ANNUAL PROJECT REPORT 2008

United Nations Development Programme

Cambodia

Clearing for Results;

A Partnership for Landmine Action in Cambodia

01Jan. 2008 to 31Dec. 2008

[insert picture with descriptive caption, including date, here]

Project ID: 00047488 (Award ID 00041585)
Duration: 2006 - 2010
Component (MYFF): Mine Action
Total Budget: 24.8 million
Unfunded: 6.7 million
Implementing Partners/Responsible parties: UNDP, CMAA, and CMAC

Table of Content

Executive summary

The table below provides a summary overview of the two main output-level objectives identified in the Clearing for Results (CFR) project document, offering a perspective over the whole CFR implementation period. The output indicator status is summarized, together with an indication of how this contributes to improved aid effectiveness outcomes.

Clearing for Results outputs, output indicators and outcomes

	CFR target output	Output indicator status	Outcome level results to date
1	Improved mechanism for funding mine clearance that promote efficiency, accountability and the targeting of mine clearance resources on development priorities established at the national, provincial and local levels.	Credible national plan in place for effective allocation of Demining resources. Quality management capacity within CMAA to ensure safe mine clearance in line with national standards. Sufficient funds mobilized to conduct sufficient mine clearance to reach national targets	National plan under development with full participation of all stakeholders. Quality management capacity substantially improved from quantitative and qualitative standpoint. Funding levels remain strong and targeted to key areas.
2	Strengthened capacities for mine action policy-making, monitoring, strategy formulation and prioritization of mine clearance tasks in accordance with development priorities established at provincial and local levels.	Capacity for SE monitoring of mine action demonstrably improved. Prioritization of mine clearance is done in a gender sensitive way and benefits are inclusive. Cambodia a vocal and active participant in the negotiations to ban cluster munitions. Management processes within CMAA strengthened.	SE Monitoring greatly expanded and improved, with increased collaboration between national and provincial officials. Gender sensitization improving and being integrated into national plans and prioritization tools. Cambodia very involved but did not sign the Convention. Management structures challenged by rapid, comprehensive staffing changes.

There have been many substantive improvements in key areas during the project period, some notably during 2008. The Quality Assurance capacity, in terms of outreach (number of sites visited) and contribution (perceived value of these services by MA operators) has undoubtedly increased. The slow, on the job approach to capacity development used to train these teams has contributed to them having a greater sense of confidence and autonomy. This has been seen in their willingness to close down sites which have serious safety breaches, which would almost certainly not have happened during 2007. Some logistical challenges for the CMAA and the project to properly support these teams remain, particularly fuel purchasing and vehicle maintenance, but these are less of a problem than in previous years.

The Socio-Economic Teams have likewise expanded their role in supporting the provincial authorities. Nearly 2.5 more sites were visited for beneficiary and land use verification than in 2007, and they have been accompanied by MAPU staff as part of a slow transition of these functions to their provincial counterparts. As well, they have been much more active in various meetings and workshops, and communications between CMAA and MAPU have increased. An expansion of the monitoring role, from strictly output monitoring (# sqm cleared, etc) to outcome monitoring (SE impact of that clearance) is definitely possible in the next year.

The CMAA as a whole suffers somewhat from 'fragmentation' issues, both internally and externally. For much of 2008 there has been a slowly moving management shift which cost a lot in terms of energy spent by many people working there, and correspondingly had an impact on progress on

some of the bigger issues that need attention. Likewise, external support to the CMAA continues to be done in an ad hoc way, which provides some isolated 'victories' while not addressing more systematic issues. DP's continue to focus on their areas of interest (e.g. individual departments), although there would be a benefit from a more systematic, coherent approach to capacity development and partnership.

Mine Clearance funded by the project continued to be at levels above initial targets, with substantial improvements in effectiveness this year in terms of number of mines found in a given area. Progress made in developing a national clearance strategy during 2008, which will finish in mid-late 2009, will allow the project to direct its resources even more effectively towards priority areas upon completion of the Baseline Survey.

Despite its proactive leadership role throughout the negotiation process for the Convention on Cluster Munitions, regional security issues led Cambodia to postpone its signature of the Convention until it could complete a review of the implications of it doing so. Rapid completion of this task may be important for long term sustainability of external funding of all mine/UXO clearance into the future.

I. Context

(minimum half a page, suggested 1 page)

> The background is a very short history of the project including rationale, intended objective, intended beneficiaries, main project stakeholders and implementation arrangements. This section also contextualises the project's overall direction by referencing the benchmarks/outcomes as approved in the NSDP, UNDAF, and CPAP.

Content:

(1) Reference to how the project will contribute to the achievement of one or several NSDP benchmarks.

(2) Reference to how the project contributes to one outcome of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).

(3) Main outcome and output(s) expected as per the approved Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) that provide overall direction to your project.

(4) State the specific development challenges to be addressed. This will usually be phrased in terms of capacity development needs.

(5) Who are the key partners in the implementation? The main stakeholders? The expected beneficiaries?

II. Performance review

(suggested maximum 4 pages)

> The performance review analyses the project's overall contribution to the national development benchmarks. It also assess the performance of the project against specific criteria such as capacity development, impact on direct and indirect beneficiaries, national ownership, quality of partnerships, quality of monitoring and evaluation, sustainability of project outputs, participatory process, cost-effective use of inputs, timely delivery of outputs.

Progress review

> This section assesses the overall progress of the project towards different development outcomes and the overall capacity development process. While it may be difficult to assess the progress towards development outcomes and benchmarks in the course of a year, it is possible to explain how the project can make an impact when it complements other partners interventions.

1. Overall progress towards the CPAP outcome and output(s) relating to your project

Briefly explain how the combined results/outputs listed in section I will contribute to the achievement of the CPAP outcome/output. Explain how your project complements other government/donor/NGO initiative towards the CPAP outcome *(suggested one sentence)*.

2. Capacity development.

Briefly assess the national capacity built over the course of the year, looking at the following elements: institution building, advances in legislative environment, policy tools, equipment, training of national counterparts, as well as on-the-job mentoring and others.

3. Impact on direct and indirect beneficiaries.

Briefly assess the level of beneficiary (client) coverage and satisfaction. a) Did you reach the right target group? If not, why? b) Try to assess the change in beneficiary condition as a direct effect of project outputs.

Implementation strategy review

This section assesses the quality of the implementation strategy looking at the quality of the consultative process, the quality of partnerships, and the extent to which the project has endeavoured to ensure national ownership and sustainability.

1. Participatory/consultative processes

Briefly assess if the project approach was participative i.e. involving stakeholders in the definition of priorities, schedule of activities, targeting and delivery.

2. Quality of partnerships

Vis-à-vis the partnership strategy in the prodoc, briefly assess the quality of your partnerships with national counterparts (at central and local level), other UN agencies (at central and local level), donors, NGOs, Implementing Partners, and civil society (when relevant). Was the partnership profitable for the project? Does the project need to re-assess or expand its partnership strategy? If so, why and how? Please mention recent partnerships agreements and south/south partnerships.

3. National ownership

Briefly assess the extent to which project outputs (and where applicable, processes) display any of the following: joint decision-making with national counterparts; involvement of national counterparts in the definition of priorities, planning of project resources allocation and/or reporting; joint monitoring and evaluation; allocation of national resources or in-kind contributions to the project; embedded staff.

4. Sustainability

Briefly explain how national capacities, national ownership and partnerships were strengthened to ensure that there are lasting results. Explain what you have done this year to prepare for your exit strategy and the transfer of the project outputs to national counterparts.

Management effectiveness review

This section assesses the effectiveness of the project management structure in terms of cost-effectiveness, timeliness, and quality of monitoring.

1. Quality of monitoring

Briefly state monitoring actions taken during the year. Specify the following: number of monitoring missions or reviews; level of involvement of government and donors; were monitoring recommendations useful? If so, were recommendations/corrective actions implemented?

2. Timely delivery of outputs

Briefly assess if outputs and/or annual output targets were achieved in accordance with the schedule in the AWP. If the expected output or annual output target could not be achieved this year, please indicate when it will be achieved.

3. Resources allocation

First, indicate the proportion of other project costs vs. development activity costs. If the proportion of other project costs (project staff, running costs) is above 40%, explain why.

4. Cost-effective use of inputs

Compare the level of available resources: "what was used" and vis-à-vis outputs achieved: "what was done". In writing this section, be as objective and as critical as possible. For example, identify budgetary categories (ex: rental, transport, translation, equipment) where you could save. If possible, make innovative recommendations for future implementation to increase cost-effectiveness.

III. Project results summary

(suggested 1-2 pages per project output)

> In this section, you report progress against your project specific outputs. This part should answer the following: Were the project outputs achieved? How were they achieved? How well were they achieved (according to schedule, budget, client satisfaction)? If they were not achieved/not achieved well, what constraints directly influenced the lack of achievement?

1) **Use the outputs listed in the AWP (or prodoc RRF) as sub-headers for this section**.

2) Under each output, list the activities undertaken leading to the attainment of the output or the output annual target.

3) Assess the quality of the implementation process. Describe if the output was achieved on schedule, with quality, within the agreed budget, with the participation of beneficiaries.

4) Very briefly describe the main implementation constraints that directly influenced the pursuit of this specific output (ex: government commitment, inadequacy of Implementing Partner, delay in procurement, in recruitment of consultants/trainers, funding, weather conditions, etc.) [1]
   In case the project was not able to make any progress towards the output or the output lost relevancy, please provide specific justifications.

5) Describe success factors that directly influenced the pursuit of this output (political commitment, partnerships, environmental, funding etc).

6) Describe changes, if any, that took place in the planning or implementation of the intervention towards the output.

---

[1] If relevant, provide an assessment of the performance of partner government institutions, Implementing Partners, Responsible Party, or inputs from other stakeholders, that negatively impacted on the progress towards the output.

IV. Implementation challenges

(suggested one page – minimum half a page)

> This section analyses project risks and project issues that had an impact on results (quality, schedule) during the reporting period, and how they have been addressed by the project (in the case of risks, "addressed" means to mitigate their effects or decrease the likelihood of impact, and in the case of issues, how to resolve them).

Project risks and actions

A risk is an external circumstance, condition or event that could potentially jeopardize the completion of a project component (output or activity) within the agreed timeline and/or at the required level of quality. A risk results from the *probability* multiplied by *impact* of a *threat*.

For instance, a risk can be resurgence of security incidents, a change of government policy/legislation, lapse of political will, limited national ownership, inflation, change in exchange rate, collapse of contractors, failure of suppliers, fraud, infrastructure failure, lack of adequate human resources, resistance to co-ordination from partners, absence of conducive legal environment, lack of data for adequate planning, etc.

Content:
> Describe risks that were identified in implementation of the project during the year, and the actions to mitigate them taken by the Project Manager or the Project Board. Use the risks assessment in the Quarterly Reports and the Risks Log.

Project issues and actions

An issue is something that can be solved internally by managerial actions. An issue could be a request for change, or a question or statement or a management concern. An issue usually refers to a deliverable but could refer to overarching management concerns.

For instance, a request for change could be the identified need to modify the project implementation modality, or to delegate the implementation of a specific component to a different partner, or to change or add an activity in order to achieve an output.

For instance, a more general issue could be an unmet funding requirement for a specific activity, the need to extend the timelines for implementation, the inexperience/lack of training of project staff in monitoring.

Content:
> Explain the main implementation issues encountered in the course of the year and the management actions taken to solve the issues. Use the part on implementation issues in the Quarterly Reports.

V. Lessons learnt and next steps

(suggested one page)

> This section is an analysis of lessons learnt that can be usefully applied to the next stage of implementation or to other projects in this sector/area. This section will then make recommendations for the next stage of implementation. This section is the conclusion of the narrative.

Lessons learnt

State the main lessons that can be drawn from the year experiences that may have application (generic, or specific to the next steps in the next reporting period). Explain the best and worst practices in designing, undertaking, monitoring and evaluating outputs, activities and partnerships.

Recommendations

Describe the corrective actions recommended for the new, ongoing or future UNDP work. Describe the priority actions planned for the following year to overcome constraints, build on achievements and partnerships, and use the lessons learnt during the previous year. In particular, make clear recommendations for the future approach to addressing the main problems that could jeopardize the success for the review of the Project Board

VI. Financial status and utilization

> This section includes the following:
>
> 1) A '*financial status report*' covering all funding donated to the project (core and non-core resources); include reference to all donor contributions.[2] The purpose is to ensure that donors can identify, at a glance, how much of their contribution was expended during for the project as a whole, and the year in question.
>
> 2) A '*financial utilization report*', which presents project disbursements vis-à-vis the project latest budget for the year. This summary is presented by a) ATLAS Activity (or major budget line) and b) by donor.

---

[2] Please note that the term "Committed" refers to funding which has been obligated by signed agreement, but not necessarily released by the donor. "Received" refers to funding which has already been committed and released by the donor.

Financial status

If the project has multiple phases, all figures should refer only to the current phase of the project (refer to the dates in the project document).

Table 1: Contribution overview [start date of the project – end date of project][3]

DONOR NAME	CONTRIBUTIONS		CONTRIBUTION BALANCE
	Committed	Received	
ex: UNDP			
ex: USAID			
ex: Canada/CIDA			
TOTAL	-	-	-

Table 2: Funding status (as of the end of the year)

DONOR NAME	RECEIVED*	EXPENDITURES			PROJECT BALANCE	EARMARKED**	AVAILABLE FUNDING (as of 1 Jan of the next year)	REMARKS
		Period Prior to the Reporting Year	Reporting Year Only	TOTAL				
ex: UNDP								
ex: USAID								
ex: Canada/CIDA								
								-
								-
								-
TOTAL		-	-			-		

*The *Received* column in this table should match the figures in the column (of the same title) in the Resource Overview table.
**The *Earmarked* column should specify if any donors have earmarked their funding to a specific activity or other requirement.

Financial utilization

---

[3] The "resource overview" can be any kind of chart (a pie chart, for example, would be an effective way of demonstrating a funding gap).

The figures in this section (budget, expenditure, and balance) can refer only to the reporting period (i.e. one year).

Table 3: Annual expenditure by activity [1 January – 31 December]

Activity	BUDGET [year]	EXPENDITURES [4]	BALANCE	DELIVERY (%)
Activity 1 [Activity Description]				
Activity 2 [Activity Description]				
Activity 3 [Activity Description]				
Activity 4 [Activity Description]				
Activity 5 [Activity Description]				
UNDP GMS (based on donor agreements)				
Total				

Table 4: Annual expenditure by donor [1 January – 31 December]

DONORS	ACTIVITY (as in ATLAS)	BUDGET [year]	EXPENDITURES*	BALANCE	DELIVERY RATE (%)	REMARKS*
Name of Donor	Activity 1: [Activity Description]					
	Activity 2: [Activity Description]					
	Activity 3: [Activity Description]					
	Activity 4: [Activity Description]					
	Activity 5: [Activity Description]					
GMS [insert %, see donor agreement]						
Subtotal [Name of Donor]						
Name of Donor	Activity 1: [Activity Description]					
	Activity 3: [Activity Description]					
	Activity 5: [Activity Description]					
GMS [insert %, see donor agreement]						
Subtotal [Name of Donor]						
Name of Donor	Activity 1: [Activity Description]					
	Activity 2: [Activity Description]					
	Activity 4: [Activity Description]					
GMS [insert %, see donor agreement]						
Subtotal [Name of Donor]						
TOTAL						

*Remarks provided in the last column of this table should pertain to any notable aspects of utilization/delivery % vis-à-vis the relevant donor(s).

[4] The expenditures for the year may be further broken down by quarters (four additional columns for quarters 1-4).

Mandatory Format:

1) **Titles.** Expenditure tables under the 'Financial utilization' part of this section must spell out the activity description titles as specified in the project budget and the names of donors. ATLAS codes can be included as well but are not sufficient.

2) **Figures.** All figures must be in USD, and should be rounded to whole numbers. No decimals.

3) **General Management Support (GMS).** All figures must be inclusive of UNDP GMS %. When the draft is submitted to UNDP CO via email, please specify whether or not the draft includes GMS. If not, UNDP CO finance will insert it.

IMPORTANT NOTE

When submitting your draft report to UNDP country office, please include the following: 1) a soft copy of all financial tables in Excel in addition to any tables embedded in the report and 2) specify whether the figures come from ATLAS or from the project.

Annexes

Multi-Annual Work Plan (or RRF)

Charts, tables and visual aids, with accompanying analytical descriptions (1-2 paragraphs per table/chart).