodian Law</th>
<th>Global distribution</th>
<th>Importance of KSWS population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banteng</td>
<td>ទននោង</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaur</td>
<td>ខ្ទីង</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stump-tailed macaque</td>
<td>ស្វ វ អងគត្់</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eld’s deer</td>
<td>រមាំង</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambar deer</td>
<td>ស្មោះ</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Possibly regional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BANTENG (*Bos javanicus*)

Banteng were last formally sighted during transect observations in 2018. Focused camera trapping efforts have been made to confirm whether the species is still present in KSWS. Images containing two large males were taken in May 2022 (Fig 22). It is therefore likely that the species is present in greatly reduced population sizes (Fig 23).

![Bar chart showing annual population estimates of banteng in KSWS. Blue bars represent the number of individuals estimated by conventional distance sampling, and black vertical lines denote standard error estimates. Red bars show years in which sufficient amounts of data were not collected to estimate population size.](image)

*Figure 22. Annual population estimates of banteng in KSWS. Blue bars represent the number of individuals estimated by conventional distance sampling, and black vertical lines denote standard error estimates. Red bars show years in which sufficient amounts of data were not collected to estimate population size.*

![Camera trap images showing banteng in KSWS.](image)

*Figure 23. The most recent camera trap images taken of banteng in KSWS.*
GAUR (*Bos gaurus*)

Gaur were last formally sighted during transect observations in 2020. The most recent camera trap image was taken in April 2021, showing two females (Fig 24; Fig 25). Records of the species have not been made since this time and it is unclear whether the species remains present in KSWS.

![Figure 24. Annual population estimates of gaur in KSWS. Blue bars represent number of individuals estimated by conventional distance sampling, and black vertical lines denote standard error estimates. Red bars show years in which sufficient amounts of data were not collected to estimate population size.](image)

![Figure 25. The most recent camera trap image taken of gaur in KSWS. The left most image shows one individual clearly visible, with the other individual covered by vegetation in the back right of the image.](image)
STUMP-TAILED MACAQUE (*Macaca arctoides*)

Stump-tailed macaque were last formally observed during transect observations in 2020, but before this had not been observed since 2016. One group containing 27 individuals was sighted by the Biodiversity Monitoring Team during scheduled anti-snaring patrolling in May 2022. Below are images taken from that encounter. It is likely this species is still present but in greatly reduced population sizes (Fig 26; Fig 27).

![Graph showing population estimates](image)

*Figure 26. Annual population estimates of stump-tailed macaque in Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary. Blue bars represent conventional distance sampling individual annual estimates, adjoined black vertical lines present annual standard error estimates. Red bars show years where sufficient data was not collected to estimate population size.*

![Images of macaques](image)

*Figure 27. Images taken during the most recent sighting of Stump-tailed macaque by WCS Biodiversity Monitoring Team staff in Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary.*
**ELD’S DEER** *(Rucervus eldii)*

This elusive species has historically been present in low densities, but was reliably observed during transect sampling until 2018. The first camera trap images of Eld’s deer within KSWS were taken in May 2022 (Fig 28). Eld’s deer is likely present in very small populations. Annual population estimates are not available due to historically low populations.

![Figure 28. The most recent camera trap image taken of Eld’s deer in KSWS, showing two grazing females.](image)

**SAMBAR DEER** *(Rusa unicolor)*

Sambar deer was last formally sighted during transect observations in 2018. Camera trap images containing this species were last taken in July 2022 (Fig 29). It is likely that this species is still present in greatly reduced population sizes. Annual population estimates are not available due to historically small populations.

![Figure 29. The most recent camera trap image taken of Sambar deer in Keo Seima Wildlife sanctuary. This individual is a male.](image)
DISCUSSION

The broad trend identified by the 2020 assessment of arboreal species (those spending most of their time in trees) remaining stable or increasing while terrestrial species (those spending most of their time on the ground) decline has persisted into 2022. Contrasting the trends in 2020 to those of the 2022 survey, it is clear the drivers of population declines remain present. Trends of six species have been reclassified in 2022, with five population trends worsening and one improving compared to the 2010-2020 assessment.

Although KSWS is able to mitigate some threats the PA continues to experience significant pressure on its wildlife. Considering these circumstances, maintaining stable populations of a species, especially within the context of declining global populations, is a triumph of the KSWS. The black-shanked douc, southern yellow-cheeked crested gibbon, and northern pig-tailed macaque all have stable populations, demonstrating that KSWS forests can still support some healthy wildlife populations that are globally threatened. Furthermore, the population trend of the Germain’s silvered langur has improved, progressing from declining to stable, despite having a restricted range in KSWS.

For other species, the last two years have compounded population reductions. For the four declining species for which population size can still be evaluated (wild pig, northern red muntjac, long-tailed macaque and green peafowl), declines have been significant. The severity of range contractions in these species illustrates the consequences of these declines. Threats associated with spending significant time on the ground combined with pervasive threats that affect all species, such as land clearance and degradation from logging, have caused continued declines. It is concerning considering that species who that are not entirely restricted to dwelling on the ground, such as the long-tailed macaque and green peafowl are still declining.

Dog ownership and hunting remains widespread within the protected area. While concerted efforts have been made to curb snaring, it is still used as a way to protect farms and catch wildlife for consumption (Ibbett et al, 2020). The declines of red muntjac, long-tailed macaque and wild pig are alarming as these species are normally considered robust to hunting and habitat disturbances (O’Brien, Kinnaird and Wibisono, 2003; Keuling and Massei, 2021). With regards to wild pig, although the introduction of swine flu to southeast Asia has likely had an effect on wild pig populations in KSWS, its existence within wild populations in Cambodia has not been confirmed (Denstedt, 2021; FAO Animal Health, 2022). Nevertheless, anthropogenic pressures remain the principle reason for declines. With drastic action it is still possible to reverse the declines seen in wild pig, northern red muntjac, long-tailed macaque, and green peafowl populations.

It is likely that the population collapses of gaur, banteng, Eld’s deer, sambar, and stump-tailed macaque are irreversible. If management strategies were to immediately abolish pressures on their populations, these species would almost certainly still be lost from KSWS. With no action to address threats, their local extinction is imminent. The KSWS REDD+ project has no doubt extended the duration for which these species remained present within KSWS, but despite the resulting protection and available resources, threat levels have been too high.

Due to their important ecological roles, losing KSWS’s wild cattle, large deer, and stump-tailed macaque populations will both impact the structure and health of the forest, and trigger the local extinction of other species. This situation will worsen if the declines observed in other key species are allowed to continue. Losing wild cattle, large deer, and stump-tailed macaque would result in a KSWS of the biodiversity for which it is renowned. This would lead to a degraded landscape that
would be unlikely to recover and will eventually be unable to support the natural resources and ecosystem services on which many Cambodians rely on for their livelihoods.

**MITIGATING FURTHER DECLINES**

To tackle the rapid population declines revealed in this report, focus should be put on stopping:

- The use of snares and hunting with dogs and guns (Ibbett et al, 2020). Despite these activities being illegal, enforcement is rare. Focus should be shifted from reactive actions to understanding the underlying drivers pushing people to partake in these. This information should then be used to form proactive prevention strategies.

- Illegal forest clearance and species specific degradation logging. These activities reduce the quality and total availability of habitat.

- Commercial trafficking of wildlife for the pet trade and consumption. Professional networks drive the hunting of wildlife in KSWS for trade within Cambodia and on international black markets.

- The granting of tourism concessions, mining permits and infrastructure development projects without thorough, transparent environmental impact assessments and adequate damage mitigation strategies.

**Capacity should be built within:**

- Law enforcement strategy development. New strategies need to be trialled, such as situation crime approaches (Lemieux., 2020; Sosnowski et al., 2021), simple patrol-based law enforcement has thus far failed to prevent wildlife declines.

- Wildlife ranger force training. High standards of training must be maintained so rangers can act according to standard operating procedures and understand their responsibilities with respect to enforcing the law.

- Applied conservation knowledge within PDoE. A deeper understanding of KSWS’ ecosystem will allow managers to plan and implement more effective interventions within the PA.

- Communication and cross-borders action. The Eastern Plains Landscape is a contiguous landscape and lessons learned in KSWS apply across its extent. This pertains to both NGOs and governmental management.

**Applied projects to address population declines should be considered:**

- Captive breeding programmes may be required to halt the extinction of Eld’s deer within Cambodia. Their small population size makes natural recovery unlikely. Captive breeding should also be considered for banteng.

- Reforestation may be needed to restore areas of important habitat that have been cleared, such as the area around Sre Pleng trapeang.
ប្រភពបទ្នលមីសម្ព័នធមានការងារដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមានការសម្រមាន

• អនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមានការសម្រមានដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន
  (Ibbett et al., 2020) ក្នុងអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមានការសម្រមានដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន ឬអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមានការសម្រមានដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន ឬអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន

• ការកាប់បន្លុះប្តូរអំពីក្នុងការសម្រមានការសម្រមានដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន

• ការបណតុកសាងសម្រាភាពម្ស្តនតីឬកិចេចឬជាការសម្រមានការសម្រមានដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន

• ការបណតុកម្រិតឬកម្រិតជាការសម្រមានការសម្រមានដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន

• ការបណតុកម្រិតឬកម្រិតជាការសម្រមានការសម្រមានដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន

• សកម្មភាពទំនិញទំនិញមួយនៅក្នុងការសម្រមានការសម្រមានដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន

• សកម្មភាពទំនិញទំនិញមួយនៅក្នុងការសម្រមានការសម្រមានដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន

• សកម្មភាពទំនិញទំនិញមួយនៅក្នុងការសម្រមានការសម្រមានដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន

• សកម្មភាពទំនិញទំនិញមួយនៅក្នុងការសម្រមានការសម្រមានដ៏ធ្វើអំពីសន្ទនាពីក្នុងការអនុវត្តន៍ការសម្រមាន
កម្មវិធីបង្ហែរ់ពូជសរបីមានប្រយោជន៍លឿនដូចជាដំណាក់កាលពីការត្រូវបានពិចារេឲ្យផ្រត្រូវបានពិបាកកែុងការសាកលកែងវិញកែុងនត្ពធម្មជាតិ។

• ការសាកលកែងវិញកែុងងារប្រយោជន៍ប្រកបដោយកម្មវិធីបង្ហែរ់ពូជសរបី។

• ការសាកលកែងវិញកែុងគំរាម្កំចំនួនប្រយោជន៍រំបន់សំខាន់ជាងរំបន់ការប្រយោជន៍។

CONCLUSIONS

Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary is a unique site of very high biodiversity value. KSWS contains a diversity of habitat types that remain broadly intact, with the PA holding the highest number of species of any Cambodian protected area.

Key species population trends are perform better than would be expected if KSWS was not protected, evidenced by the success of maintaining populations of four globally threatened primate species. This demonstrates the positive impact of KSWS in preserving the area’s rich wildlife and the broader landscape’s ecosystems. Despite this inherent value, KSWS has reached a critical moment.

The intensity of the threats to Cambodia’s biodiversity and natural resources are severe, and even with the significant protection efforts brought by KSWS these threats continue to cause biodiversity and forest loss. Wild cattle, large deer, and the stump-tailed macaque are displaying such severe declines that their disappearance from KSWS is almost inevitable.

Although the last two years have compounded threats, urgent action at both national and local levels could reverse the declines seen in wild pig, long-tailed macaque, red muntjac, and green peafowl. Without this action, KSWS will become empty of medium and large sized mammals. This would severely degrade KSWS’ ecosystems, accelerating further biodiversity loss and creating a landscape that lacks the variety KSWS is known for. Not only would Cambodia’s natural heritage be lost, the natural resources upon which many Cambodians rely on for their livelihood, recreation, culture and religion would be destroyed.
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