CONSERVATION OF THE IRRAWADDY DOLPHIN, ORCAELLA BREVIROSTRIS (OWEN IN GRAY, 1866) IN THE MEKONG RIVER: BIOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS INFLUENCING MANAGEMENT

Thesis submitted by

Isabel L. Beasley

B.Sc., Dip.WlM (Otago University, New Zealand)

April 2007

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Earth and Environmental Sciences

James Cook University

Townsville, Australia

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of:

Dr. Peter William Arnold

(14 May 1949 – 07 March 2006)

A treasured friend, colleague and mentor, whom I miss dearly



STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, author of this work, understand that James Cook University will make this thesis available for use within the University Library and, via the Australian Digital These network, for use elsewhere. All users consulting this thesis will have to sign the following statement:

"In consulting this thesis I agree not to copy or closely paraphrase it in whole or in part without consent of the author and to make proper written acknowledgement for any assistance for which I have obtained from it".

I understand that, as an unpublished work, a thesis has significant protection under the copyright Act and I do not wish to place any further restriction on access to this work.

Signature		Date	
	Isabel L. Beasley		

STATEMENT OF SOURCES DECLARATION

I declare that the	is thesis is my own worl	k and has not bee	n submitted in any form	n for another
degree or diplo	ma at any university or	other institution	of tertiary education.	Information
derived from th	e published or unpublish	ed work of others	s has been acknowledge	ed in the text
and a list of refe	rences is given.			
Signature		Date		
	Isabel L. Beasley			

ELECTRONIC COPY

I, the undersign	ned, the author	of this work,	declare	that the	electronic	copy of	this thesis
provided to the.	James Cook Uni	versity Library	is an acc	curate co	py of the pr	rint thesis	submitted,
within the limits	of technology a	vailable.					
Signature			Date				
	Isabel L. Beasle	y					

STATEMENT ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF OTHERS

Project support: British Embassy, Phnom Penh

Australian Agency for International Development (AUSAID) New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID)

Mekong River Commission (MRC)

Rufford Foundation Small Grants Programme, UK

Hong Kong Ocean Park Conservation Foundation, Hong Kong

IUCN Mekong Wetlands Biodiversity Project Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, UK

Society for Marine Mammalogy, USA James Cook University, Australia

Wildlife Conservation Society, Research Fellowship Program

Stipend: James Cook University Postgraduate Scholarship

Supervision: Professor Helene Marsh

Dr Peter Arnold

Dr Thomas Jefferson

Additional support:

Statistics: Dr Guido Parra (capture-recapture)

Dr James Molony (multivariate analyses)

Erin LaBrecque (GIS analyses) Matti Kummu (GIS analyses)

Rural Development: Brendan Boucher

Cambodian Rural Development Team

Editorial assistance: June Bode (entire thesis)

Suzanne Yin (entire thesis)

Dr Guido Parra (Chapters 2, 5, 6, 8) Dr Jay Barlow (Chapters 5 and 6) Dr Susan Chivers (Chapter 9)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I began my PhD candidature in East Malaysia in 1999 and have spent the past seven years of my life working towards its completion. As a result of this experience, I have had the opportunity to travel around the world twice over, live and experience life in Asia (particularly rural Cambodia), discover a new dolphin species, and meet a great deal of people from a variety of backgrounds – many of whom are now my dearest friends. Importantly, I have had the unique opportunity to research a remarkable river dolphin population, interact with local communities involved with conservation efforts, and observe first-hand the great difficulties faced in trying to conserve an endangered species. I could not have completed my thesis without the much appreciated support and assistance of the various people and organisations below.

First and foremost, I am forever thankful for the unconditional support and encouragement that I have always received from my family: **Mum, Dad, my wonderful brothers Chris, Gareth and Dyson, and grandparents**. No matter what choices I made, or where I wanted to go, you always stood by my decisions and helped me to make things happen. I could not ask for a more loving and supportive family. Thanks Nana and Grandad for putting up with me living in your house after my motor-bike accident (even though I was an absolute brat to be around) and Mum and Dad for not trying to stop me hobbling on my crutches back to Cambodia.

To my supervisors, **Helene Marsh**, **Tom Jefferson** and the late **Peter Arnold**, I owe my deepest thanks and gratitude. I am extremely grateful for the endless support you have given me over the years. I am very privileged to have what I consider the best team of supervisors that a student could have ever asked for.

I can never thank you enough **Tom**, for giving me my first marine mammal job in Hong Kong and being a constant source of support, never-ending enthusiasm and knowledge. If not for your quirky interest in measuring dolphin skulls (which I became interested in trying myself), I would never have been involved in the discovery of the Australian snubfin dolphin. Thanks very much for teaching me the value of cooperation, multidisciplinary project activities, local involvement, and the importance of cetacean conservation in Asia.

Helene, you are such a remarkable woman and inspirational mentor, I am extremely privileged to have been one of your students. When many other supervisors would have given up on me with my constant diversions and side-trips, you were always extremely supportive of my

decisions and ready to provide the best advice possible when needed. I am truly grateful for your guidance, wisdom and constant encouragement – without which I would never have finished this thesis.

Words cannot express how thankful I am to have had the opportunity to know **Peter** - such a wonderful man of quiet humility, patience, incredible intelligence and never-ending support and encouragement. Peter spent many hours discussing *Orcaella* ecology, conservation and various Cambodian issues with me: providing me with a strong sounding post when I needed advice, and quickly getting me back on track if my enthusiasm ever wavered. Discovering the Australian snubfin dolphin with Peter (and Kelly Robertson) will remain one of the great highlights of my life, not just because of the discovery itself but because of the opportunity I had to get to know Peter as a colleague and friend throughout the process. Peter, you were taken far too soon and I miss you terribly but I will never forget your words of advice.

My very special thanks to **Brendan Boucher:** a wonderful friend and colleague who helped me immensely to get the Dolphins for Development project up and running. My deepest gratitude to you for always supporting me and my work wholeheartedly, and quite literally changing my life for the better.

During my time in Cambodia I worked with some exceptional Cambodians, whom I am very proud to call my friends and colleagues. My deepest thanks to **Yim Saksang** and **Lor Kim San** who started the project with me in 2001, and continued on the project until I left Cambodia five years later. Without their assistance, support, and enthusiasm, I would never have achieved the extent of activities outlined in my thesis. Additionally, I would especially thank the Cambodian Rural Development Team (CRDT) team members, particularly **Or Channy**, **Sun Mao**, **Hang Vong** and **Hean Pheap**. CRDT's dedication and professionalism throughout all aspects of the Dolphins for Development project were integral to its success, and could not have been achieved by any other group in Cambodia. Saksang, San and the CRDT team members are shining examples of hard-working, honest Cambodian nationals, who are proud of their country and are willing to work long hours in harsh conditions to conserve Cambodia's natural resources and assist poor rural communities.

My deepest thanks to the **Pann Family** (Stung Treng Province) for being my second family while I was in Cambodia. Thanks for allowing my team to stay in your home during surveys in Stung Treng Province, and for your unconditional kindness and friendship. I will always cherish the volleyball games, amazing dinners and rice-wine evenings.

My sincere thanks to the various funding agencies for providing the financial assistance that ensured that I was able to complete my fieldwork:

- Mekong River Commission Environment Program (in particular, thanks to Hans Guttman and Ian Campbell for their interest and support of the project and conservation activities)
- Ocean Park Conservation Foundation (in particular, thanks to Heidi Chan, Jessica Wong, Susan Gendron, Timothy Ng and Jonathon Fong)
- British Embassy, Phnom Penh (in particular Stephen Bridges and Meas Sopheareak)
- **Rufford Foundation Small Grants Programme** (in particular Josh Cole)
- Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society (in particular, Alison Smith and Vanessa Williams)
- Society for Marine Mammalogy
- IUCN Mekong Wetlands Biodiversity Project (in particular Alvin Lopez and Peter-John Meynell)
- Wildlife Conservation Society Research Fellowship Program
- School of Tropical Environment Studies and Geography, James Cook University
- **Aruna Technologies** (in particular Jeffrey Himel).

I would like to express my utmost thanks to the Cambodian Ministry of Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) and the Cambodian Department of Fisheries, for their full support of all dolphin activities throughout the duration of my project in Cambodia. This support and assistance was greatly appreciated, and assisted significantly to initiate conservation and management efforts.

My sincerest thanks to: **Excellency Chan Sarun** (Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries), **Excellency Nao Thuok** (Director General, Department of Fisheries, Cambodia), **Mr Ing Try** (Deputy Director, Department of Fisheries) and **Mr Srun Lim Srong** (Director of the Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute) for their full support of this project. Thanks also to **Mr Sam Kim Lun** (Chief of Kratie Fisheries Office) and **Mr Mao Chan Samon** (Chief Stung Treng Fisheries office) for their assistance and support during surveys in Kratie and Stung Treng Province. Thanks also to all the Department of Fisheries counterparts for their efforts in the project, which has ensured its continued success.

Thanks in particular to **Mr Kim Sokha** and **Mr Phay Somany** (my full time counterparts from the Cambodian Department of Fisheries) for their hard work in the field, and assistance at various stages of my project in liaising with the Department of Fisheries and relevant

government agencies. Thanks also to **Mr Sean Kin** (Kratie Fisheries Office), who provided a wealth of information about the dolphins and the river.

Many thanks to **Excellency Touch Seang Tana**, for his advice and assistance during the all stages of my project. Thanks also to **Frank Ludwig** (Monsoon Tours) and **Seung Kimyonn** (Cambodian Craft Corporation), for their assistance with tourism activities at Kampi Pool. Thanks to **Zeb Hogan** for being a good friend in Cambodia and contributing his knowledge on ecology and conservation of migratory catfish, and **Ian Baird** for his valuable contribution to research on Irrawaddy dolphins on the Lao/Cambodian border and support of my project. My deepest gratitude and thanks to all **local villagers** throughout the lower Mekong River (particularly Kratie and Stung Treng Provinces in Cambodia) for their generous hospitality, assistance with reporting and recovering numerous carcasses, and sharing their knowledge about the area and the dolphins of the Mekong River.

Many thanks to all the people that assisted with field surveys in Cambodia: Pich Sery Wat, Seng Lieng, Kim Voet, Tan What, Te Ki Bun, Mr Bun (our guide), Lor Kim On, Khai Sy Rambo, Seng Leng, Sok Hom, Tum Nyro, Khosa Vern, Amitav Gosh, Helene Marsh, Gill Braulik, Albert Reichert, Peter-John Meynell, Kaiya Eicher and Matti Kummu.

Many thanks also to the Vietnamese Department of Fisheries and Cantho University for supporting research in Vietnam. Thanks in particular to Le Xuan Sinh, Ha Phuoc Hung and Huynh Van Hien from Cantho University, our boat driver Nguyen Khac Quang, and the following officials from the Vietnamese Department of Fisheries who assisted on the surveys: Mai Ba Truong Son (Cantho City), Doan Hau Giang (An Giang Province), Nguyen Hoay Huy (An Giang Province), Pham Minh Chi (Dong Thap Province), Nguyen Van Thanh (Dong Thap Province), Nguyen Van Phieu (Vinh Long Province), Truong Phi Hung (Vinh Long Province), Nguyen Thua Thinh (Tra Vinh Province), Tran Quang Nghi (Soc Trang Province) and Nguyen Van Tam (Peoples Committee Council).

I have been very fortunate to meet many incredible people over the course of my PhD. A very special thanks to all my friends throughout the world that I have met along the way, who have given me so much support and encouragement. In Hong Kong: Gill Braulik, Heidi Chan, the late Chris Claire, Samuel Hung, Reimi Kinoshita, Mientje Tory, Theresa Webb, and Irene Wong. In Thailand, my deepest thanks to my dear friend Nitikorn Piwpong. Nitikorn is a shining example of the enthusiasm, passion and dedication that a single person can bring to dolphin conservation in Asia In Cambodia, many thanks to the wonderful friends who were always there for support and encouragement. Thanks to: Tom Clements, Nick and Stephanie

Cox, Pete Davidson, Etienne Delattre, Laura and Tom Evans, Kao Kok, Dan Levitt, Charlotte MacAlister, Allan Michaud, and wonderful Thy Sothoun. My sincere thanks goes to Matti Kummu who helped me at a moments notice with many maps throughout my thesis. Thanks also to Srey Mom for taking such great take of my beloved dogs, Mange and Klar when I was away in the field and overseas. A very big thanks to my other colleagues in Asia who always inspired me to continue with conservation work in Asia, in particular Ellen Hines, Danielle Kreb and Brian Smith. I am extremely fortunate to have wonderful and supportive friends in Townsville. Thanks to my great mates for their constant support and many, many good nights out: Ally and Roger Beeden, Amanda Hodgson, William Hyams, Kathryn Larsen, Vimoksalehi Lukoschek, James Molony, Guido Parra, Heidi Schuttenberg, James Sheppard, Aaron Shorthouse, Dipani Sutaria, and Stephen Sutton. A huge thanks in particular to Amanda for helping me with the Vietnmese surveys. I am sure neither of us will forget them.

Many thanks to **Randy Reeves**, who was always there to provide support, assistance and sound advice, and references for my many funding applications. I would also like to sincerely thank all of the folks at the Southwest Fisheries Science Centre, La Jolla, USA, who provided me with support, encouragement and assistance since my thesis began. Thanks particularly to Lisa Ballance, Jay Barlow, Susan Chivers, Tim Gerodette, Bob Pitman, Bill Perrin, Kelly Robertson and Barb Taylor. To the very intriguing bunch of characters that I sailed with on the various ETP and HICEAS cruises: Dawn Breese, Jim Cotton, Annie Douglas, Erin LaBreaque, Michael Force, Laura Morse, Richard Rowlett, Ernesto Vacquez, Sophie Webb and Yin, thanks for such memorable times! I feel very fortunate to have been a part of these cruises and the memories are ones that I will never forget (although some I certainly will try to). My deepest thanks to Laura Morse (aka. my guardian angel) for being such a wonderful friend, helping me with fieldwork in Cambodia when I needed it the most, and being so supportive of my project. Also, a huge thanks to Yin, for taking the time to read through my entire thesis, when she could have instead been increasing her movie list, and Erin LaBreaque for helping me with the ranging pattern analysis, when she was already busy applying for grad school.

Thanks to the great staff in TESAG for all the assistance I received while back in Townsville: the computer guru's **Clive Grant** and **Rob Scott**, **Jodie Kreugar** for organising equipment and courses, **Adella Edwards** for much appreciated assistance with various maps and figures for publicatons, and **Beth Moore** and the essential **secretaries** for all financial and administration matters.

Lastly, I would like to thank **Wildlife Conservation Society – Cambodia Program**, for providing me with desk space and internet access during 2001-2003, and assistance with financial book-keeping from 2002-2004. Thanks to **Colin Poole** (previous WCS-Cambodia Country Director) and **Joe Walston** (current WCS-Cambodia Country Director).

My acknowledgements would not be complete without a special thanks to the **dolphins of the Mekong River**. I feel privileged to have been able to research and contribute to conservation of this *Critically Endangered* dolphin population. I have spent many hundreds of hours photographing individuals such as Klasico, Rags, Vern, Chiteal, and Phnom and I sincerely hope that future generations of Irrawaddy dolphins will continue to survive in the Mekong River for many years to come. Despite the precarious situation facing the Mekong dolphin population, I do hold significant hope for their long-term survival in the river that results from my admiration of the very dedicated local staff that I have worked with, particularly Saksang, San and CRDT members, as well as the support and eagerness of local rural communities residing along the river to support conservation efforts.

Many thanks to all of the above people and organisations – and to those that I have forgotten I am truly sorry. I could never have completed my PhD without the support, encouragement and friendship from you all.

PUBLICATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS THESIS

The following peer reviewed journal articles have been published during my candidature:

- **Beasley, I.L**. K. Robertson, P. Arnold. 2005. Description of a new dolphin, the Australian Snubfin dolphin *Orcaella heinsohni* sp. N. (Cetacea, Delphinidae). Marine Mammal Science 21(3): 365-400.
- Baird, I.G. and **I.L. Beasley**. 2005. Irrawaddy dolphin *Orcaella brevirostris* in the Cambodian Mekong River: an initial survey. Oryx 39(3): 301-310.
- Smith, B.D., I.L. Beasley, Buccat, M., Calderon, V., Evina, R., Lemmuel de Valle, J., Cadigal, A., Tura, E., and Z. Visitacion. 2004. Status, ecology and conservation of Irrawaddy dolphins *Orcaella brevirostris* in Malampaya Sound, Palawan. Journal of Cetacean Conservation and Management 6(1): 41-52.
- Smith, B.D., **I.L. Beasley**, and D. Kreb. 2003. Marked declines in populations of Irrawaddy dolphins. Oryx. 37(4): 401.
- **Beasley, I.** L, P. Arnold, and G.E. Heinsohn. 2002. Geographical variation of the Irrawaddy dolphin, *Orcaella brevirostris* (Owen in Gray 1866). Raffles Museum Bulletin–Supplement No 10. P 3-14.
- **Beasley, I.L.** and T.A. Jefferson. 2002. Surface and dive time behaviour of Finless Porpoise in Hong Kong waters. The Raffles Museum Bulletin-Supplement No 10. 116-124.
- **Beasley, I.L**. S. Chooruk, and N. Piwpong. 2002. The status of the Irrawaddy dolphin, *Orcaella brevirostris*, in Songkhla Lake, southern Thailand. The Raffles Museum Bulletin – Supplement No 10. 68-74.
- **Beasley, I.L.**, and T.A. Jefferson. 1997. Marine Mammals of Borneo: A Preliminary Checklist. Sarawak Museum Journal Vol. L1, No. 72. Pp 193-216.

Information from this thesis has resulted in the following management strategy being adopted as national policy in Cambodia (January 2005):

Cambodian Department of Fisheries, 2005. Mekong Dolphin Conservation and Management Strategy: 2001-2008 (Appendix V).

Information from, and obtained as part of, this thesis has resulted in the following World Conservation Union (IUCN) Red List Designations:

- Smith, B.D. and **I.L. Beasley**. 2004. *Orcaella brevirostris* (Mekong River Subpopulation). In: IUCN 2004. 2004 Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org. Downloaded on 20 December 2004.
- Smith, B.D. and **I.L. Beasley**. 2004. *Orcaella brevirostris* (Songkhla Lake Subpopulation). In: IUCN 2004. 2004 Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org. Downloaded on 20 December 2004.
- Smith, B.D. and **I.L. Beasley**. 2004. *Orcaella brevirostris* (Malampaya Sound Subpopulation). In: IUCN 2004. 2004 Red List of Threatened Species. <u>www.redlist.org</u>. Downloaded on 20 December 2004.

POPULAR ARTICLES ASSOCIATED WITH THIS THESIS

The following popular articles have been published during my candidature:

- **Beasley, I.L.** and Arnold, P. 2006. New dolphin species surfaces in Australia. Australasian Science. 27 (7): 36-38.
- **Beasley, I.L**. 2005. Charting Cambodia's Coastal Cetaceans. Asian Geographic Magazine. Issue 5. pp. 28-39.
- **Beasley, I.L**. 2005. Population at Peril: The Mekong's Irrawaddy River Dolphins. Tropical Homes Magazine. 2(2): 108-111.
- Holiday, G. and **I.L. Beasley.** 2004. Death on the Mekong. CNN Traveler Magazine. Nov-Dec. pp. 77-80.
- Beasley, I.L. 2002. Trapped High and Try. Wildlife Conservation (June-July)
- **Beasley, I.L**. 2001. Irrawaddy dolphins of Songkhla Lake. Sonar. Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society. UK.
- **Beasley, I.L**. 2001. *The* Irrawaddy Dolphins of the Mekong River. Catch and Culture Magazine, Mekong River Commission, Cambodia.

INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION AWARDS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS THESIS

While undertaking this thesis, I obtained the following international conservation awards:

2005: William T. Hornaday Conservation Award. American Society of Mammaologists

2005: Stephen Leatherwood Award, Society for Marine Mammalogy

NEW SPECIES DESCRIBED

ASSOCIATED WITH THIS THESIS

While undertaking this thesis, I contributed to the discovery of a new dolphin species:

The Australian Snubfin dolphin, Orcaella heinsohni

Beasley, I.L. K. Robertson, P. Arnold. 2005. Description of a new dolphin, the Australian Snubfin dolphin *Orcaella heinsohni* sp. N. (Cetacea, Delphinidae). Marine Mammal Science 21(3): 365-400.

ABSTRACT

The goal of my study was to contribute to the effective conservation of the Irrawaddy dolphin population that inhabits the lower Mekong River. To achieve my goal, I developed objectives based on a conceptual framework of conservation principles and strategies that guide management of endangered species. The results of my study provide significant new information relevant to the taxonomic status of Orcaella and ecology and conservation of the Irrawaddy dolphin population inhabiting the Mekong River, with broader application to other freshwater dolphin populations.

Previously, the genus *Orcaella* was considered to consist of only one species, the Irrawaddy dolphin (*Orcaella brevirostris*). However, two colleagues and I discovered that what were previously considered Irrawaddy dolphins occurring in Australian/Papua New Guinean waters are instead a separate species, which we named the Australian snubfin dolphin (*Orcaella heinsohni*).

Freshwater Irrawaddy dolphin populations and their habitats are highly susceptible to anthropogenic threats. As a result of small population sizes, strict habitat preferences, apparent high site fidelity, slow maturation rate, long calving intervals and most importantly, their close proximity to human activities in freshwater ecosystems, Irrawaddy dolphins are highly susceptible to anthropogenic impacts. Most freshwater populations of Irrawaddy dolphins are small and declining; nevertheless, there has been a notable lack of on-the-ground conservation measures to conserve these populations. Flora and fauna along the river, as well as local subsistence communities, are facing threats similar to those faced by freshwater Irrawaddy dolphins. Irrawaddy dolphins should therefore be considered an effective flagship species for freshwater biodiversity conservation.

My study area encompassed the lower Mekong River of southern Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam and focused on the population of freshwater Irrawaddy dolphins that inhabit this river system. The natural environment of the lower Mekong River had previously been shielded from major development by war and political upheaval. However, all the lower Mekong countries are now developing quickly, and are experiencing significant human population growth. Based on conservation lessons learned from other countries, community involvement in habitat and species conservation is imperative for conservation efforts to be successful. Preservation of habitat is essential, not only to the conservation of endangered species, but also to the survival

of subsistence rural human communities, and other flora and fauna that rely on the river ecosystem.

I conducted 497 interviews with local villagers throughout the lower Mekong River to investigate local perceptions and knowledge relevant to dolphin conservation. Information from these interviews suggests a major decline in dolphin occurrence and abundance throughout most of the river. Reports affirm that dolphins previously occurred regularly south of Kratie Township to the Vietnamese Delta, but they are now virtually never sighted there. Interviewees identified the Kratie to Khone Falls river segment as the most important habitat remaining for dolphins in the lower Mekong River. Local communities hold very positive attitudes towards Irrawaddy dolphins. These attitudes significantly assist with securing local cooperation for management strategies. My study confirms that interviews with local people can provide detailed information about changes in species' distribution and abundance over time, as well as about local perceptions towards riverine flora and fauna. Such information may take scientists many decades to obtain.

The absolute abundance of Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River was estimated using capture-recapture analysis of photo-identified individuals, line-transect, and direct count methodologies. I compared these three survey methodologies to ascertain the most appropriate survey technique for accurate and precise long-term monitoring. Ninety-nine dolphins were individually identified during my study period, with 83% of the population estimated to be photographically-identifiable. A closed population model was used for capture-recapture analysis. I estimated that a minimum of 127 dolphins (range: 108-146), inhabited the Mekong River, as of April 2005. With the highest level of precision obtained from capture-recapture abundance estimates (CV=0.07), I estimated that with a CV of 0.07, it would take six years to detect a 5% per annum decline, and only two years to detect a 20% per annum decline.

A total of 13,200 km of boat surveys were undertaken throughout the lower Mekong River to provide estimates of abundance to compare with capture-recapture estimates. Dolphins were sighted only in the Kratie to Khone Falls river section – no dolphins were sighted south of Kratie Township. The largest number of dolphins sighted during upriver direct count surveys was 68 (range: 54-88), in May 2001. The largest number of dolphins sighted during downriver pool counts was 69 (range: 57-84), in May 2003. Direct counts were deemed an imprecise and inaccurate survey method, and not recommended for future monitoring purposes. Line-transect analyses estimated 161 dolphins (range: 89-289) inhabited the Mekong River, as of April 2005. Based on a combination of photo-identification and line-transect methodologies, I estimated that the total Irrawaddy dolphin population in the Mekong River was between 127–161 individuals

(range: 89-289), as of April 2005. Comparisons of survey techniques indicate photoidentification is the preferred methodology for population monitoring because of its efficiency and precision. Irrespective of the differences between survey methodologies, the total number of Irrawaddy dolphins inhabiting the Mekong River is very small and the population is now facing a very uncertain future.

Individual Irrawaddy dolphins exhibit extremely high site fidelity. By analysing ranging patterns for the 15 most frequently sighted photo-identified individuals, I estimated a mean area ranged of only 16.0 km^2 in the dry season (range = $0.7-73.0 \text{ km}^2$) and 42.0 km^2 in the wetseason (range $0.9-99.0 \text{ km}^2$).

Average group sizes during the dry and wet seasons were 6.8 dolphins \pm s.e. 0.20 (range=1-19, n=405) and 5.7 dolphins \pm s.e. 0.41 (range=1-34, n=107), respectively. School dynamics and social structure were investigated using photo-identified individuals. Analysis of association patterns revealed that individuals were seen with a particular companion significantly more often than would be expected by chance. The relationship between the lagged association rates and time lag suggests a 'constant companions model' *i.e.*, the population is highly structured with the majority of individuals having preferred, long-term associates. Association analyses indicated four, somewhat discrete, sub-populations. From a management standpoint, my research suggests that it is critical that conservation efforts are now focused on the four sub-populations and associated critical habitats.

My study provides the first reliable estimates of mortality rates for the Irrawaddy dolphin population in the Mekong River and potential causes for these mortalities. Fifty-four dolphin carcasses were recovered and/or confirmed between January 2001 and April 2005. Forty-three percent of all carcasses recovered were newborns and only two newborns were known to have survived longer than six months. The cause of the high number of newborn deaths is unknown. Entanglement in gillnets and direct deaths through destructive fishing practices (e.g., dynamite fishing) are known causes of anthropogenic mortality. Other potential indirect causes of dolphin mortality include: contaminants, boat harassment and noise, boat collision, reduced fish stocks, and inbreeding depression. The Irrawaddy dolphin population appears to be declining at a yearly rate of at least 4.8%. The most conservative allowable Potential Biological Removal (PBR) from anthropogenic mortality is less than one individual/year. Anthropogenic mortality must therefore be reduced to zero as a primary management goal, if the population has any chance of survival in the river.

I initiated an integrated conservation development project named Dolphins for Development, which aimed to provide tangible benefits to the community in exchange for their cooperation with conservation efforts. Project components included: (1) rural development and diversification of livelihoods; (2) community-based ecotourism; (3) education and awareness raising; and (4) strengthening stakeholder relationships. Various project limitations were encountered, nevertheless, observable measures of success were evident. To conserve endangered species in developing countries, some incentive must be provided to local communities. 'Community-conscious conservation' is a term that I developed to describe multidisciplinary, on-the-ground conservation programs that work towards involving communities with conservation of endangered species and habitats. Further efforts are also required to integrate local conservation efforts with regional and national conservation priorities and decision-making.

Based on the preliminary results obtained (*i.e.*, before comprehensive analyses of most data), I developed a conservation and management strategy for the Irrawaddy dolphin population in the Mekong River, which was adopted as national policy in Cambodia in January 2005. The five management goals of this strategy are to: (1) reduce threats and mortality rates; (2) increase local education and awareness; (3) effectively manage dolphin-watching tourism; (4) continue research and monitoring; and (5) clarify regional and national management responsibilities. Based on a comprehensive analysis of my data and acknowledgement of biological and social considerations affecting conservation, I developed recommendations built on my original MDCP strategy. These recommendations acknowledge that the Irrawaddy dolphin population that inhabits the Mekong River is very small, declining, and is in urgent need of effective management. The recommendations identify the high priority activities urgently required to contribute towards the dolphins' immediate and long-term conservation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1-2
1.1. THE IRRAWADDY DOLPHIN	1-2
1.2. STUDY AREA	
1.3. ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION	
1.4. THE IMPORTANCE OF BIOLOGICAL STUDIES IN SPECIES CONSERVATION	
1.5. THE IMPORTANCE OF COMBINING BIOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL STUDIES	
1.5.1. Stakeholder Involvement	
1.5.2. Political Considerations	
1.6. MOUNTAIN GORILLA CONSERVATION – AN 'ON-THE-GROUND' EXAMPLE	
1.7. BAIJI CONSERVATION – AN EXAMPLE OF UNSUCCESSFUL CONSERVATION	
1.8. EFFECTIVE PLANNING FOR ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION	
1.8.1. Principles of Conservation Management	1-13
1.8.2. Conservation Process	
1.9. GOALS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF MY RESEARCH	1-19
1.10. THESIS FRAMEWORK AND OUTLINE	1-20
1.10.1. Conceptual Framework	1-20
1.10.2. Thesis Outline	1-21
2. FRESHWATER DOLPHIN POPULATIONS AT RISK: IRRAWADDY DOLPHINS (ORCAELLA BREVIROSTRIS) AS A CASE STUDY	2 26
2.1. INTRODUCTION	
2.1.1. Irrawaddy Dolphin Distribution	
2.1.2. Global Status	2-30
2.2. REVIEW OF FRESHWATER IRRAWADDY DOLPHIN POPULATIONS	
2.2.1. Chilka Lake (India)	
2.2.2. Songkhla Lake (Thailand)	
2.2.3. Ayeyarwady River (Myanmar)	
2.2.4. Mahakam River (Indonesia)	
2.3. NATURAL SUSCEPTIBILITY TO ANTHROPOGENIC IMPACTS	
2.3.1. Risks Associated with Small Populations	
2.3.2. Habitat Preferences	
2.3.3. Survival and Life History	
2.4. EVIDENCE OF POPULATION DECLINES	2-40
2.5. THREATENING PROCESSES	
2.5.1. Direct Take	
2.5.2. Live- Capture for Display	
2.5.3. Dolphin-Watching Tourism	
2.5.4. Fisheries-Related Impacts	
2.5.5. Habitat Degradation	
2.6. SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND LOCAL PERCEPTIONS OF VILLAGERS	
2.7. CONSERVATION, MANAGEMENT AND THREAT MITIGATION	2-47
2.7.1. Cultural Protection	
2.7.2. Awareness Raising Programs and Community Involvement	
2.7.3. Net-Compensation Packages	2-48
2.7.4. Integrated Conservation Development Projects	
2.7.5. Dolphin-Watching Tourism	2-50
2.7.6. Protected Areas	
2.7.7. Legislation	2-51
2.8. THE VALUE OF FRESHWATER DOLPHINS AS A FLAGSHIP SPECIES	
2.9. CONCLUSIONS	2-57

3. THE MEKONG RIVER IN PERIL: A HISTORY OF THE LOWER MEKONG	
THE IMPORTANCE OF HABITAT PRESERVATION TO SPECIES CONSERVA	
3.1. INTRODUCTION	
3.2. GEOLOGICAL HISTORY OF AREA	
3.3. COUNTRIES OF THE LOWER MEKONG RIVER	
3.4. DESCRIPTION OF THE LOWER MEKONG RIVER SECTION	
3.4.1. Climate	
3.4.2. Khone Falls	
3.4.4. Deep Pools	
3.4.5. Kratie Township to Phnom Penh River Stretch	
3.4.6. Tonle Sap Great Lake	
3.4.7. Lower Cambodian Mekong River and Vietnamese Delta	
3.5. FISH AND FISHERIES	
3.6. NON-FISH FAUNA AND FLORA	
3.7. THREATS TO THE MEKONG RIVER	
3.7.1. Direct Impacts from Within the Fisheries Sector	
3.7.2. Direct Impacts from Outside the Fisheries Sector	
3.8. INSTITUTIONAL, LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS	
3.9. IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY-BASED CO-MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS 3.10. IMPORTANCE OF HABITAT PRESERVATION TO SPECIES CONSERVA	
3.10. IMPORTANCE OF HABITAT PRESERVATION TO SPECIES CONSERVA 3.11. CONCLUSIONS	
4. EVALUATING THE CONSERVATION STATUS OF IRRAWADDY DOLPH	
MEKONG RIVER USING LOCAL KNOWLEDGE	4-84
4.1. INTRODUCTION	4-85
4.2. BACKGROUND SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE OF IRRAWADDY DOLPHINS	S IN THE
MEKONG RIVER	
4.3. SURVEY AREA AND TIMING	
4.4. INTERVIEW METHODOLOGY	
4.4.1. Questionnaire Development	
4.4.2. Methodology	
4.5.1. Demographics of Respondents	
4.5.2. Local Knowledge of Historical Distribution of Dolphins	
4.5.3. Local Perceptions of Dolphin Status and Conservation	
4.6. DISCUSSION	
4.6.1. Limitations of Methodology	
4.6.2. Historical Dolphin Distribution and Population Change	
4.6.3. Local Perceptions of Dolphins and Conservation	
4.7. CONCLUSIONS	4-115
5. ESTIMATING ABUNDANCE AND ASSESSING TRENDS OF IRRAWADDY	DOI PHIN
S. ESTIMATING ABUNDANCE AND ASSESSING TREADS OF IRRAWADD T NUMBERS IN THE MEKONG RIVER, BASED ON CAPTURE-RECAPTURE AN	
PHOTO-IDENTIFIED INDIVIDUALS	
5.1. INTRODUCTION	
5.2. STUDY AREA5.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS	
5.3. MATERIALS AND METHODS	
5.3.2. Identification from Photographs	
5.3.3. Capture-Recapture Assumptions	
5.3.4. Data Selection	
5.3.5. Estimating the Proportion of Animals with Long-lasting Marks	
5.3.6. Estimating Total Population Size	
5.3.7. Estimating the Number of Newborns/Calves and Dead Animals	
5.3.8. Study Constraints	
5.4 ANALYSIS OF STATISTICAL POWER OF MONITORING PROGRAMS	5-134

	TS	
	mber of Dolphins with Long-Lasting Marks	
	oportion of Dolphins with Long Lasting Marks	
	odel Selection and Population Size	
	mber of Calves and Dead Animals	
5.5.5. To	tal Population Size	5-142
5.6. EFFEC	TIVENESS OF MONITORING PROGRAMS	5-142
5.7. DISCU	SSION	5-144
5.7.1. Es	timates of Population Size	5-144
5.7.2. Ris	sk of Small Populations	5-145
5.7.3. Su	rvival, Mortality Rates and Population Trends	5-146
	unagement Implications	
	LUSIONS	
MEKONG RIV	ION SIZE ESTIMATES OF FRESHWATER IRRAWADDY DOLPH ER, BASED ON DIRECT COUNTS AND DISTANCE SAMPLING	
	DUCTION	
	AREA	
	SURVEY METHODS	
	rect Count Surveys	
	ne-transect Distance Sampling	
	ning of Surveys	
	neral Search Effort	
	ta Recorded	
	thting Data Recorded	
	ducing the Potential for Double Counting for Direct Counts	
	lependent Observations	
	stance Estimation	
	ine-Transect Data Analyses	
	BASED OBSERVATIONS	
	olphins Missed/Group Size Observations	
	serving Surface and Dive Times	
	YSIS OF STATISTICAL POWER OF MONITORING PROGRAMS	
6.6. STUDY	CONSTRAINTS	6-169
6.7. RESUL	TS	6-169
6.7.1. Di	rect Counts	6-170
6.7.2. Lii	ne-Transect Surveys in the Kratie to Khone Falls River Section	6-173
6.7.3. Lii	ne-Transect Surveys Below Kratie	6-177
6.8. LAND-	BASED OBSERVATIONS	6-178
	oportion of Dolphins Missed by the Boat-based Observer Team	
	oup Size Estimates	
	nd-based Observations to Estimate Sighting Probability	
	R TO DETECT TRENDS	
	JSSION	
	nportance of Kratie to Khone Falls River Section	
	rect Count Considerations	
	ine Transect Considerations	
	lethodological Considerations	
	EUSIONS	
	SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS	
0.12. BOAT	SURVET RECOMMENDATIONS	0-100

	IBUTION AND RANGING PATTERNS OF IRRAWADDY DOLPHINS	7-190
7.1. IN	FRODUCTION	7_101
	UDY AREA AND METHODS	
7.2.1.	Distribution	
7.2.2.	Ranging Patterns	
	SULTS	
7.3.1.	Distribution of Dolphin Sightings	
7.3.2.	Environmental Characteristics of Sighting Locations	
7.3.3.	Deep Pool Characteristics	
7.3.4.	Ranging Patterns	
7.4. DIS	SCUSSION	7-210
7.4.1.	Distribution and Habitat Preferences	
7.4.2.	Ranging Patterns	7-211
7.5. CO	NCLUSIONS	7-212
	OL DYNAMICS AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF IRRAWADDY DOLPHINS IG THE MEKONG RIVER	8-214
8.1. IN	FRODUCTION	8-215
	ATERIALS AND METHODS	
8.2.1.	Photo-Identification of Individuals	
8.2.2.	Group Size	
8.2.3.	Association Analyses	
8.2.4.	Temporal Patterns of Analyses	
8.3. RE	SULTS	8-222
8.3.1.	Group Size	
8.3.2.	Dry Season Association Patterns	8-224
8.3.3.	Wet Season Association Patterns	
8.3.4.	Dry Season Temporal Patterns of Analyses	
8.4. DIS	SCUSSION	
8.4.1.	A Stable Social Structure and its Potentially Influencing Factors	
8.4.2.	Research and Management Implications	
	NCLUSIONS	
8.6. SO	CIAL STRUCTURE RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS	8-242
	ALITY RATES AND CAUSES AFFECTING SURVIVAL OF THE IRRAWAD POPULATION INHABITING THE MEKONG RIVER	
J.1. 11 1.	FRODUCTION	9-245
	UDY AREA	
	THODOLOGY	
9.3.1. 9.3.2.	Carcass Reporting and Collection	
9.3.2. 9.3.3.	Location of Deaths	
9.3.3. 9.3.4.	Cause of Death	
	TIMATES OF MORTALITY LIMIT	
	SULTS	
9.5. KE 9.5.1.	Mortality Rates, Seasonality and Age/Sex Composition	
9.5.2.	Location of Dolphin Deaths	
9.5.3.	Cause of Death	
	FIMATES OF SUSTAINABLE ANTHROPOGENIC MORTALITY	
	SCUSSION	
9.7.1.	Newborn Mortalities and Survival Rates	
9.7.2.	Location of Deaths	
9.7.3.	Causes of Death	
	Potential Causes of Dolphin Death	9-267

0.81	MATES OF MORTALITY LIMIT	9-269
	Considerations Regarding Implementing Management Actions	
	CLUSIONS	
9.10. REC	OMMENDATIONS FOR MORTALITY STUDY AND MITIGATION	9-273
0. ENCOU	RAGING COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR IRRAWADDY DOLPHIN	
	ION: RURAL DEVELOPMENT, LIVELIHOOD DIVERSIFICATION	AND
	RODUCTION	
	Conservation Strategies	
	Project Evaluation Freshwater Conservation Strategies	
	LPHINS FOR DEVELOPMENT': A CONSERVATION INITIATIVE IN C.	
10.2. DO		AMBODIA
	52 Project Background	10-282
	Project Location	
	Dolphin-watching Tourism	
	Project Initiation and Methods	
10.2.5.	Dolphins for Development Project	10-287
10.2.6.	Project Evaluation	10-295
	CUSSION	
	The Potential for Conservation Success Using Integrated Conservation Dev	elopment
Projects		
	Community-based Tourism Initiatives	
10.3.3.	Community Conscious Conservation	
	RVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE IRRAWADDY DOLPHIN N THAT INHABITS THE MEKONG RIVER	11-307
11.1. INT	RODUCTION	11-308
	OR RESULTS OF THE STUDY	
	Objective 1. Determine the current status and biodiversity importance of from	
Irrawadd	y dolphin populations (Chapter 2)	11-309
11.2.2.	Objective 2. Provide information on the study area and justification for why	
	ion should be a major priority (Chapter 3)	y habitat
	Objective 3. Investigate the historical status of the population and reasons	y habitat 11-310
		y habitat 11-310 for any
1121	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat 11-310 for any 11-310
11.2.5.		y habitat 11-310 for any 11-310 11-311
11.2.5. 312	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat 11-310 for any 11-310 11-311 aapter 7)11-
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6.	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat 11-310 for any 11-310 11-311 napter 7)11-
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7.	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat 11-310 for any 11-310 11-311 apter 7)11- r 8)11-312
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8.	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat11-310 for any11-311 napter 7)11- r 8)11-31211-312 ttegies and
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Da	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat 11-310 for any 11-311 napter 7)11- r 8)11-312 11-312 tegies and 11-313
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Do	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Do 11.2.9. dolphins of	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Do 11.2.9. dolphins of	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Do 11.2.9. dolphins dolphins 11.3. SET 11.3.1. 11.3.2.	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Do 11.2.9. dolphins of 11.3. SET 11.3.1. 11.3.2. 11.3.3.	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Do 11.2.9. dolphins of 11.3. SET 11.3.1. 11.3.2. 11.3.3. 11.4. MEA	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Do 11.2.9. dolphins of 11.3. SET 11.3.1. 11.3.2. 11.3.3. 11.4. MEA 11.5. CON	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Do 11.2.9. dolphins of 11.3. SET 11.3.1. 11.3.2. 11.3.3. 11.4. MEA 11.5. CON 11.6. RECO	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Do 11.2.9. dolphins of 11.3. SET 11.3.1. 11.3.2. 11.3.3. 11.4. MEA 11.5. CON 11.6. RECO	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Do 11.2.9. dolphins o 11.3. SET 11.3.1. 11.3.2. 11.3.3. 11.4. MEA 11.5. CON 11.6. REC Objective dolphin p	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat
11.2.5. 312 11.2.6. 11.2.7. 11.2.8. trial a Da 11.2.9. dolphins a 11.3. SET 11.3.1. 11.3.2. 11.3.3. 11.4. MEA 11.5. CON 11.6. REC Objective dolphin p	n change using local knowledge (Chapter 4)	y habitat

	Objective 3. Inve	estigate the historical status of the population and reasons for any popu	ılation
		al knowledge (Chapter 4)	
	-	otain estimates of total population size (Chapters 5 and 6)	
		tinued. Obtain estimates of total population size (Chapters 5 and 6)	
	-	tain baseline data on ranging patterns and habitat use (Chapter 7)	
		tain data on school dynamics and social structure (Chapter 8)	
		estigate social considerations influencing conservation strategies and to	
	Dolphins for Dev	elopment conservation initiative (Chapter 10)	11-338
12.	LITERATURE	CITED	12-340
13.	APPENDIX		373
API	PENDIX I.	Beasley et al. 2005	373
API	PENDIX II.	Beasley et al. 2002	375
API	PENDIX III.	Land-based Observations	377
API	PENDIX IV.	MDCP Mekong Dolphin Conservation Strategy	386
API	PENDIX V.	Cambodian DoF Mekong Dolphin Conservation Strategy	389
API	PENDIX VI.	Orcaella Life History Information	391
API	PENDIX VII.	Mekong Dolphin Stranding and Mortality Summary	403
API	PENDIX VIII.	Biological and Social Research Recommendations	405
API	PENDIX IX.	Management Recommendations	412

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 2

CHAPTER 2
Table 2.1. A summary of previous attempts to estimate abundance of freshwater Irrawaddy dolphin
populations
Table 2.2. Comparisons of previous and current freshwater Irrawaddy dolphin abundance estimates and historical distribution. Many of the previous estimates are anecdotal reports, or best guesses, as a result of a lack of detailed study
Table 2.3. Various awareness-raising conservation initiatives implemented to conserve freshwater
Irrawaddy dolphin populations
Table 2.4. Known, proposed, or recommended protected areas for freshwater Irrawaddy dolphins2-52 Table 2.5. Legislation relevant to freshwater populations of Irrawaddy dolphins2-53
CHAPTER 3
Table 3.1. The 2003 Human Development Index and Human Poverty Index statistics for Laos, Cambodia
and Vietnam, compared with Australia (UNDP 2004)
Table 3.2. International agreements that pertain directly, or indirectly, to conservation and management of the lower Mekong River
of the lower Mekolig River.
CHAPTER 4
Table 4.1. Summary of the differences between developed and developing countries with respect to the
conditions under which surveys are designed and deployed. The identified differences are arranged
in ascending order of importance to undertaking a questionnaire survey regarding natural resource
management issues. The third column describes the methods by which I addressed these concerns
in my study. The last column summarises the potential for problems to occur during data collection/analyses based on my final questionnaire design4-94
Table 4.2. The average age (including standard deviation) and average length of time interviewees had
resided, or worked, in the area (including standard deviation) where they were interviewed, based
on interview surveys conducted throughout the lower Mekong River
Table 4.3. A summary of the number (and percent) of respondents to interview surveys who had
previously sighted Irrawaddy dolphins in various sections of the Mekong River and Tonle Sap Lake
(Area), during the wet and dry seasons. Most respondents sighted Irrawaddy dolphins during the dry season in the Kratie to Khone Falls river section and Tonle Sap River and Tonle Sap Lake.
During the wet season, Irrawaddy dolphins were sighted most frequently south of Kratie, into the
Vietnamese Delta
Table 4.4. Summary of the reported trends in current dolphin abundance along the Mekong River,
compared to when the respondent was a child based on interview surveys. Cambodia is separated
into three regions: Kratie to Khone Falls, Kratie south to the Vietnamese/Cambodian border, and
Tonle Sap River and Lake. These regions can be seen on Figure 4.4
closest relative of Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River4-105
violeto remini o ri inimimum, morphino in morrishong ru voi
CHAPTER 5
Table 5.1. The assumptions of mark-recapture and consequences of the methods used in this study to
address them 5-127
Table 5.2. The number of excellent quality photographs in each year from 2004-2005 and the associated
proportion of individuals identifiable in the total population
model
Table 5.4. Known Irrawaddy dolphin minimum birth and mortality rates in the Mekong River from
January 2003–April 2005. 5-141
Table 5.5. The effect of different annual rates of population change on the number of years required to
detect population trends with yearly survey intervals $(t = 1)$, for Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong
River. Data variability is specified at CV = 0.07, which corresponds to the highest level of precision obtained for the abundance estimates. The probability of Type I and Type II errors was
set at the 0.05 level. Power analysis based on Gerodette (1987)5-144
CHAPTER 6
Table 6.1. Summary of surveys conducted to assess the freshwater Irrawaddy dolphin population size in
the Ayeyarwady and Mahakam Rivers in Asia6-156

Table 6.2. A summary table of the assumptions of line-transect methodology, the effect of failure to address the assumption adequately, the methods used in this study to address potential violations and the potential in this study for assumptions to be violated
Table 6.3. Summary of direct count and line-transect methodologies used to estimate Irrawaddy dolphin population size in the Mekong River
Table 6.4. A summary table of the constraints involved in boat and land-based surveys for Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River. Each constraint has an associated indication on the potential for it to be problematic to data analyses
Table 6.5. Summary of boat survey type, duration and number of Irrawaddy dolphin groups sighted during boat surveys in the Mekong River
Table 6.6. A summary of the upriver direct count surveys conducted to estimate population size of the Irrawaddy dolphin population that inhabits the Mekong River. The summary includes the dates of each survey, total effort conducted (in both distance and time) and the number of individual dolphins sighted based on 'best', 'low' and 'high' estimates ¹
Table 6.7. A summary of the downriver direct count surveys conducted to estimate population size of the Irrawaddy dolphin population that inhabits the Mekong River. The summary includes the dates of each survey, total effort conducted (distance and time) and the number of individual dolphins sighted based on 'best', 'low' and 'high' estimates ¹
Table 6.8. Summary of on-effort and combined independent observer sightings during surveys conducted in January and April 2004 and April 2005. Two dolphin groups were sighted only by the
independent observer team only in April 2004, representing 22% of sightings for that survey period. These data indicate that boat-based observers had the potential to miss at least 22% of dolphins in the survey area
Table 6.9. Summary of the combined line-transect and upriver direct count boat surveys conducted in the Kratie to Khone Falls section of the Mekong River. The summary provides information on survey duration and effort, with corresponding minimum population size estimates of Irrawaddy dolphins.
Table 6.10. Habitat type and availability in the Kratie to Khone Falls river section. Dolphins are most commonly sighted in deep pool areas during the dry season which comprise only 26.4% of available habitat in the Kratie to Khone Falls river section6-175
Table 6.11. Estimates of Irrawaddy dolphin abundance from line-transect surveys within deep pool habitats in Kratie to Khone Falls river section. The Model Fit was the model chosen by the program DISTANCE, resulting from the lowest AIC value. All data were truncated using 5% of
outliers *
Table 6.13. Number of dolphin groups sighted by land- and boat-based observer teams. Land-based observations were undertaken over two years of the study period. The boat-based observers did not miss any dolphin groups that were sighted by land-based observers in critical dolphin habitats. A total of 16 dolphin groups were sighted by land-based observers and 17 dolphins groups sighted by the boat-based observers
Table 6.14. Effect of different annual rates of population change on the number of years required to detect population trends with yearly survey intervals (<i>t</i> =1). Data variability is specified at CV = 0.30, which corresponds to the highest level of precision obtained for the line-transect abundance estimates from this study
Table 6.15. A comparison of the different surveys methods used to estimate total population size of Irrawaddy dolphins inhabiting the Mekong River
CHAPTER 8 Table 8.1. Irrawaddy dolphin group size in the five primary areas in the Mekong River during the dry and wet seasons
Table 8.2. An examination of differences in Irrawaddy dolphin group size in the Mekong River between primary areas during the dry season. Highly significant differences in group size between primary areas are indicated by two stars (**), significant differences are indicated by one star (*) and areas showing no significant differences are indicated by 'ns'
Table 8.3. Results of permutation tests for preferred companionship of Irrawaddy dolphins inhabiting the Mekong River based on the 2003-2005 dry season data-set, following the Bejder <i>et al.</i> (1998) procedure. The highly significant P value (<i>P</i> <0.001) indicates that individuals showed a preference in their associations

CHAPTER 9
Table 9.1. Total confirmed and unconfirmed dolphin mortalities in the Mekong River from January 2001 to April 2005
Table 9.2. Summary table of inorganic mercury residues in Irrawaddy dolphin liver and blubber tissue from the Mekong River, plus comparative data for other cetacean species from Japan, China and the Mediterranean 1
Table 9.3. The allowable Potential Biological Removal of Irrawaddy dolphins from the Mekong River
from anthropogenic mortality
CHAPTER 10
Table 10.1. A summary of the potential constraints to development and implementation of Integrated Conservation Development Projects (ICDPs), with a corresponding list of potential solutions to these constraints
Table 10.2. Summary of the objectives and outputs for the rural development and livelihood
diversification component of the Dolphins for Development' project at Kampi Village, Kratie Province
Table 10.3. Summary of the objectives and outputs for the community-based tourism project component of the Dolphins for Development project, initiated at Kampi Village, Kratie Province10-291
Table 10.4. Summary of the objectives and outputs for the awareness raising and education component of the Dolphins for Development project, initiated at Kampi Village, Kratie Province10-293
Table 10.5. Summary of the objectives and outputs for the stakeholder relationship strengthening
component of the Dolphins for Development project, initiated at Kampi Village, Kratie Province
Table 10.6. Characteristics of successful ICDPs and comparison with the Cambodian Dolphins for Development ICDP
Table 10.7. Summary of the dolphin-watching tourism at Kampi Pool and my perceived levels of community empowerment resulting from the Mekong River Dolphins for Development project. 10-300
Table 10.8. Summary of the limitations encountered in the community-based tourism project at Kampi Village and the potential solutions that could be implemented
Table 10.9. Local and national conservation programs required and the necessary components of each programme
CHAPTER 11
Table 11.1. Summary of the main research and conservation implications of Chapter 1: Objective 1 - to determine the current status and importance of freshwater Irrawaddy dolphin populations11-331
Table 11.2. Summary of the main research and conservation implications of Chapter 3: Objective 2 – to
provide information on the study area and justify why habitat conservation should be a major priority
Table 11.3. Summary of the main research and conservation implications of Chapter 4: Objective 3 – to investigate the historical status of the Irrawaddy dolphin population in the Mekong River and
reasons for any population change using local knowledge
to obtain estimates of total population size of Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River, using
capture-recapture of photo-identified individuals
obtain estimates of total population size of Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River, using direct
count and line-transect methodologies
investigate Irrawaddy dolphin school dynamics and social structure in the Mekong River11-336
Table 11.7. Summary of the main research and conservation implications of Chapter 8: Objective 4d - investigate mortality rates and causes affecting survival of Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong
River
investigate social considerations influencing conservation strategies and trial a Dolphins for
Development conservation initiative

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1
Figure 1.1. Location map of southern Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam, showing the research area where my
study was undertaken. 1-
Figure 1.2. Location map of the lower Mekong River study area. The study area begins at the
Laos/Cambodian border and extends south to the Vietnamese Delta (including Tonle Sap Lake).
The light blue shading shows the floodplain area of Tonle Sap Lake. Map created by Matti Kummi
(MRCS/WUP-FIN Lower Mekong Modeling Project) and reproduced with his permission 1-0
Figure 1.3. The seven components of an overall process for conserving biodiversity, as described by
Margoluis and Salafsky (1998), pg 319.
Figure 1.4. A conceptual framework of my thesis, as adapted from Groves (2003). My primary goal is to
contribute to the effective conservation of the Irrawaddy dolphin population inhabiting the Mekong
River, by considering both biological and social factors (shown by the black and white boxes respectively) of relevance to conservation and management1-2
respectively) of relevance to conservation and management.
CHAPTER 2
Figure 2.1. An Irrawaddy dolphin photographed from the Mekong River, Cambodia. This image shows
the characteristic slaty grey uniform colouration, rounded head and small rounded dorsal fin.
Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River rarely leap completely out of the water (as shown in this
picture) and normally surface inconspicuously, with little of their body showing. Photograph by
Yim Sak Sang. 2-2
Figure 2.2. Partial distributions of the Irrawaddy dolphin (black) and Australian snubfin dolphin (red).
The species-level separation between the Irrawaddy and Australian Snubfin dolphin stocks appears
to occur on either side of the deep-water straits of Indonesia.
Figure 2.3. Locations of the five freshwater Irrawaddy dolphin populations, shown in red: Chilka and
Songkhla Lakes (shown by red dots) and the Mahakam, Mekong and Ayeyarwady Rivers (shown
by red lines)
Figure 2.4. Irrawaddy dolphins live-captured from coastal Thai waters and held for public display at
Oasis Sea World, Chantaburi Province, Thailand, near the Thai/Cambodian border2-4.
Figure 2.5. An example of the dolphin-watching boats now used at Chiteal Pool to observe dolphins.
The area is very small (1 km²) and this photograph shows the main habitat for the dolphins2-4
Figure 2.6. An Irrawaddy dolphin captured by a large mesh gillnet in the Mekong River, Cambodia in
February 2001. The indentations from the net can be viewed just behind the flippers and neck
region (indicated by the arrow)
provide access to freshwater, in rural villages adjacent to critical dolphin habitats. Photograph by
Brendan Boucher
Figure 2.8. A Mekong River giant stingray (<i>Himantura chaophraya</i>) that was captured by a large hook in
Kampi Pool in January 2004. Conservation efforts directed at the <i>Critically Endangered</i> Irrawaddy
dolphin population would also benefit other fauna and flora in the river system
CHAPTER 3
Figure 3.1. The Mekong River from its origin in Tibet to the South China Sea (left). The inset on the
right shows the study area of the lower Mekong River section. A large expanse of waterfalls,
named Khone Falls, is situated across the Laos/Cambodian border. These falls prevent dolphin
movement north. My surveys cover nearly the entire known historical distribution of dolphins in
the Mekong River, apart from the Sekong River of southern Laos. Both maps were produced by
Matti Kummu (MRCS/WUP-FIN Lower Mekong Modelling Project) and reproduced with his
permission
Figure 3.2. The Mekong River narrowing to the bottom of Khone Falls (left). The right photo is of a
representative section of Khone Falls, showing the extensive small waterfall system3-6' Figure 3.3. Chiteal Pool situated on the Laos/Cambodian border is one of hundreds of deep pool areas in
the Mekong River. Dolphins preferentially use only 10-12 deep pool areas in the upper Cambodian
Mekong River (including Chiteal Pool)
Figure 3.4. A Mekong giant catfish captured in the Dai fisheries situated along Tonle Sap River,
Cambodia, at the end of the 2003 rainy season. Photograph by Dr. Zeb Hogan3-7
Figure 3.5. A large Asian Giant softshell turtle found dead during my surveys in the upper Cambodian
Mekong River, near Sambor village, on 10 April 2005.

Figure 3.6. Regional distribution of large dams at the end of the 20th century. Excerpt from WCD (2000)
CHAPTER 4
Figure 4.1. Location map of the lower Mekong River showing where interview surveys were conducted (as shown by the dark red line). No surveys were conducted north of Khone Falls (Muang Khong
on map)
Figure 4.3. The length of time that respondents from Cambodia and Vietnam had lived in the area where they were interviewed. The majority of respondents have lived in the area more than 10 years. In Cambodia, those interviewees that had lived in the area for more than 30 years had returned to their original village after the Pol Pot regime. 4-97
Figure 4.4. Historical and current distribution map of Irrawaddy dolphin reports from the Mekong River based on interview surveys. The Kratie to Khone Falls river section is now reportedly the primary region where the dolphins are sighted most frequently in the Mekong River. Dolphins now rarely occur south of Kratie to the Vietnamese Delta and are even rarer in Tonle Sap River or Lake. Map produced by Matti Kummu (MRC/WUP-FIN Lower Mekong Modelling Project) and reproduced with his permission
Figure 4.5. Historical and current distribution map of Irrawaddy dolphin observations from the Mekong River based on published boat survey data and my results from Chapters 5 and 6. Lloze (1973) reportedly surveyed in Tonle Sap Lake and south along the Mekong River to the Cambodian/Vietnamese border (not surveying into Vietnam). Lloze (1973) caught at least two dolphins from Kampi Pool, Kratie Province for his anatomical studies. Baird and Beasley (2005) surveyed from Khone Falls south to Kratie Township and MDCP surveys covered the entire lower Mekong River from Khone Falls south to the Vietnamese Delta (including Tonle Sap Lake). The MDCP sighting in Vietnamese Mekong waters represents the location of the three dolphin carcasses, not a live dolphin. Map produced by Matti Kummu (MRC/WUP-FIN Lower Mekong Modelling Project) and reproduced with his permission
Figure 4.6. An elderly man who discovered an old Irrawaddy dolphin skull in Tonle Sap Lake during the low waters of the dry season in the early 1990s. He kept this skull, as he believed it would bring him good luck. This man was not directly interviewed but observed the interviews and then showed us the dolphin skull he had recovered.
Figure 4.7. Respondents' reasons (percent of respondents) during interview surveys for the apparent decrease in dolphin numbers in the Mekong River. Bars are separated into Cambodia and Vietnam to illustrate differences in perceptions between country
Figure 4.8. Respondents' reasons (percent of respondents) during interviews for the perceived increase in dolphin numbers in the Mekong River. Bars are separated into Cambodia and Vietnam to illustrate differences between country. Only two respondents from Vietnam believed that the dolphin population in the Mekong River was increasing
Figure 4.9. The perceived importance of conserving dolphins and fish in Cambodia and Vietnam based on interview surveys
Figure 4.10. Respondents perceived reasons why it is important to conserve dolphins in the Mekong River, based on interview surveys. 4-107
Figure 4.11. Cambodian and Vietnamese respondents, illustrating the perceived reasons why it is not important to conserve dolphins in the Mekong River
CHAPTER 5 Figure 5.1. The study area in the lower Mekong River from Muang Khong (Laos/Cambodian border), south to the Vietnamese Delta. The river section in red is the Kratie to Khone Falls River section, which is the dolphins' primary habitat during the dry season. The four primary areas occupied by dolphins during the dry season are indicated by red circles. From north to south, the areas are: Chiteal, Stung Treng, Koh Pidau and Kampi
Figure 5.2. Photo-identification was one of the primary techniques used to estimate abundance of Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River. From 2004-2005, high quality photographic equipment was used to photograph dolphin groups. I used a combination of a Canon digital camera with 300 mm fixed lens and a converter (2x), which resulted in a focal length of 960 mm. Using this arrangement, I obtained very clear, high quality dolphin images. Photo by Brendan Boucher5-123
Figure 5.3. The survey boat drifting in Chiteal pool in the Mekong River, to obtain photographic images of individual Irrawaddy dolphins. I often spent an entire day was spent drifting in one deep water

pool, to obtain adequate photographs. I normally took all photographs. The boat driver and	
research assistants observed the dolphin group as I was photographing, to estimate group size an	ıd
composition, as well recording any unusual behaviours or events. Photo by Yim Saksang5-	-124
Figure 5.4. Two examples of photographic image quality. An excellent image (left), in which nicks,	
notches and even scratches can be clearly seen in focus. A good quality image (right), which	
although in focus, is not exactly perpendicular to the camera5-	
Figure 5.5. An example of a newborn dolphin surfacing beside its mother, sighted during boat surveys	S.
This individual was sighted in Chiteal Pool in January 2004 with adult, Chiteal (CH01). The	
newborn (named Phnom: CH11), was resighted in Chiteal Pool during every survey conducted t	
April 2005. Phnom swam constantly with CH01 and exhibited subtle marks on its body (but not	
dorsal fin) which were acquired in April 2004 and matched from then on in all good and excelle	
photographs5-	-132
Figure 5.6. The project team members responsible for the dedicated carcass recovery programme	
photographed with three newborn dolphin carcasses recovered during March 2004 in the Kratie	
Koh Pidau primary areas. Photo by: Mr. Chivv That (Kratie Fisheries Office)5-	
Figure 5.7. Total photo-identification effort (based on the total time photographing Irrawaddy dolphin	
groups in the Mekong River) in 2004 and 2005 (data from 2001-2003 were excluded from these	;
analyses). Photographic effort was higher in 2004 (71.2 hr) compared with 2005 (41.5 hr) becau	use
photo-identification effort was restricted to one month during 2005 (April)5-	-136
Figure 5.8. Total time (hours) photographing Irrawaddy dolphin groups in each primary area in the	
Mekong River from 2004-April 2005. Throughout the study, most photo-identification effort was	as
conducted at Kampi Pool, with the least being undertaken at Stung Treng5-	-136
Figure 5.9. The number of individual dolphins photo-identified in each primary area (consisting of 11	
critical areas where dolphins were identified) along the Kratie to Khone Falls river stretch of the	,
lower Mekong River, from January 2001-April 2005. The four primary areas are: Kampi, Koh	
Pidau, Stung Treng and Chiteal. n = the total number of individuals identified in each primary a	ırea.
5-	-137
Figure 5.10. Discovery curve of the cumulative number of Irrawaddy dolphins identified between	
January 2001 and April 2005 in the Mekong River. The bars represent the total photographic ef	fort
for each survey month and the line represents the cumulative number of dolphins identified5-	-138
Figure 5.11. The number of times individually identified dolphins were sighted in the Kratie to Khone	e
Falls river section of the Mekong River during 2004–2005. The individual sighted 18 times is	
Klasico (KA01) sighted only in Kampi Pool, Kratie Province5-	-138
Figure 5.12. Relationships between different rates of population change, time to detection of trend and	d
coefficient of variation (CV) for annual population estimates for Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mek	ong
River. The CVs used to present data variability are the values obtained for population estimates	,
including two lower CVs (0.15 and 0.20), for comparison. The probability of both Type I and T	ype
II errors was set at 0.05.	-143
CHAPTER 6	
Figure 6.1. Map showing the study area where boat surveys were conducted. The area ranged from the	ne
Laos/Cambodian border (Muang Khong) south to the Vietnamese Delta (including Tonle Sap	
Lake). The Kratie to Khone Falls river section (shown in red), is the only area in the river where	e
dolphins were sighted6-	-154
Figure 6.2. Survey protocol for the Kratie to Khone Falls River section. Survey lines started at a rand	lom
location in the river, depending on the area to be surveyed for that day. River stretches greater the	han
1 km wide were surveyed in a zigzag manner, while river stretches less than 1 km wide were	
surveyed in as straight a line as possible. The oval areas in the middle of the river represent mid	l -
channel islands. 6-	
Figure 6.3. Chiteal deep pool located on the Laos/Cambodian border (Laos is on the opposite bank)6-	-161
Figure 6.4. A newborn calf sighted in Chiteal Pool (on the Laos/Cambodian border of the Mekong Ri	
in January 2004. The mother of the calf (to the left) was identified as CH01 Chiteal. The calf v	
surfacing in the typical 'corkscrew' fashion of a newly born dolphin, with its head jerking high of	
of the water. The foetal folds are also obvious just behind its head (as indicated by the black	
arrow)	-163
Figure 6.5. Boat used during surveys in the Kratie to Khone Falls river section. This image shows on	
the regions in the dry season where boat survey effort was stopped for the day, as a result of the	
probability that dolphins passed through the area because of the shallow depth, large number of	- / 1
rocks and high water velocity.	-166

Figure 6.6. Survey boat used for line-transect surveys south of Kratie to the Cambodia/Vietnam border, with two observers on-effort at all times. The observer using binoculars stood behind the observer	
using his/her naked eye. The naked eye observer was also responsible for recording environmental	
and sighting data. (left). Boat used for surveys of the Vietnamese Mekong River (right)6-166	
Figure 6.7. A summary graph showing 'best' estimates of total dolphins seen for upriver direct counts	
(shown by the diamonds) and downriver pool counts (shown by the squares), from 2001-2005. A	
red circle indicates the maximum 'best' estimate for each year. No data were available for direct	
counts in February 2004. The bars as shown on the right axis represent the minimum water level	
for the month (obtained from the Mekong River Commission)	
Figure 6.8. The number of Irrawaddy dolphin groups sighted during boat surveys in the Mekong River,	
at various perpendicular sighting distances from the survey transect line. Sighting rates dropped off	
significantly after 640 m perpendicular sighting distance. All data to the right of the dotted line	
(988 m) were truncated from the final analysis (5% of outliers)	
Figure 6.9. A scatterplot of the relationship between the size of a detected cluster and the distance from	
the line to the geometric centre of the cluster. The correlation coefficient is 0.4. A coefficient with	
a value of 0 indicates that cluster size and distance from the transect line are not correlated and 1	
indicates a very high correlation. 6-174	
Figure 6.10. The Hazard rate detection probability curve (red line) fit to the histogram of observed	
detection distances (blue) obtained during line-transect surveys for Irrawaddy dolphins in the	
Mekong River. The analysis is based on all sightings 2003-2005 within deep pool habitats. Five	
percent the outliers truncated.	,
Figure 6.11. Relationships between different rates of population change, time to detection of trend and	
coefficient of variation (CV) for annual population estimates. The highest level of precision	
obtained for line-transect estimates was CV=0.30. Additionally, comparative CVs of 0.20 and 0.10	
are presented in the event that increased sampling was possible	
CHAPTER 7	
Figure 7.1. Map showing the study area where boat surveys were conducted. The area ranged from the	
Laos/Cambodian border (Muang Khong) south to the Vietnamese Delta (including Tonle Sap	
Lake). The Kratie to Khone Falls river section (shown in red), is the only area in the river where	
dolphins were sighted. The lower box represents Kratie Province, and the upper box represents	
Sung Treng Province. Map created by Matti Kummu	
Figure 7.2. Distribution of Irrawaddy dolphins inhabiting the Mekong River, based on all dolphin	
sightings obtained between January 2001-April 2005. Kratie province is shown on the left map and	
Stung Treng Province, which is further north (see Figure 7.1) on the right map. Sightings are	
separated into dry season (red dots) and wet season (yellow dots). Chiteal primary area is located	
on the right map on the Laos/Cambodian border. Since it is a small area, the green colour is hidden	
by sighting dots and is therefore not visible. Maps created by Erin LaBrecque	
Figure 7.3. Total survey effort (boat surveys and dedicated photo-identification) in the Kratie to Khone	
Falls River section. No dolphins were sighted south of Kratie Township	,
Figure 7.4. Distribution of all Irrawaddy dolphin sightings in the Kratie to Khone Falls section of the	
Mekong River from January 2001-April 2005. The sightings are separated by year. Map created	
by Erin LaBrecque. 7-198	
Figure 7.5. Average water temperature at dolphin sighting locations in the Kratie to Khone Falls river	
stretch from 2001-2005. Water temperature was highest in May and lowest in January7-199	
Figure 7.6. Average water clarity at the locations where dolphins were sighted in the Kratie to Khone	
Falls river stretch from 2001-2005. Water clarity was significantly reduced in August and greatest	
in April)
Figure 7.7. Locations of all individual Irrawaddy dolphins photo-identified in the Mekong River from	
2001-2005. Most dolphins are represented more than once based on re-sightings. Sightings are	
separated into dry season (red dots) and wet season (yellow dots). Map created by Erin LaBrecque.	
7-201	
Figure 7.8. The number of different days an identified Irrawaddy dolphin was sighted in the Kratie to	
Khone Falls river stretch of the Mekong River, from 2001-2005	
Figure 7.9. The total numbers of days each of the 15 individual dolphins that were included in the	
ranging pattern analyses were sighted in the Mekong River, from 2001-20057-203	
Figure 7.10. A comparison of the average area (total km²) Irrawaddy dolphins ranged in the Kratie to	
Khone Falls river section, from 2001-2005. The 15 individual dolphins included in the analysis are	
grouped by primary area and separated into dry and wet seasons7-203	

TI	.11. The ranging patterns of an identified Irrawaddy dolphin individual from the Mekong River,
	X02: Sa'at, which was only observed to inhabit the Stung Treng primary area. Map A (top)
	ustrates all sighting locations of TK02 during my study. Map B (bottom) illustrates the dry
se	ason sighting locations (red dots). No sightings of TK02 were obtained during the wet season.
M	ap created by Erin LaBrecque7-204
Figure 7	.12. Ranging patterns of an identified Irrawaddy dolphin individual from the Mekong River,
K	501: Suntuk, which was only observed to inhabit the Stung Treng primary area. Map A (top)
	ustrates all sighting locations of KS01 during my study. Map B (middle) illustrates the dry
	ason sighting locations (red dots). Map C (bottom) illustrates both dry and wet season (yellow
	ts) sighting locations. Map created by Erin LaBrecque
	.13. Ranging patterns of an identified Irrawaddy dolphin individual from the Mekong River,
	H01: Chiteal, which was only observed to inhabit the Chiteal primary area. Map A (top)
	ustrates all sighting locations of CH01 during my study. Map B (middle) illustrates the dry
	ason sighting locations (red dots). Map C (bottom) illustrates both dry and wet season (yellow
	ts) sighting locations. Map created by Erin LaBrecque.
	.14. Ranging patterns of an identified Irrawaddy dolphin individual from the Mekong River,
	A04: Sabai, which was only observed to inhabit the Kampi primary area. Map A (top) illustrates
	sighting locations of KA04 during my study. Map B (middle) illustrates the dry season sighting
	cations (red dots). Map C (bottom) illustrates both dry and wet season (yellow dots) sighting
	cations. Map created by Erin LaBrecque
	.15. Ranging patterns of an identified Irrawaddy dolphin individual from the Mekong River,
	A05: Rags, which was observed to inhabit both Kampi and Koh Pidau primary areas. Map A
	p) illustrates all sighting locations of KA05 during my study. Map B (middle) illustrates the dry
	ason sighting locations (red dots). Map C (bottom) illustrates both dry and wet season (yellow
	ts) sighting locations. Map created by Erin LaBrecque
Figure 7	.16. Ranging patterns of an identified Irrawaddy dolphin individual from the Mekong River,
	002: Chop, which was observed to inhabit only the Koh Pidau primary area. Map A (top)
ill	ustrates all sighting locations of GO02 during my study. Map B (middle) illustrates the dry
	ason sighting locations (red dots). Map C (bottom) illustrates both dry and wet season (yellow
do	ts) sighting locations. Map created by Erin LaBrecque
СНАРТ	ER 8
M	.1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within
Figure 8 M ea	.1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group.
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8	.1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group. 8-219 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group. 8-219 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters ring the dry and wet seasons in the Mekong River. In addition, a group of 34 individuals were that do n 30 July 2004 at Phum Kreing critical area. This group was excluded from this figure, as was a significant outlier. The numbers above each bar represent the number of groups
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group. 8-219 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters ring the dry and wet seasons in the Mekong River. In addition, a group of 34 individuals were thated on 30 July 2004 at Phum Kreing critical area. This group was excluded from this figure, as was a significant outlier. The numbers above each bar represent the number of groups countered. 8-220
Figure 8 Au Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group. 8-219 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters ring the dry and wet seasons in the Mekong River. In addition, a group of 34 individuals were that on 30 July 2004 at Phum Kreing critical area. This group was excluded from this figure, as was a significant outlier. The numbers above each bar represent the number of groups countered. 8-223 3. The percentage of Irrawaddy dolphin groups sighted in the Mekong river between 2001-
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group. 8-219 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters ring the dry and wet seasons in the Mekong River. In addition, a group of 34 individuals were thated on 30 July 2004 at Phum Kreing critical area. This group was excluded from this figure, as was a significant outlier. The numbers above each bar represent the number of groups countered. 8-220 3. The percentage of Irrawaddy dolphin groups sighted in the Mekong river between 2001-05, with ≥ 50% of individuals identified in the group. Data from 2001-2002 were excluded from
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group. 8-219 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters ring the dry and wet seasons in the Mekong River. In addition, a group of 34 individuals were the don 30 July 2004 at Phum Kreing critical area. This group was excluded from this figure, as was a significant outlier. The numbers above each bar represent the number of groups countered. 8-223 3. The percentage of Irrawaddy dolphin groups sighted in the Mekong river between 2001-05, with \geq 50% of individuals identified in the group. Data from 2001-2002 were excluded from a social structure analysis because of the minimal number of individuals identified (Chapter 5).
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group. 8-219 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters ring the dry and wet seasons in the Mekong River. In addition, a group of 34 individuals were the don 30 July 2004 at Phum Kreing critical area. This group was excluded from this figure, as was a significant outlier. The numbers above each bar represent the number of groups countered. 8-223 3. The percentage of Irrawaddy dolphin groups sighted in the Mekong river between 2001-05, with ≥50% of individuals identified in the group. Data from 2001-2002 were excluded from a social structure analysis because of the minimal number of individuals identified (Chapter 5)8
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group. 8-219 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters ring the dry and wet seasons in the Mekong River. In addition, a group of 34 individuals were ghted on 30 July 2004 at Phum Kreing critical area. This group was excluded from this figure, as was a significant outlier. The numbers above each bar represent the number of groups countered. 8-223 3. The percentage of Irrawaddy dolphin groups sighted in the Mekong river between 2001-05, with ≥50% of individuals identified in the group. Data from 2001-2002 were excluded from a social structure analysis because of the minimal number of individuals identified (Chapter 5)8 5.
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group
Figure 8 Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group. 8-219 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters ring the dry and wet seasons in the Mekong River. In addition, a group of 34 individuals were ghted on 30 July 2004 at Phum Kreing critical area. This group was excluded from this figure, as was a significant outlier. The numbers above each bar represent the number of groups countered. 8-223 3. The percentage of Irrawaddy dolphin groups sighted in the Mekong river between 2001-05, with ≥50% of individuals identified in the group. Data from 2001-2002 were excluded from a social structure analysis because of the minimal number of individuals identified (Chapter 5)8 5. 4. Discovery curve showing the cumulative number of individuals identified against the mulative number of identifications (with only one identification of each individual counted ring each sampling period). 8-226
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 th 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group. 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters ring the dry and wet seasons in the Mekong River. In addition, a group of 34 individuals were ghted on 30 July 2004 at Phum Kreing critical area. This group was excluded from this figure, as was a significant outlier. The numbers above each bar represent the number of groups countered. 3. The percentage of Irrawaddy dolphin groups sighted in the Mekong river between 2001-05, with ≥ 50% of individuals identified in the group. Data from 2001-2002 were excluded from a social structure analysis because of the minimal number of individuals identified (Chapter 5)8 4. Discovery curve showing the cumulative number of individuals identified against the mulative number of identifications (with only one identification of each individual counted ring each sampling period). 8-220. 5. Distribution of maximum HWI of Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River (individuals ghted on ≥ 4 days and in schools with ≥ 50% of individuals identified). The distribution of
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8 sig ma	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within the group
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8 sig ma	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within the group. 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters ring the dry and wet seasons in the Mekong River. In addition, a group of 34 individuals were ghted on 30 July 2004 at Phum Kreing critical area. This group was excluded from this figure, as was a significant outlier. The numbers above each bar represent the number of groups countered. 3. The percentage of Irrawaddy dolphin groups sighted in the Mekong river between 2001-05, with ≥50% of individuals identified in the group. Data from 2001-2002 were excluded from a social structure analysis because of the minimal number of individuals identified (Chapter 5)8 4. Discovery curve showing the cumulative number of individuals identified against the mulative number of identifications (with only one identification of each individual counted ring each sampling period). 5. Distribution of maximum HWI of Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River (individuals the phase of the particular suggests that most animals formed strong associations with a ricicular companion. 8-220
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8 sig ma pa Figure 8	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within the group. 2. Comparisons of Irrawaddy dolphin group size in relation to the percent of total encounters ring the dry and wet seasons in the Mekong River. In addition, a group of 34 individuals were that on 30 July 2004 at Phum Kreing critical area. This group was excluded from this figure, as was a significant outlier. The numbers above each bar represent the number of groups countered. 3. The percentage of Irrawaddy dolphin groups sighted in the Mekong river between 2001-05, with ≥50% of individuals identified in the group. Data from 2001-2002 were excluded from a social structure analysis because of the minimal number of individuals identified (Chapter 5)8 4. Discovery curve showing the cumulative number of individuals identified against the mulative number of identifications (with only one identification of each individual counted ring each sampling period). 5. Distribution of maximum HWI of Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River (individuals that on ≥ 4 days and in schools with ≥ 50% of individuals identified). The distribution of eximum association indices suggests that most animals formed strong associations with a ricular companion. 8-220. 6. Distribution of maximum SI of Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River (individuals sighted). 8-221.
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8 sig ma pa Figure 8	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within the group
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8 sig ma pa Figure 8 on as	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within the group
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8 sig ma pa Figure 8 on as co	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within the group
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8 sig ma pa Figure 8 on as co Figure 8	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8 sig ma pa Figure 8 on as co Figure 8 Ri	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8 sig ma pa Figure 8 on as co Figure 8 Ri As	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group
Figure 8 M ea Figure 8 du sig it en Figure 8 20 the 22 Figure 8 cu du Figure 8 sig ma pa Figure 8 on as co Figure 8 Ri As	1. A scatterplot showing the relationship between Irrawaddy dolphin group size estimates in the ekong River from 2001-2005 and the number of individuals photographically identified within ch group

primary areas. However, results from Stung Treng must be viewed with caution because of the
small sample size (n=2)
Figure 8.8. A sociogram of the association matrix of the top 21 individuals identified during the study period during the dry season. This sociogram shows that there appears to be no associations between the Stung Treng (KKS10/TK02) or Chiteal individuals (CH01/CH02/CH05) between themselves or individuals from other primary areas. However, results from Stung Treng must be
viewed with caution because of the small sample size $(n=2)$.
Figure 8.9. PCA of associations between Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River. The PCA clearly
shows the four primary areas: Stung Treng (KKS/TK), Kampi (KA/CB), Koh Pidau (GO/PK) and Chiteal (CH). Dolphins from these four primary areas also grouped together in the dendogram (Figure 8.7) (see Footnote 3. regarding an explanation of individual CH04 that associates with individuals from Kampi primary area).
Figure 8.10. A sociogram of Irrawaddy dolphin association patterns from the Mekong River during the
2003-2005 wet seasons. Only groups where ≥50% of the group was identified were included in this analysis. The number of times that an individual was identified during the wet season ranged from two to five times. Only individuals with associations of 0.5 or greater are displayed on this sociogram. As a result of the small sample size the results should be viewed with caution8-232 Figure 8.11. Average-linkage cluster analysis for associations between Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River during the wet season, using only groups with ≥ 50% of individuals identified. Associations higher than 0.50 are indicated by coloured branches. The dendogram shows that the Chiteal community appears to remain isolated during the wet season. There are individuals from
Koh Pidau and Kampi that associate with other communities and some that appear to have no
association with other communities
Figure 8.12. Standardised-lagged association rate for Irrawaddy dolphins inhabiting the Mekong River, using only individuals sighted ≥ 4 days and in groups with ≥ 50% of individuals photo-graphically identified. Standard error bars were estimated using jackknife procedures. The null association rate is the lagged association rate expected if individuals are associating at random. The constant companions model best explains the observed temporal association rates of Irrawaddy dolphins in the Mekong River. This model indicates a highly structured population with preferred companions and long-term associations
Figure 8.13. An Irrawaddy dolphin feeding in Kampi Pool, near Kratie Township. Irrawady dolphins are
commonly seen spitting water in the vicinity of fish at the water surface (top). After a few moments of spitting behaviour, fish are often observed jumping in the air near the dolphin –
seemingly disorientated (bottom). Photos by Laura Morse
CHAPTER 9
Figure 9.1. Study area for the carcass recovery program. The primary study area is the Kratie to Khone Falls River section (shown in red). From 2003 onwards, there was a high probability that most of the dolphins that died in this river section were reported to my project (see text for further discussion). Surveys south of Kratie were conducted during 2004–2005 to investigate mortality rates and causes throughout the known range of the population. Map created by Matti Kummu9-
247 Figure 9.2. MDCP team members measuring the total length a newborn dolphin carcass (OBRE04-
28/09), that was discovered in Chiteal Pool during September 2004. This newborn dolphin was estimated to be only a few days old. The foetal folds are still clearly present (indicated by arrows). The cause of death was unknown
Figure 9.3. A newborn dolphin discovered in September 2002 near Kampi Pool (OBRE02-08/09). The
carcass was weighed using 100 kg scales. This specimen was classified as a newborn (as opposed to a calf), as it had obvious foetal folds (indicated by the arrows) and the umbilicus was unhealed.9-
251
Figure 9.4. A large adult dolphin (OBRE01-12/05) that was photographed by a local person at the location where it was found stranded. The dolphin (2.26 m long and 130 kg) was reported to have
been caught in a large mesh size gillnet at Tbong Klar Pool, Stung Treng Province. The
indentations from the net can be clearly seen around the head, behind the ear and at the base of the
flippers, extending around the body. 9-254
Figure 9.5. The number of adult and newborn/young calf Irrawaddy dolphin carcasses recovered from the Mekong River each year. The bars are separated into January - April and May – December, to
facilitate comparisons with 2005 data, which was only collected until April. Newborn/young calf
mortalities reached a maximum in 2004, with ten carcasses recovered. No data are available for this
analysis from May 2005 onwards (although see Appendix VII)9-256

Figure 9.6. The number of adult and newborn/young calf Irrawaddy dolphin carcasses recovered from the Mekong River between 2001 and 2005. Note that only a few carcasses were reported in the first few years of the study. Therefore, only the months where carcasses were recovered are shown on the bar chart. All months are shown from 2003 onwards. From 2003 onwards, the highest numbers of carcasses per month were recovered in March of each year. These carcasses primarily consisted of newborns/young calves
Figure 9.7. The number of adult and newborn/young calf Irrawaddy dolphin carcasses salvaged from the Mekong River and confirmed for each month from January 2001-April 2005 combined. Carcasses of newborns/young calves were recovered every month except May, July and December. Carcasses of adults were recovered every month except July. An adult female carcass recovered on 02 August 2003 was carrying a near term foetus (73 cm)
Figure 9.8. Known sex of Irrawaddy dolphin carcasses collected in the Mekong River (<i>n</i> =29), separated by year. Based on these data there were no apparent trends in rate of stranding for either sex or age composition (<i>i.e.</i> , adult or calf) of carcasses. Although five calves were recorded in 2003, their sex could not be determined
Figure 9.9. Distribution of confirmed Irrawaddy dolphin carcasses found in the upper Cambodian Mekong River between 01 January 2001 and 31 December 2005. The size of each circle has been scaled to represent the number of dolphins found dead within a radius of 2km. This map was produced by WCS Cambodia Program and is also shown in Gilbert and Beasley (2006): Appendix VII
CHAPTER 10
Figure 10.1. Location map of Kampi Village where the Dolphins for Development ICDP was
implemented (indicated by the red circle)
minimise boat disturbance to the dolphins, such as operators paddling when dolphins are near the boat (middle), a toilet block constructed by CRDT (right), which tourists can use by paying a small fee for its maintenance.
Figure 10.4. Education and awareness-raising project activities: (left) construction of dolphin and fisheries conservation signs; (middle) a young boy holding a calendar his family was given to record dolphin distribution; (right) one of two educational signboards erected at the Kampi viewing site
Figure 10.5. Stakeholder relationship building project activities: a boat and engine being donated to the Kratie Fisheries Office, with funding obtained from the British Embassy, Phnom Penh (left); a local counterpart being trained to use the camera for photo-identification of individual dolphins (middle: Chapter 6); increased patrols to ensure compliance with fishing regulations, such as the use of castnets which is a permitted fishing method (right)
CHAPTER 11 Figure 11.1. Brendan Boucher (CRDT Project Manager) and I conduct photo-identification studies at Kampi Pool, Kratie Province
Figure 11.2. Example of a small-scale workshop held a Kampi Village to inform the village about the results of the MDCP interviews.