



## PROJECT REPORT 2018

JANUARY – MARCH 2018

United Nations Development Programme Cambodia

### CoWES – Collaborative Management for Watershed and Ecosystem Service Protection and Rehabilitation in the Cardamom Mountains, Upper Prek Thnot River Basin

01-01-2018– 31-03-2018

---

**Project ID & Title:** CoWES/ID:00090509

**Duration:** Three Years Project (July 2017- July 2020)

**Total Budget:** 1,490,917.00 US Dollars

**Implementing Partners:** Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF)

**UNDAF Outcome:** By 2018, people living in Cambodia, in particular youth, women and vulnerable groups, are enabled to actively participate in and benefit equitably from growth and development that is sustainable and does not compromise the well-being or natural or cultural resources of future generations.

**UNDP Strategic Plan Output 1.3:** Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.

## Table of Contents

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| 1.   | Executive summary .....                 | 3  |
| 2.   | Implementation progress .....           | 4  |
| 2.1. | Progress towards project outputs:.....  | 5  |
| 2.2. | Progress toward project outcomes:.....  | 8  |
| 3.   | Capacity Development: .....             | 9  |
| 4.   | Gender: .....                           | 9  |
| 5    | Environemntal and social safeguard..... | 10 |
| 6    | Lessons learnt: .....                   | 10 |
| 7.   | Project implementation challenges:..... | 10 |
| 8    | Project risks and actions: .....        | 11 |
| 9    | Key project issues and actions: .....   | 11 |
| 10.  | Donor Visibility:.....                  | 11 |
| 11.  | Project board meeting.....              | 11 |
| 11   | Financial report.....                   | 13 |

# **Collaborative Management for Watershed and Ecosystem Service Protection and Rehabilitation in the Cardamom Mountains, Upper Prek Thnot River Basin (CoWES)**

## **2018 Progress Report (January-March 2018)**

---

### **1. Executive summary**

First quarter of year 2018, CoWES Project implementation was to carry out spillover activities from year 2017 such as start-up phase including reviewing and amending project document. The project result-framework, development of project outputs, implementation strategy, indicators etc. were timely consumed to accommodate the comments and inputs from different stakeholders including MAFF, UNDP, GEF Regional Office in Bangkok, Local Authorities and other stakeholders. The modification of project document is very important in order to update social, environmental, economic and political development in Cambodia, particularly at project area/sites, Phnom Sruoch and Oral District, Kampong Speu Province. Additionally, development of multi-year budget and activity plans is strongly required inputs, consensus and agreement from project board's members.

The key achievements of project implementation in the first quarter are:

The first project board meeting was successfully organized on January 25, 2018 at Kampong Speu Province to approve the proposed changes of project's document, result-framework, implementation strategy, multi-year activity and budget plan (yearly budget allocations).

Two-year activity and budget plan (2018-2019) was developed and approved by Regional Technical Advisor (RTA)/GEF Bangkok Office, UNDP and MAFF. For partnership building with NGO (local NGO), the thematic papers, activity-budget plan, MoU and term of reference developed before started ground activities at 3 target communes (Krang Devay, Trapeang Chor and Tasal) in second quarter.

## 2. Implementation progress

There are 7 outputs under 3 components to be achieved by the end of project's life (2020). Going along with output's statement and annual work plan and budget (AWPB) approved by project board, there were 5 targets setting for an achievement within year 2018 as an overlap of election's year for Cambodian national assembly, this event could affect to project's momentum due to most government's officials will engage with political campaign between May and August.

In this quarter, the efforts invested for consensus building for finalization of inception report, planning and preparation of project board meeting. A modified/amended project's document was also consumed time to get an agreement from relevant stakeholders, so these led to passive progresses for CoWES. The progresses against setting targets describes as below:

3 targets setting under output 1.1: SLM priorities mainstreamed into local authority area plans in collaboration with MAFF and partners

Target 1: Situation and livelihood analysis conducted and micro-watershed resource assessment made at target communes (no progress).

Target 2: Commune and community action plans developed at target communes (no progress)

Target 3: Support service plan developed to respond the community plans and to address the assessment's results (no progress).

A single target setting under output 1.2: Suitable SLM practices for small landholders demonstrated

Target 4: Understanding of local authorities and communities on sustainable land management (SLM), soil water conservation and agroforestry (no progress).

A target setting under output 2.1: Prioritized actions to accelerate Community Forestry (CF) implementation, reflected in local authority and MAFF programs of action

Target 5: Rapid assessment on current status and trend of community forestry (CF) and community protected areas (CPA) conducted at target districts and communes (no progress).

All 5 targets above have not yet implementation. However, a partnership building with NGO (consensus agreement) will kick off project's activities by NGO (Mlup Baitong) during the second quarter.

Key activities implemented during first quarter were:

- Prepared and organized first project board meeting: the first project board meeting was successfully organized on January 25, 2018 in order to approve the proposed changes of project's document, reviewed and approved result-framework, implementation strategy, multi-year work plan and 2018 annual work plan and budget (AWPB).

- Work with start-up advisor in order to finalize inception report, this report conducted by international advisor (supported by project team) with contributed inputs from relevant stakeholders.
- Work with NGO (Mlub Baitong) to develop work and budget plan and to draft memorandum of understanding (MoU) between MAFF and Mlub Baitong. Series of meetings between and among MB, project team and MAFF conducted in order to reach consensus. On March 7, 2018, an agreement made between MB and MAFF for partnership building. Currently, MB and project team have finalized relevant papers such as MoU, logical framework, term of reference and budgeting for an official signature before started implementation.
- Recruitment of M&E officer and National Coordinator is under process. It is anticipated that both positions will be on board in April or May.
- A vehicle and required office equipment (2 office desk, 3 chairs, 2 laptops, safe box, 2 filing cabinets etc.) were procured.
- Project and UNDP staffs participated in project management training for UNDP-GEF projects in Asia and the Pacific from 26-28 March 2018 at Bangkok, Thailand to learn and share good practices, achievements and challenges between among countries implementing GEF fund project.
- Connection with relevant stakeholders (both governmental institutions, university and NGOs) through the meetings, discussion and consultations to expand relationship and knowledge around agroforestry, community forestry and environmental related subjects. With this network, selected technologies and best practices on agriculture listed to apply for small landholder farming at project target areas.

## 2.1. Progress towards project outputs:

| Output Indicators  | Baseline<br>(Jan 2018) | 2018 Targets<br>(December)   | Status  |
|--|------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Output 1.1:</b> SLM priorities mainstreamed into local authority area plans in collaboration with MAFF and partners   |                        |  |   |
| <b>Indicators 1.1.1:</b><br># Communes with plans, budgets and working groups reflecting landscape (land and water) based SLM strategies agreed with District, MAFF and key partners | (0)                    | Target 1: Situation and livelihood analysis conducted and micro-watershed resource assessment made at target communes. | No progress: it is expecting to facilitate by NGO on ground-activity implementation. Currently, MoU between MAFF and MB is under preparation. |
|  |                        | Target 2: Commune and community action plans developed at target communes  | No progress: it is expecting to facilitate by NGO on ground-activity implementation.  |
|  |                        | Target 3: Support service plan developed to respond the community plans and to address the assessment's results.       | No progress: it is expecting to facilitate by NGO on ground-activity implementation.  |
| - delivery exceeds plan  |                        | - delivery in line with plan   | - delivery below plan   |
| Partnership building with NGO and MAFF technical departments, the ground activities will be started at target communes early second quarter.   |                        |  |   |

| <b>Output 1.2:</b> Suitable SLM practices for small landholders demonstrated.  |                              |   |  |
|--|------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Indicators:</b><br>1.2.1. Percentage of men and women in the adopting SLM practices/technologies (including agroecology friendly practices) in the pilot communes<br><br>1.2.2. No. Communes with SLM oriented extension support system for men and women famers in place | (0)<br><br>(0)               | Target 4: Understanding of local authorities and communities on sustainable land management (SLM), soil water conservation and agroforestry | No progress: it is expecting to facilitate by NGO on ground-activity implementation. |
| - delivery exceeds plan  | - delivery in line with plan | - delivery below plan   |  |
| Partnership building with NGO and MAFF technical departments, the ground activities will be started at target communes early second quarter.   |                              |   |  |

| <b>Output 1.3:</b> Suitable land use practices demonstrated among medium to large scale agribusiness entities                |                              |                                |   |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Indicators:</b><br>1.3.1. No. of Agreements with key Agribusiness on relevant practices executed and under implementation | (0)                          | It was target in 2019 and 2020 | It was target in 2019 and 2020, therefore, no progress made |
| - delivery exceeds plan  | - delivery in line with plan | - delivery below plan          |   |
| Not applicable, it was target in 2019 and 2020   |                              |                                |   |

| <b>Output 2.1:</b> Prioritized actions to accelerate CF implementation, reflected in local authority and MAFF programs of action  |                              |   |  |
|---|------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Indicators:</b><br>2.1.1. No of collaborative, local authority -base plans to address CF implementation issues (including law enforcement) and livelihood opportunities<br><br>2.1.2. Indicator: % of CF with enhanced plans under implementation, in pilot communes | (0)<br><br>(0)               | Target 5: Rapid assessment on current status and trend of community forestry (CF) and community protected areas (CPA) conducted at target districts and communes. | No progress: it is expecting to facilitate by NGO on ground-activity implementation. |
| - delivery exceeds plan   | - delivery in line with plan | - delivery below plan   |  |
| No progress: it is expecting to facilitate by NGO on ground-activity implementation   |                              |   |  |

| <b>Output 2.2:</b> Suitable restoration strategies and livelihood enterprises demonstrated  |                                      |                                |  |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Indicators:</b><br>2.2.1. No. and type of Forest restoration strategies in place<br><br>2.2.2. No of men and women benefitting from forest based livelihoods and agroecology friendly farming practices) | N/A (TBI in Q2 by MB or M&E Officer) | It was target in 2019 and 2020 | It was target in 2019 and 2020, therefore no progress made |
|   | N/A TBI in Q2 by MB or M&E Officer)  |                                |  |
| - delivery exceeds plan   |                                      | - delivery in line with plan   | - delivery below plan                                      |
| Not applicable, it was target in 2019 and 2020  |                                      |                                |  |

| <b>Output 3.1:</b> Capacity of key stakeholders to develop and start a program of action for watershed management in place  |     |                                |  |
|---|-----|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Indicators:</b><br>3.1.1. No. of stakeholder based sectors trained to on collaborative watershed management<br><br>3.1.2. Collaborative watershed wide Program of action and interim coordination mechanism in place | (0) | It was target in 2019 and 2020 | It was target in 2019 and 2020, therefore no progress made |
|   | (0) |                                |  |
| - delivery exceeds plan   |     | - delivery in line with plan   | - delivery below plan                                      |
| Not applicable, it was target in 2019 and 2020  |     |                                |  |

| <b>Output 3.2:</b> Participatory monitoring and assessment to support agreed upon program of action is in place                                    |                                     |                                |  |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Indicator:</b><br>3.2.1. No of agreements executed at different local levels with stakeholder groups who can help monitor agreed upon indicator | NA (TBI in Q2 by MB or M&E Officer) | It was target in 2019 and 2020 | It was target in 2019 and 2020, therefore no progress made |
|  |                                     |                                |  |
| - delivery exceeds plan  |                                     | - delivery in line with plan   | - delivery below plan                                      |
| Not applicable, it was target in 2019 and 2020   |                                     |                                |  |

|   |          |  |  |
|---|----------|--|--|
| <b>Project operation and management</b> | Start-up | Modification of project document, operation and office set up. | Project document revised especially result-framework, a consensus built during the inception workshop (Dec 15, 2017) and approved by PB on January 25, 2018.<br>Inception report finalized and submitted on January 28, 2018.<br>Recruitment of 2 positions (M&E officer and national coordinator) |
| - delivery exceeds plan                 |          | - delivery in line with plan                                   | - delivery below plan  |

## 2.2. Progress towards project outcomes:

| Outcome Indicators  | Baseline (Jan 2018)   | Target (2020)   | Current status  |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Objective:</b> To restore and maintain forest cover and watershed stability functions while providing for sustainable livelihoods and ecosystem services in the Upper Prek Thnot Watershed   |   |   |   |
| <b>Indicators</b>   |   |   | Too early for an assessment, it will assess/evaluate by the end of project (July 2020).             |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity to implement the strategic objectives of NAP as measured by the Capacity Development Scorecard. (MAFF and Local Authority, LA)</li> <li>Areas brought under productive land management in the project target areas</li> <li>% of targeted households (gender dis-aggregated data) in the project target areas benefitting from diversified livelihoods</li> </ul> | MAFF (14)<br>LA (13)<br><br>0<br><br>0  | LA-41<br>LA 28<br><br>150 has<br><br>15%  |   |
| <b>Component/Outcome 1:</b> On-farm soil conservation and agroforestry practices improved   |   |   |   |
| <b>Indicators:</b>  |   |   | It is a preparation stage for project-activity implementation.<br>No progress made in this quarter. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% increase in average gross and net income per household in forest area of Oral and Phnom Sruoch districts</li> <li>Land productivity for key commodity</li> <li>Labor productivity</li> <li># of PPP case study developed as model for applying good practices in watershed management</li> </ul>   | 1.1: (0)<br>1.2: (2t/ha)-<br>Rice<br>Production per ha per year (Dist. Profile 2017)—M&E and MB will work more in 2018.<br>1.3: (250\$): net income per person per year—district profile 2017-M&E and MB will work more in 2018<br>1.4: (0) | 10%<br><br>2.2t/ha (rice)-- M&E and MB will work more detail in 2018<br><br>300\$/person/year-- M&E and MB will work more detail in 2018<br><br>(1) |   |
| <b>Component / Outcome 2:</b> Community forest areas restored and sustainably managed   |   |   |   |
| <b>Indicators:</b>  |   |   | It is a preparation stage for project-activity implementation.<br>No progress made in this quarter  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% increase in forest and vegetation cover of commune forest in locally prioritized micro watersheds based on land use management plan, strengthened law enforcement,</li> </ul>  | 2.1: (0)  | (10%)   |   |



|   |          |       |  |
|---|----------|-------|--|
| conservation and land use<br>• % increase in average gross net income per participating households (20% of baseline among CF in pilot communes).  | 2.2: (0) | (20%) |  |
| <b>Component /Outcome 3:</b> Watershed management and monitoring capacity improved  |          |       |  |
| <b>Indicators:</b><br>• A collaborative program of action to enforce regulations and establish provincial level administrative mechanisms for Prek Tnoat watershed <i>management</i> is in place and functional<br>• # of measurement parameters for management of soil, water, land and forests, defined and included in a functional M& E system that <i>supports agreed upon watershed management strategies</i> | (0)      | (1)   | It is a preparation stage for project-activity implementation.<br>No progress made in this quarter |
|   | (0)      | (10)  |  |

### 3. Capacity Development:

Training plan developed in inception phase, however the training need assessment and designation will be formulated based on result of situation analysis facilitating by contracted NGO in collaboration with MAFF technical departments/individual experts. Other training methods will be applied during the project's implementation such as exposure visits for learning the best practices, workshops, consultations, meetings, case studies and development of knowledge management.

### 4. Gender Marker:

The gender action plan (GAP) was developed during the inception phase to respond to the needs and priorities of women within the community, and particularly those of poor and vulnerable women. This Project Gender Action Plan (GAP) combines measures to ensure that women have equal opportunity as men, to participate and to benefit from project activities.

The Project GAP adopts three-pronged approaches that aims to ensure the meaningful participation of women and girls, rather than only representation: (1) raising the awareness of the overall community of the differential gender aspects on sustainable land management and community forestry; (2) ensuring inclusivity and facilitating participation of all types of participants in the different aspects of project implementation; and, (3) specific livelihoods support inclusive to all beneficiaries particularly the affected women.

The gender's aspect was mainstreamed to all activities under project's intervention (all 3 components) with a clear percentage/quantity of female beneficiaries and participants in project activities or capacity-development opportunities.

## **5. Environment and Social Safeguard**

Even the project has not start activities at the ground yet, but the project was hired start-up advisor to review and modify project's document (which was developed in 2014) in accommodating with present situation of project's sites. A series of consultations with local authorities, communities and local people were used as inputs for an improvement of implementation strategy such as livelihood, forest's restoration, functional watershed protection and sustainable land management. The situation analysis at target communes, participatory planning with local authorities and communities and setting of technical support mechanism by MAFF departments will mitigate negative impact to social and environment at project's areas. The monitoring and evaluation is an additional tool to prevent social and environmental implications cause by project intervention or implementation.

## **6. Lessons learnt:**

Knowledge strategy and knowledge mapping was developed during the inception phase to ensure the lesson learnt and best practice well recorded and documented during the project implementation. Going along with knowledge strategy, the communication and training plan was developed to support the visibility. There are 2 types of knowledge will be generated by CoWES project, a first one is local knowledge relating to local people who traditionally depends on the resources of watershed for their livelihood and second knowledge is science-based knowledge to using research data, planning and innovative technologies such as SLM, climate smart agriculture and interaction between farming and community forestry. It is strongly believed that the good practices will be well documented and shared with stakeholders as well as using to support for updating national action plan for land degradation (NAP) and MAFF programs.

## **7. Project implementation challenges:**

There are some challenges identified during the consultation in the start-up phase such as the upcoming election of national assembly will slow down project implementation for year 2018, because most of political parties, especially local authorities are busy with electoral process even before and after election. Additional challenge, there are not many MAFF staffs are working and supporting to CoWES project due their workload with ministerial duties and functions. It would a best to engage young staffs from relevant departments under MAFF working as volunteers, so they would have opportunities to learn knowledge and gain skills during project's life such as sustainable land management (SLM), community forest and watershed management. Start with voluntary work then their skills will gradually built (both soft and technical/hard skills) along CoWES project implementation.

As result of ethnological study conducted in September 2017 found that land security/land encroachment is a critical issue at upper part of Preak Tnoat Watershed, most of land areas converted into mango plantation and ELC, so poor land governance effected to landscape and watershed management. Therefore, working with local authorities, especially commune and district levels are best strategy.

There was difficulty to meet and discuss with ELCs located at target districts during the inception phase, therefore active and strong support from MAFF's leadership is required for

mobilization of ELC's participation/involvement in soil productivity and sustainable land management

#### **8. Project risks and actions:**

The anticipated risks were identified in project document and additional risks also indicated in inception report such as economic development and other priorities overshadow natural resource management needs, farming and village households in project target areas (including CF) reluctant to give up charcoal making as supplementary source of income etc. However, there is strongly anticipated that the risks will be mitigated during project implementation and under managerial guidance of project board and technical supports from MAFF departments. For detail please find risk log.

#### **9. Key project issues and actions:**

Insufficiency of MAFF staffs to execute project activities because they all are busy with department's duties and functions as their mandate's performance. Currently, there were a few project staffs and management (project manager and director) are coordinating, managing and implementing in this project with a slow progress made. Therefore, under decision/guidance of project board, project is building partnership with NGO and technical departments to push forward activities at target communes. Additionally, the encouragement and mobilization of supports from local administration is strongly required to kick-off the actions in April 2018. For detail, please find issue log.

#### **10. Donor Visibility:**

Under current GEF-UNDP financial support, all CoWES activities have been posting GEF and UNDP logo on backdrop of all event as well as project papers and acknowledgement has been made to project's donors. UNDP and GEF representatives had invited to participate in relevant project activities such as inception workshop and project board meeting.

#### **11. First project board meeting**

The first project board (PB) meeting was organized on 25 January 2018 at Holiday Hotel, Kampong Speu provincial town in order to review and approve the proposed changes of project document, theory of change, result framework, multi-year plan, 2018 annual work and budget plan and implantation strategy. The key highlights of project's board meeting are:

**Board decision #1:** There was an overall agreement to the proposed changes to project document, result framework, the 3 components of the project, 7 expected outputs, project implementation strategy, developed/modified indicators, work and budget plan for 2018, consultancy service procurement, recruitment of full time staff for the project, service-contract with NGOs and sectoral departments and 3-year budget allocations.

**Action taken:** With decision and comments of project board, the inception report revised and finalized on February 28. The inception report was not only consolidated comments and inputs of project board, but also included comments from regional technical advisor, GEF office in Bangkok.

**Board decision #2:** The new members PDAFF and RUA were decided for adding to the existing steering committee fold;

**Action taken:** PDAFF and RUA were added in a list of project board members, but MAFF needs to issue an official letter/decision notifying both organizations as existing project board members.

**Board decision #3:** Agreed that the next steering committee meeting be held in a target district to provide opportunity for the committee members to meet with local community and view project activities on the ground;

**Action taken:** It was well noted, next board meeting will be organized at target districts, Phnom Sruoch or Tasal.

**Board decision #4:** Decided to allocate budget and detailed 3-year action plan for integration with development plans for the 3 project communes, and fund allocated to support the finalization of NAP;

**Action taken:** A package of budget was allocated to stimulate the participation of local authorities such as communes, district and province. Additionally, a small amount of budget also planned to support for publication or final meetings regarding national action plan (NAP, SLM).

**Board decision #5:** Decided on engaging more women taking into account equitable gender in project implementation for all the project activities, with project impact on woman participants and non-participants in the project to be studied;

**Action taken:** The gender action plan (GAP) developed and will use as roadmap to promote an equitable gender in CoWES project implementation.

**Board decision #6:** Agreed in principle to extend the project end date to 2020 pending a review during the next steering committee meeting in 2019; and

**Action taken:** On-hold due to this issue will discuss more detail next project board meeting.

**Board decision #7:** Agreed that no technical advisory committee was needed in the project implementation structure as proposed by consultant instead focal point at relevant sectoral agencies was endorsed

**Action taken:** Department of Agricultural Land Resource Management (DALRM) is preliminary identified as focal point in Component 1. The relevant papers are under drafting for discussion and agreement between MAFF and the department.

## 12. Finance

**Table 1: Contribution overview [2017 – 2020]**

| DONOR NAME        | CONTRIBUTIONS          |                        | ACTUAL EXPENSES AS OF 31 MARCH 2018 | BALANCE                |
|-------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
|                   | Committed              | Received               |                                     |                        |
| GEF               | \$ 1,100,917.00        | \$ 1,100,917.00        | \$ 132,972.47                       | \$ 967,944.53          |
| UNDP (TRACT FUND) | \$ 150,000.00          | \$ 150,000.00          | \$ 22,332.79                        | \$ 127,667.21          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>      | <b>\$ 1,250,917.00</b> | <b>\$ 1,250,917.00</b> | <b>\$ 155,305.26</b>                | <b>\$ 1,095,611.74</b> |

**Table 2: Quarterly expenditure by project output or Activity (Jan 2018 – March 2018) against total budget in 2018**

| Activity   | Description  | 2018 QUARTER 1 (JAN-MAR) |                                    |                     |                     |                      |            |
|--|--|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------|
|  |  | Budget                   | Actual Expenditures (Jan-Mar 2018) |                     |                     | Balance              | Delivery % |
|  |  |                          | MAFF (Disbursement)                | UNDP (Disbursement) | TOTAL               |                      |            |
| <b>COMPONENT 1: On Farm Soil Conservation and Agroforestry Practices Improved.</b> |  |                          |                                    |                     |                     |                      |            |
| Activity 1.1.1   | SLM priorities mainstreamed into local authority area plans in collaboration with MAFF and partners            | \$ 55,559.76             | \$ 1,763.45                        | \$ 1,998.44         | \$ 3,761.89         | \$ 51,797.87         | 7%         |
| Activity 1.2   | Suitable SLM practices for small landholders demonstrated.   | \$ 39,714.29             |                                    |                     | \$ -                | \$ 39,714.29         | 0%         |
| Activity 1.3   | Suitable land use practices demonstrated among medium to large scale agribusiness entities.                    | \$ 26,100.00             | \$ 12,956.30                       |                     | \$ 12,956.30        | \$ 13,143.70         | 50%        |
| <b>Sub-total Component 1:</b>  |  | <b>\$ 121,374.05</b>     | <b>\$ 14,719.75</b>                | <b>\$ 1,998.44</b>  | <b>\$ 16,718.19</b> | <b>\$ 104,655.86</b> | <b>14%</b> |
| <b>COMPONENT 2: Community Forest Areas restored and sustainably managed</b>        |  |                          |                                    |                     |                     |                      |            |
| Activity 2.1.1   | Prioritized actions to accelerate CF implementation, reflected in local authority and MAFF programs of action. | \$ 20,677.36             | \$ -                               | \$ 1,841.35         | \$ 1,841.35         | \$ 18,836.01         | 9%         |
| Activity 2.2.1   | Suitable restoration strategies and livelihood enterprises demonstrated.                                       | \$ 86,307.14             | \$ -                               | \$ 7,577.02         | \$ 7,577.02         | \$ 78,730.12         | 9%         |
| <b>Sub-total Component 2:</b>  |  | <b>\$ 106,984.50</b>     | <b>\$ -</b>                        | <b>\$ 9,418.37</b>  | <b>\$ 9,418.37</b>  | <b>\$ 97,566.13</b>  | <b>9%</b>  |
| <b>COMPONENT 3: Watershed Management and monitoring capacity improved</b>          |  |                          |                                    |                     |                     |                      |            |
| Activity 3.1.1   | Capacity of key stakeholders to develop and start a program of action for watershed management in place.       | \$ 143,676.53            |                                    | \$ 3,098.76         | \$ 3,098.76         | \$ 140,577.77        | 2%         |
| Activity 3.2.1   | Participatory monitoring and assessment to support agreed upon program of action is in place                   | \$ 55,774.80             |                                    | \$ 36.30            | \$ 36.30            | \$ 55,738.50         | 0%         |
| <b>Sub-total Component 3:</b>  |  | <b>\$ 199,451.33</b>     | <b>\$ -</b>                        | <b>\$ 3,135.06</b>  | <b>\$ 3,135.06</b>  | <b>\$ 196,316.27</b> | <b>2%</b>  |
| <b>PROJECT MANAGEMENT COST</b>   |  | <b>\$ 45,067.42</b>      | <b>\$ -</b>                        | <b>\$ 5,360.51</b>  | <b>\$ 5,360.51</b>  | <b>\$ 39,706.91</b>  | <b>12%</b> |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   |  | <b>\$ 472,877.30</b>     | <b>\$ 14,719.75</b>                | <b>\$ 19,912.38</b> | <b>\$ 34,632.13</b> | <b>\$ 438,245.17</b> | <b>7%</b>  |

**Table 3: Cumulative expenditure by Activity (in Atlas format) [from July 2017 to 31 March 2018]**

| Activity  | TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET   | CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURE as of 31 March 2018 |                      |                      | BALANCE                | DELIVERY (%) |
|---|------------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------|
|   |                        | Govt/MAFF (Disbursed)                      | UNDP (Disbursed)     | TOTAL                |                        |              |
| <b>ACTIVITY1.1:</b> Assessment to define target areas and interventions in Aural and Phnum Sruoch districts                           | \$ 33,482.67           | \$ -                                       | \$ 33,482.67         | \$ 33,482.67         | \$ -                   | 100.00%      |
| <b>Activity 1.1.1:</b> SLM priorities mainstreamed into local authority area plans in collaboration with MAFF and partners            | \$ 110,364.82          | \$ 1,763.45                                | \$ 1,998.44          | \$ 3,761.89          | \$ 106,602.93          | 3.41%        |
| <b>ACTIVITY1.2:</b> Suitable SLM practices for small landholders demonstrated.  | \$ 84,000.01           | \$ -                                       | \$ -                 | \$ -                 | \$ 84,000.01           | 0.00%        |
| <b>ACTIVITY1.3:</b> Suitable land use practices demonstrated among medium to large scale agribusiness entities.                       | \$ 50,121.20           | \$ 15,275.50                               | \$ -                 | \$ 15,275.50         | \$ 34,845.70           | 30.48%       |
| <b>ACTIVITY2.1:</b> Restoration of selected community-managed forest lands using appropriate methodologies                            | \$ 60.00               | \$ -                                       | \$ 60.00             | \$ 60.00             | \$ -                   | 100.00%      |
| <b>Activity 2.1.1:</b> Prioritized actions to accelerate CF implementation, reflected in local authority and MAFF programs of action. | \$ 86,693.40           | \$ -                                       | \$ 1,841.35          | \$ 1,841.35          | \$ 84,852.05           | 2.12%        |
| <b>ACTIVITY2.2:</b> Capacity development to improve local livelihoods in Dam Ray Chak Pluk Community Forest                           | \$ 11,469.05           | \$ -                                       | \$ 11,469.05         | \$ 11,469.05         | \$ -                   | 100.00%      |
| <b>Activity 2.2.1:</b> Suitable restoration strategies and livelihood enter   | \$ 201,724.34          | \$ -                                       | \$ 7,577.02          | \$ 7,577.02          | \$ 194,147.32          | 3.76%        |
| <b>ACTIVITY3.1:</b> Establishing functional institutional arrangements for watershed management authority in Kampong Speu province    | \$ 9,531.50            | \$ -                                       | \$ 9,531.50          | \$ 9,531.50          | \$ -                   | 100.00%      |
| <b>Activity 3.1.1:</b> Capacity of key stakeholders to develop and start a program of action for watershed management in place.       | \$ 284,700.00          | \$ -                                       | \$ 3,098.76          | \$ 3,098.76          | \$ 281,601.24          | 1.09%        |
| <b>ACTIVITY3.2:</b> Development of basic, scalable monitoring and assessment system for land degradation.                             | \$ 43,669.71           | \$ 11,895.68                               | \$ 31,774.03         | \$ 43,669.71         | \$ -                   | 100.00%      |
| <b>Activity 3.2.1:</b> Participatory monitoring and assessment to support agreed upon program of action is in place                   | \$ 212,100.30          | \$ -                                       | \$ 36.30             | \$ 36.30             | \$ 212,064.00          | 0.02%        |
| Project Management Cost   | \$ 123,000.00          | \$ -                                       | \$ 25,501.51         | \$ 25,501.51         | \$ 97,498.49           | 20.73%       |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>\$ 1,250,917.00</b> | <b>\$ 28,934.63</b>                        | <b>\$ 126,370.63</b> | <b>\$ 155,305.26</b> | <b>\$ 1,095,611.74</b> | <b>2.31%</b> |

## Work plan Q2

| No. | Events/tasks   | Focal point     | Quarter 2, 2018 |    |    |    |     |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
|-----|--|-----------------|-----------------|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|
|     |  |                 | April           |    |    |    | May |    |    |    | June |    |    |    |
|     |  |                 | W1              | W2 | W3 | W4 | W1  | W2 | W3 | W4 | W1   | W2 | W3 | W4 |
| 1   | Develop Micro watershed planning (National consultant)   | MAFF            |                 |    |    |    |     |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| 2   | Project site visit and meeting with stakeholder at sub-national level  | MAFF & Advisors |                 |    |    |    |     |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| 3   | Trip to India to join workshop on how to write a book related to UNCCD   | MAFF            |                 |    |    |    |     |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| 4   | Conduct community participatory situational analysis   | MB              |                 |    |    |    |     |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| 5   | Develop commune and community action plan with differentiated targets for men and women about the importance of SLM, SWC and NRM | MB              |                 |    |    |    |     |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| 6   | Technical support for Agroforestry (National consultant)   | MB/MAFF         |                 |    |    |    |     |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| 7   | Technical support for Landscape-based Agriculture Extension (National consultant)  | MB/MAFF         |                 |    |    |    |     |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |
| 8   | Stimulation of participatory local authorities (Local Administrations)   | MB/ Communes    |                 |    |    |    |     |    |    |    |      |    |    |    |





**ANNEXES**

1. Issues log template
2. Risk log template