

**Mid-term Evaluation of the CALM (Conservation Areas through
Landscape Management in the Northern Plains of Cambodia)
Project**

Project ID: PIMS 2177

Prepared for UNDP Cambodia

by

Richard E. Salter and Nga Prom

October 2009

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CALM (Conservation Areas through Landscape Management)
CDP (Commune Development Plan)
CSO (Community Support Organization)
CSPPM (Civil Society and Pro-Poor Market)
DANIDA (Danish International Development Agency)
e.g. for example
FA (Forestry Administration)
FLD (Farmer Livelihood Development)
GDANCP (General Department for Administration of Nature Conservation and Protection)
GEF (Global Environment Facility)
i.e. (that is)
ITTO (International Tropical Timber Organization)
IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources)
KIPD (Khmer Institute for Peace and Development)
KPWS (Kulen Promtep Wildlife Sanctuary)
MAFF (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries)
MDG (Millennium Development Goal)
MIST (spatial Management Information System [Ecological Software Solutions])
MoE (Ministry of Environment)
MoU (Memorandum of Understanding)
NFP (National Forestry Program)
NGO (Non-Governmental Organization)
PAG (Project Advisory Group)
PB (Project Board)
PEG (Project Executive Group)
PIU (Project Implementation Unit)
PK (Ponlok Khmer)
PLUP (Participatory Land Use Planning)
PSC (Project Steering Committee)
PSDD (Project Support to Deconcentration and Decentralization)
PVPF (Preah Vihear Protected Forest)
RCAF (Royal Cambodian Armed Forces)
REDD (Reduced Emissions from Degradation and Deforestation)
RGC (Royal Government of Cambodia)
RULIP (Rural Livelihoods Improvement Project)
SLM (Sustainable Land Management)
SMP (Sansom Mlup Prey)
SVC (Sam Veasna Centre for Conservation)
ToR (Terms of Reference)
TRAC (Targeted Resources at the Core)
UNDP (United Nations Development Programme)
UNFIP (United Nations Fund for International Partnerships)
WCS (Wildlife Conservation Society)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The CALM Project is a seven year GEF-supported initiative aimed at conserving the globally important biodiversity found in the Northern Plains of Cambodia, where human land and resource use pose increasing threats. The Project supports provincial-level land use planning processes, demonstration of land-use interventions at three key sites, and strengthening of biodiversity management by government in two protected areas. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the Project at the mid-point of its seven year implementation period, and to recommend corrective actions to ensure that the Project achieves its goals and objectives by scheduled closure at the end of 2012. The Project was formulated in accordance with standard GEF policies and procedures and is designed to work closely with a variety of national and local institutions and other projects. The Project is implemented by WCS, with MoE and MAFF's Forestry Administration as the key government partners. Oversight is provided by a Project Board with representatives from UNDP, MoE and WCS.

Work planning, budgeting and reporting have proceeded largely as initially planned, and at its mid-point the Project is well on track to attain its objectives by scheduled Project closure in 2012. The Project contributes substantially to upgrading the skills of national staff by providing work experience and training in a well-funded and well-equipped environment, including technical mentoring by WCS national and international staff. The Project utilizes an adaptive management approach for rapid resolution of issues potentially impacting Project activities, and no major current requirements for corrective actions regarding the design, implementation, monitoring or evaluation of the Project have been identified. However sustainability over the longer-term remains an issue that requires monitoring and periodic re-examination, and further consideration in conjunction with planning for Project closure.

The Project has utilized and incorporated both innovative and best practice techniques during the first half of its implementation. Examples include support to the growing and marketing of "wildlife friendly" rice, the development and operation of a community-based ecotourism enterprise at a globally important site for populations of giant and white-shouldered ibises, feasibility assessments and planning for initiatives that will compensate Cambodia for reducing emissions from forest degradation (REDD), continuation of a bird nest protection programme across the Northern Plains, support to staff training, and implementation of a management information system (MIST) with proven utility in both law enforcement and biodiversity monitoring and management. Other initiatives include support to appropriate infrastructure development in protected areas, adoption of a pro-poor policy to ensure that those who are most reliant on exploitation of natural resources and wildlife for their livelihoods also benefit from conservation activities, adoption of a gender strategy to ensure integration of women's needs into community and land use planning activities, and use of local NGOs as partners in implementing Project activities, which is both cost-effective and supportive of national capacity development.

The report includes proposals for future directions of the Project, including 25 specific recommendations, a review of lessons learned, and an assessment of practices used by the Project in addressing issues related to relevance, performance and success.

Primary conclusions are:

- the Project remains highly relevant within the broader global and national contexts
- government engagement and participation has been satisfactorily achieved to date
- stakeholder participation at all levels has been appropriate and adequate to date
- gender balance has occurred primarily in terms of participation in activities at community level, but is otherwise severely constrained by the lack of gender balance in the institutions involved in implementation of field activities (which is largely beyond the Project's control)

- the Project has developed effective partnerships with the relevant government institutions, other projects, NGOs and Community-based Institutions
- Project activities implemented to-date have been of high technical quality and designed with environmental sustainability in mind
- the Project has catalyzed an array of effective biodiversity conservation activities across the northern plains of Cambodia. It has also (of necessity) played a catalytic role, along with other organizations, in helping to focus attention on current and proposed military activities and consequent threats to biodiversity resources and conservation effectiveness within and adjacent to the Project area. It is hoped that this attention will influence pending government decisions on proposed military family settlement concessions in and adjacent to key Project sites.
- considering the unexpected challenges faced by the Project, effectiveness (progress achieved against planned outputs and suboutputs) can be judged to be satisfactory to-date
- financial aspects of the Project were not examined in depth, but financial planning, tracking and auditing appear to be sufficient to ensure appropriate use of funds. No major issues regarding cost-effectiveness or financial supply were identified
- the monitoring and evaluation, risk management and review system used by the Project appears to have been appropriate and effective in ensuring the implementation of activities to-date.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation consultants are grateful for the support provided by UNDP and WCS in organizing and participating in implementation of the evaluation. We also thank all those who patiently provided answers to our questions and offered their views on the Project, including Project staff, government officials, and NGO and community participants. Senior staff of UNDP, WCS, the Asia Foundation, DANIDA, the ITTO Transboundary Project, MoE and Forestry Administration provided additional background on natural resource management activities in Cambodia, as well as insights into Project operations and challenges. We are particularly grateful to all those who provided review comments on drafts of the evaluation report. While we have made every effort to accurately reflect the information and opinions received, any remaining errors or omissions are our own.

TABLE OF CONTENTS¹

List of Abbreviations

Executive Summary

Acknowledgements

1. Introduction.....	7
1.1 Purpose of the evaluation.....	7
1.2 Key issues addressed.....	7
1.3 Methodology of the evaluation.....	8
1.4 Structure of the evaluation.....	9
2. The Project and its Development Context.....	9
2.1 Project start and its duration.....	9
2.2 Problems that the Project seeks to address.....	9
2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the Project.....	9
2.4 Main stakeholders.....	9
2.5 Expected results.....	10
3. Findings and Conclusions.....	10
3.1 Project formulation.....	10
3.1.1 Implementation approach.....	10
3.1.2 Country ownership/driven-ness.....	10
3.1.3 Stakeholder participation.....	10
3.1.4 Replication approach.....	11
3.1.5 Cost-effectiveness.....	11
3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage.....	11
3.1.7 Linkages between Project and other interventions within the sector.....	12
3.1.8 Indicators.....	12
3.1.9 Management arrangements.....	12
3.2 Project implementation.....	12
3.2.1 Financial planning/work planning.....	13
3.2.2 Monitoring and evaluation.....	13
3.2.3 Execution and implementation modalities.....	14
3.2.4 Management by UNDP Country Office.....	14
3.2.5 Coordination and operational issues.....	14
3.3 Project Results.....	16
3.3.1 Attainment of objectives.....	16
3.3.2 Sustainability of Project results.....	17
3.3.3 Contribution to upgrading skills of national staff.....	18
3.4 Recommendations.....	18
3.4.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Project.....	18
3.4.2 Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the Project.....	18
3.4.3 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives, particularly on	

¹ based on Annex A (Suggested Structure of the Final Evaluation Report) in the Terms of Reference for Mid-Term Evaluation

Project effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.....	21
3.4.4 Lessons learned.....	23
3.4.5 Desirable and undesirable practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.....	24
3.5 Conclusions.....	25

Tables

1. CALM progress status at mid-term as measured by indicators in the logical framework.....	28
2. CALM progress status at mid-term as measured by Project impact indicators.....	32

Annexes

1. Terms of Reference.....	36
2. Mid-Term Review Mission Itinerary.....	48
3. List of Persons Interviewed.....	50
4. Evaluation Questions Asked and Summary of Results.....	51
5. List of Documents Reviewed.....	59
6. CALM Management Response Framework.....	62

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

The Northern Plains of Cambodia are the largest remaining extensive and intact block of a unique landscape of exceptional global importance for biodiversity conservation. The area is either a last refuge for or maintains a key population of over 40 species on the IUCN Red List, including five that are listed as Critically Endangered.

The Conservation Areas through Landscape Management (CALM) Project is a seven year (2006-2012) UNDP/Global Environment Facility (GEF)-supported initiative aimed at developing the management capacity for biodiversity conservation in the Northern Plains. The Project is designed to address the problem of escalating biodiversity loss caused by increasing human land and resource use. This is being achieved through: 1) the introduction of biodiversity considerations into provincial-level land use processes; 2) the demonstration of specific mainstreaming interventions at three key sites (including community land-use tenure, community contracts and incentives for biodiversity supportive land-use practices; and 3) strengthening of biodiversity management by government in the Kulen Promtep Wildlife Sanctuary and the Preah Vihear Protected Forest.

The Project is funded primarily by UNDP/GEF (US\$2,300,000, plus \$210,000 disbursed during the PDF-B Phase), with co-financing provided by WCS (\$1,600,000 plus \$475,000 disbursed during PDF-B), Seila/PLG (\$463,407) and the Royal Government of Cambodia (\$126,710). The Project is implemented by WCS under an agreement with UNDP, which assigns WCS responsibility and accountability for overall management of the Project and the attainment of all objectives. WCS has in turn established implementation agreements with the General Department for Administration of Nature Conservation and Protection (GDANCP) of the Ministry of Environment, which has a management mandate over Kulen Promtep Wildlife Sanctuary, and with the Forestry Administration (FA) of MAFF, which is responsible for Preah Vihear Protected Forest.

The Project was initiated on 7 December 2005 with the signing of the Project Document, and funding was received in mid-February 2006. The inception phase was completed in mid-July 2007 and was marked by the completion of an Inception Report that updated and finalized implementation arrangements.

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to assess the relevance, performance and success of the CALM Project at the mid-point of its seven year implementation period, and to identify and recommend any corrective actions that need to be taken in order to ensure that its goals and objectives are achieved by scheduled closure at the end of 2012.

1.2 Key issues addressed

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation indicate that it should assess the following:

- **relevance** of the project concept, design and implementation arrangements in the current context. This includes overall relevance of the Project in the broader global and national contexts, *i.e.*, whether the Project outcomes are

consistent with the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and country priorities, and with UNDP's biodiversity agenda

- **Project ownership** at the national and local levels
- **stakeholder participation**, including government, community, civil society and gender balances in participation and influence
- **mainstreaming gender**, including whether the Project has taken adequate measures to ensure that gender concerns are mainstreamed in the implementation of Project activities
- **Project effectiveness**, *i.e.*, progress achieved to date against planned outputs and suboutputs, and the likelihood of achieving planned objectives in time
- **partnership and complementarity** with other relevant ongoing or past activities
- likely **sustainability** of the Project achievements and impacts, including financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental sustainability, as well as an assessment of the feasibility of planned replication and exit strategies
- any **catalytic role** played by the Project
- **financial aspects** of the Project, including planning, execution and sustainability, and the timely delivery and use of co-financing
- Project **efficiency**, defined as cost effectiveness and financial supply
- effectiveness of the application of **adaptive management** principles through monitoring and evaluation (including effective use of the logical framework, the UNDP risk management system, Annual Project Implementation Reviews, and other monitoring tools and mechanisms as appropriate, and
- any other unplanned achievements

The ToR further indicate that the assessment should be grouped into the following components:

- Project design assessment
- Project implementation assessment
- results assessment, and
- capacity-building assessment

1.3 Methodology of the evaluation

Based on the ToR, methodologies for conducting the evaluation included the following:

- desk review of key Project documentation
- interviews and briefings with key stakeholders
- field visits to the Project sites, meeting with local Project staff, government counterparts and resource users, and
- discussion and review of findings with the Core Learning Team

1.4 Structure of the evaluation

As outlined below the structure of the evaluation includes:

- an assessment of the Project and its development context (Project start and duration, problems that the Project seeks to address, immediate and development objectives of the Project, main stakeholders and expected results), and
- presentation of findings and conclusions (with regard to Project formulation, Project implementation, Project results, and recommendations)

2. The Project and its Development Context

2.1 Project start and its duration

The Project was formally initiated in December 2005 with the signing of the Project Document by all parties. Funds were received for expenditure in mid-February 2006. The inception period spanned mid-February to mid-July 2006 and was completed with the preparation of an Inception Report (WCS 2006).

2.2 Problems that the Project seeks to address

The Project is designed to address the problem of escalating biodiversity loss across Cambodia's Northern Plains, caused by increasing human land and resource use. This is being achieved through a seven year, three-pronged approach involving: 1) the introduction of biodiversity considerations into provincial-level land use planning processes; 2) the demonstration of specific mainstreaming interventions at three key sites (including community land-use tenure, community contracts and incentives for biodiversity supportive land-use practices, as well as work to mainstream biodiversity into the forestry and tourism productive sectors), using the Landscape Species Approach (pioneered internationally by WCS) to identify the sites; and 3) strengthening biodiversity management by government in a Wildlife Sanctuary and a Protected Forest within the Project area.

2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

Immediate and development objectives of the Project are not explicitly stated as such in the Project documentation. However, the Project interventions work to introduce biodiversity values into landscape-level land use planning processes (an immediate objective), and to build the capacity of provincial departments and authorities (a development objective).

2.4 Main stakeholders

The main stakeholders are community members in and around the Project area (as the Project beneficiaries), the Wildlife Conservation Society (providing expertise and facilitating national execution), the UNDP Cambodia Country Office (providing project assurance), the forestry and tourism sectors, and provincial agriculture, environment and tourism agencies (as the responsible management authorities).

It is worth noting here the synergies and cooperation between the CALM Project and the ongoing ITTO-funded Transboundary Project implemented by the Forestry Administration. The Transboundary Project is responsible for leading the preparation of the Preah Vihear Protected Forest Management Plan, has constructed a modern

field station, and is undertaking a number of activities that parallel those implemented under CALM.

2.5 Expected results

Expected results of the CALM Project are contribution to capacity development and rural livelihood improvement across the Project area, and to the achievement of national and global environmental goals.

3. Findings and Conclusions

3.1 Project Formulation

The Project was formulated in accordance with standard GEF policies and procedures. It was certified as having met the GEF Project Review Criteria for work program inclusion in April 2004.

3.1.1 Implementation Approach

The Project is designed to work closely with a variety of national and local institutions and projects to share experience and to ensure complementarity. The intention at the design stage was that this would be done through WCS's existing nationwide network and relationships, and its MoU with Government concerning capacity-building for conservation.

3.1.2 Country Ownership/Driven-ness

The two primary government institutions responsible for biodiversity conservation in Cambodia (Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) share responsibility as implementing agencies for the Project. MAFF is also the executing agency. The Project aims to build staff capacity at both ministries, primarily at local level, thus ensuring both effective implementation and sustainability.

3.1.3 Stakeholder Participation

The Project Executive Summary prepared by GEF at the end of the preparatory phase notes that stakeholder involvement has been "a hallmark of CALM's preparation and intervention logic", focusing on MAFF and MoE and their Provincial Departments, and using Participatory Rural Appraisal techniques to explore environmental issues and problems with local people. Based on a review of past and ongoing activities formulation and implementation, interviews and field visits made during the Evaluation Mission, there has continued to be a substantial and satisfactory level of stakeholder participation in Project planning and implementation to date. The nature of the Project's activities requires a high level of stakeholder involvement and this will need to (and appears likely to) continue through the remainder of the Project.

The Project also has developed a gender strategy which focuses largely on integration of women's needs into community and land use planning activities (to-date, fifty percent of participants in village marketing networks have been women). Although a gender strategy document has been developed and some follow-up has occurred, this has not yet been followed by a gender mainstreaming plan, which is recommended as a priority for the next stage of the Project. An additional concern is that none of the

Project staff are women, which limits contact with and delivery of support to women participants and beneficiaries of the Project.

3.1.4 Replication Approach

The Project design and implementation planning do not specifically address the need or potential for replication of Project activities. However a number of elements of the Project, ranging from land use planning to environmental education, naturally lend themselves to replication both within the Project area and elsewhere in Cambodia, particularly in those parts of the Northern Plains not currently covered by Project activities.

3.1.5 Cost-effectiveness

A total of US\$2,443,820 has been allocated by GEF and UNDP/TRAC in support of the Project for the period 2006-2012. The budget is allocated towards strengthened capacity for biodiversity management (62%), integrated conservation and development planning at landscape level (17%), learning/evaluation and adaptive management (13%) and establishment of community engagement in adaptive management (7%). Per the Project Document, parallel funding of US\$1,600,000 is provided by WCS, US\$463,407 is provided by UNDP Seila/PLG, and an in-kind contribution of US\$105,210 is made by Royal Government of Cambodia.

GEF/UNDP costs include payments to Rangers based on patrolling efforts, a practice that has been under review by Cambodia's donor community for some time. Without directly joining the debate on either side, the Review Mission notes that from all indications these Ranger teams have to date been effective agents for biodiversity conservation in the Project area, and certainly deserve to be adequately compensated. However, whether this effectiveness can be maintained post-Project (*i.e.*, at cessation of donor funding) remains an open question.

Two routine audits of WCS have revealed only minor accounting issues. The primary concern (related to Ranger salaries) has reportedly been resolved through provision of a list of staff eligible for payments.

3.1.6 UNDP Comparative Advantage

The Project is overseen by the UNDP Country Office Environment Unit, which has both formal and (importantly) informal linkages with the key governmental organizations, donors and NGOs currently active in the environment sector in Cambodia. These linkages have been vital to the efficient organization and operation of the Project, and have contributed directly to the Project's successes to-date.

The Project has contributed to a number of initiatives with which UNDP is engaged at country and global level, and for which it has programming and support mechanisms in place. It has contributed particularly to achievement of Millennium Development Goal 7 (Ensure Environmental Sustainability) Target 9 (to integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes), and specifically to indicators 25 (forest cover) and 26 (protected areas). The Project also contributes directly to Goal 1 (Eradicate Extreme Poverty), to Goal 3 (Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women) and to Goal 8 (Develop a Global Partnership for

Development). It also is of direct relevance to the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and Strategic Programming for GEF-4.

3.1.7 Linkages Between Project and Other Interventions Within the Sector

Consistent with GEF Strategic Priority BD-2 (Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Protection Landscapes and Sectors), the CALM Project is intended to integrate biodiversity considerations into relevant sectors such as tourism, forestry and agriculture at landscape level. The Project is of direct relevance to Cambodia's Millennium Development Goals (Ministry of Planning 2007), primarily to Goal 7 (ensuring environmental sustainability), but also to Goal 8 (developing a global partnership for development), and secondarily to the other health and development related goals through education and livelihoods improvements. It also is of relevance to RGC's Strategic Development Plan 2006-2010, and to RGC's Rectangular Development Strategy, which focuses on sustainable forest management and the development of a protected areas system.

3.1.8 Indicators

The Project uses two sets of indicators to measure and report progress: 29 indicators designed to assess progress of implementation of each of the activities specified in the Project's logical framework, and reported on a quarterly basis (Table 1), and 11 impact indicators that focus on increases in wildlife populations, maintenance of habitat, reduction in illegal or unsustainable resource use, improved community livelihoods, mainstreaming biodiversity and improved protected area management (Table 2).

The Project also reports annually to GEF using standard (globally applicable) tracking tools to measure site-level management effectiveness.

3.1.9 Management Arrangements

UNDP plays an important role in providing oversight of the Project. Currently three UNDP staff members in the Environment Cluster (Team Leader, Program Analyst and Program Associate) are engaged with the Project, with responsibility for organizing Project Board meetings, tracking implementation against the UNDP/WCS implementation agreement, and monitoring financial expenditures.

3.2 Project Implementation

The Project design assigns primary governmental responsibility to MoE and the Forestry Administration. The Project is implemented by WCS under a cooperating agreement with UNDP. As the implementing partner WCS is responsible and accountable, under its Cambodia Program, for overall management of the Project and the achievement of all Project objectives.

WCS has established agreements for the implementation of the Project with the General Department for Administration of Nature Conservation and Protection (GDANCP) of the Ministry of Environment, and with the Forest Administration (FA) of Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. GDANCP has the management mandate for Kulen Promtep Wildlife Sanctuary, while FA has the management mandate for Preah Vihear Protected Forest and all forest estate outside protected

areas. The Project design hence (correctly) assigns the primary operational roles to the two government agencies with overall responsibility for biodiversity and protected areas management in Cambodia. By all accounts this arrangement works well and no needs for adjustment are foreseen.

Five NGOs work under the guidance and management of WCS to assist with implementation of specific Project activities. Farmer Livelihood Development (FLD) supports improvement of agricultural productivity at village level. Khmer Institute for Peace and Development (KIPD) and Ponlok Khmer (PK) support resource management activities (community forestry, mapping of residential and agricultural land inside the Protected Forest and forest concessions). Ponlok Khmer also supports indigenous land registration. The Sam Veasna Centre for Conservation supports and markets the Project's ecotourism activities. Sansom Mlup Prey supports the certification and marketing of Ibis Rice. WCS reports that all of the NGOs are capable of managing staff, funds and proposals, have assigned sufficient staff to undertake assigned activities, and have appropriate technical capacity. The Review Mission met with staff of all of the above NGOs and visited representative sites where Project activities are assisted by NGO inputs. While only a rapid assessment was possible within the Review Mission's timeframe, it appears that the activities supported by NGO inputs are proceeding largely as planned and can be expected to contribute positively to Project outcomes.

3.2.1 Financial Planning/Work Planning

Annual work planning and budgeting have proceeded as planned and have been submitted to UNDP through the Project Board. Work planning and budgeting are based on the Project's logical framework.

Quarterly work plans and budgeting generally follow the annual workplan (as approved by the Project Board and endorsed by UNDP) and the Project's logframe. Financial staff inputs currently are limited to disbursements and accounting and they are not directly involved in budgeting or work planning.

Capacity of national staff could be improved through additional involvement of both field and financial staff in the planning, budgeting and monitoring and evaluation (see Section 3.2.2 below) processes. A participatory review of the Project logframe would contribute both to a better appreciation of the Project's goals and objectives, achievements made to date and commitment to future Project activities.

3.2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and reporting responsibilities are described in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan included in the Project Inception Report (Section 4). Monitoring and evaluation include project impact monitoring, progress tracking and reporting, evaluation and audit using standard UNDP procedures. This aspect of Project implementation appears to have been largely satisfactory to date, and no major concerns have been noted in reporting or have otherwise been reported to the Review Mission.

3.2.3 Execution and Implementation Modalities

WCS has established agreements for Project implementation with the relevant government agencies: GDANCP of the Ministry of Environment, which is responsible for the management of Kulen Promtep Wildlife Sanctuary, and the Forestry Administration of MAFF, which is responsible for the management of all of the forest estate in the Project area, including Preah Vihear Protected Forest.

The Review Mission's assessment is that partnership arrangements are appropriate and functional. No major issues related to their implementation have been identified.

During start-up of implementation, minor changes (primarily streamlining through combination of similar activities, as detailed in Section 1.2 of the Inception Report) were made to the Project's Logical Framework. These changes were made primarily to facilitate monitoring of the Project. As predicted at the time these changes have had no discernible impact on Project implementation.

3.2.4 Management by the UNDP Country Office

UNDP's primary role subsequent to Project approval has been to provide backstopping with regard to UNDP rules and procedures, and to oversee Project assurance. No major issues regarding fulfillment of this role have been identified.

3.2.5 Coordination and Operational Issues

Initial planning for oversight of the Project (per the Project Document and Inception Report) included the establishment of a Project Executive Group (PEG) with the role of providing overall guidance to Project implementation, and a membership including MAFF (as chair), MoE, Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction, Ministry of Defense, Forestry Administration, regional representatives of the military, police (including border police), UNDP, WCS, Seila/Partnership for Local Governance and the Provincial Governors of Preah Vihear, Siem Reap and Odar Meanchey provinces. However, after an initial meeting, this body was replaced by a Project Advisory Group (PAG) with representatives from Forestry Administration, GDANCP, WCS and UNDP. It is understood that this group functions primarily by means of individual consultations on an as-required basis.

Operational oversight of the Project is otherwise provided by a Project Board comprising representatives from UNDP, WCS and MoE (GDANCP). Forestry Administration is not represented on the Board, although the current Project Manager/Site Manager for the Preah Vihear Protected Forest is a staff member of FA, and hence also plays the *de facto* role of representing FA's interests with regard to Project activities. Other senior project staff are invited to join meetings as necessary. Meetings were conducted on a quarterly basis during 2008 and have been minuted, but the current arrangement is for twice yearly meetings (in January and July), with additional meetings focusing on technical issues.

The Site Manager for the Kulen Promtep Wildlife Sanctuary is a staff member of GDANCP/MoE. Both site managers report to their government line agencies and WCS.

Four Project Implementation Units (PIUs) have been established, one led by GDANCP, one by FA and two by WCS. Two fulltime technical advisors assist with biodiversity conservation and community livelihoods activities. No major issues were identified with regard to these arrangements.

The Project maintains a Risk Log (last updated 28 August 2009) which provides a useful means of tracking risk type (environmental, financial, operational, organizational, political, regulatory, security, strategic), countermeasures/management response and current status. Risks extant at the time of the evaluation are:

- ensuring government support (risk currently decreasing)
- failure to engage the armed forces (risk currently increasing)
- local security (risk currently decreasing)
- land grabbing (risk currently increasing)
- rescinding moratorium on logging concessions (risk currently no change)
- need to improve coordination between UNDP/GEF-supported projects in Preah Vihear (risk currently decreasing)
- threat of conflict between Thailand and Cambodia (risk currently active)
- growing political strength of Cambodian armed forces in Preah Vihear Province (risk currently increasing rapidly)
- income from long-tailed macaque catching interferes directly and indirectly with project management (risk currently decreasing)
- mineral exploitation planned for Chhep and Chaom Ksan Districts (risk currently active)

Recent military activity in the region (along the Cambodia-Thailand border) accompanied by a more recent influx of additional soldiers and their families pose by far the largest current threat to the biodiversity of the area. This is documented in the current risk log. Some damage has already been done (widening of roads, clearing of forest for housing and farming plots) and this will be exacerbated on a continuously larger scale as families settle, clear forest for agricultural land, and harvest biodiversity resources.

Damage has so far not impacted the most valuable forest/biodiversity areas, but the presence of large numbers of military poses an incipient threat. It appears likely that there will inevitably be clearing of forest for agriculture on a relatively large scale, although the hope is that this can be excluded from currently intact areas having the highest biodiversity value.

There is no indication that additional hostilities with Thailand are likely, and hence the most valuable forest areas along the Cambodia-Thai border are not directly threatened at the moment, but the presence of large numbers of military in the area both poses an incipient threat and constrains the scope and scale of conservation activities.

Relations of Project staff with the military were not directly explored, although it appears that senior Project staff do have at least some access to military field commanders. While the Project is extremely constrained with regard to how it can respond to the military presence and concomitant threats to biodiversity, at least some

discussion has occurred (and is continuing) at field level. However, it remains uncertain exactly how much influence the Project can bring to bear on this issue.

3.3 Project Results

3.3.1 Attainment of Objectives

Issues regarding military activities in the Project area notwithstanding, at its mid-point the Project appears to be well on track to attain its objectives by scheduled Project closure in 2012. Of the 29 activities listed under the four Project outputs (Table 1), seven have been completed, and significant progress is being made against the others. Implementation progress and challenges (Project risks and actions, Project issues and actions) are described in narrative form in quarterly progress reporting, providing both the WCS/RGC implementation team and the UNDP/RGC/GEF oversight team with sufficient information to judge progress and assess any corrective actions that may be required. Each quarterly progress report also includes a next-quarter workplan identifying activity to be implemented, timing, responsible persons and funding, and hence provides an effective basis both for planning and tracking attainment of objectives.

The Project design includes 11 impact indicators (two dealing with populations of key wildlife species, one dealing with habitat extent, two dealing with illegal or unsustainable resource use, two dealing with community livelihoods, two dealing with mainstreaming biodiversity, two dealing with protected areas management) selected to measure the Project's impact and attainment of objectives. Baseline and target values exist for all indicators and are provided in the Project Inception Report. According to the latest progress report (second quarter 2009) monitoring and evaluation of activities and their impacts in the CALM landscape are currently integrated into the day to day work of the Project. Status at mid-term is summarized in Table 2. Progress is being made in terms of increasing key wildlife populations, reducing hunting pressure, reducing illegal logging, improving community livelihoods, community-based land use planning, ecotourism and wildlife protection, protected areas zoning and protected areas management.

The Project also uses standard GEF Tracking Tools to contribute to annual global assessments of all GEF projects, specifically through tracking of site-level management effectiveness. The tools also are useful in indicating specific types of actions that are needed to strengthen management in a given protected area. The latest (October 2009) compilation flagged the following issues of concern in both Kulen Promtep Wildlife Sanctuary and Preah Vihear Protected Forest:

- inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent
- a management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented, and
- there is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding

and the following in KPWS only:

- the boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighboring land users
- problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives, and

- protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives.

3.3.2 Sustainability of Project Results

As with any initiative of this type, results will only be sustainable if supported by government policies and practice at all levels. Results also need to be seen to be positive by all levels of stakeholders, and particularly by area residents who rely on the use of natural resources for their livelihoods. Initial indications are that Project results are moving in the right direction, but continuous monitoring and inputs of appropriate levels of technical support will be required through the second half of the Project, and (to maximize continuity and sustainability) by the relevant government agencies and NGOs following Project closure, albeit possibly at a reduced level.

The Northern Plains area has a high profile among Cambodians, and the sense of national ownership has been heightened by the recent border dispute with Thailand. Government staff assigned to the Project and met during the Review Mission demonstrated a high level of interest and commitment. Sustainability of results is directly linked to continued involvement in and “ownership” of Project activities by government staff, but this is clearly influenced by the relatively high levels of compensation (salaries and *per diems*) available to government staff working on the Project. Without these incentives, it is likely that few staff from outside the immediate area would have the same level of commitment to the implementation of Project activities. Without revisiting the ongoing donor/RGC discussion regarding compensation of government staff, it is worth reiterating that supplementary payments to government staff from donor funding, while certainly now contributing to successful implementation of CALM activities, also carries a substantial risk of future loss of staff and weakened management if these levels of compensation cannot be maintained. This is a major risk to the sustainability of resource management gains should the issue remain unresolved at Project closure.

Both the attainment of Project objectives and the sustainability of results are impacted by immediate and long-term risks and the effectiveness with which these are resolved. Risks identified and acted upon to-date are the following:

- failure to ensure government support for Project activities
- failure to engage the armed forces
- banditry and local security concerns
- land-grabbing
- rescinding of the moratorium on logging concessions and potential restarting of logging activities
- conflicting activities between donor-funded projects
- border conflict between Thailand and Cambodia
- military-related land use activities in Preah Vihear Province
- market hunting of long-tailed macaques
- plans for mineral exploration

Additional risks related to further development of the area are:

- potential damage to temple sites due to increased visitor levels, and
- inadequate sharing of benefits from increased visitor levels with local residents

The updated project issues and actions section of the most recent Quarterly Project Report identified the need for sustainable financing of conservation activities in the CALM landscape subsequent to completion of the current UNDP/GEF funding as a key issue. This issue requires immediate and continuing attention in order to ensure that conservation benefits gained during the Project are not subsequently lost due to inadequate funding for continuing biodiversity conservation activities subsequent to Project closure.

3.3.3 Contribution to Upgrading Skills of National Staff

The Project contributes substantially to upgrading the skills of national staff by providing work experience and training in a well-funded and well-equipped environment, including technical mentoring by WCS international staff. Skills development focuses on field activities, but includes reporting, data management and, where relevant, enhancement of office skills.

3.4 Recommendations

This section provides (where necessary) additional background and a set of 25 recommendations (in italics) for future operation of the Project.

3.4.1 Corrective Actions for the Design, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation of the Project

The overall approach taken by the Project has resulted in significant progress against objectives, and no major requirements for corrective actions regarding the design, implementation, monitoring or evaluation of the Project have been identified.

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the adaptive management approach taken by the Project to-date be continued. This approach permits adjustments to Project activities in response to changing circumstances (including funding availability, successes that can be built on, and failures that require a modification in approach), based on clearly developed justification, feedback from participants and the agreement of all Parties, and without losing sight of the fundamental goals and objectives of the Project.

3.4.2 Actions to Follow up or Reinforce Initial Benefits from the Project

The Project has been soundly planned with adequate reference to the then land use and security situation in the Northern Plains, to modern conservation principles, and to UNDP/GEF planning requirements, as reflected in both the Project Executive Summary (2004) and the Project Inception Report (2006). Significant progress has been made with regard to the overall Project objectives and implementation of specific activities. Actions required to follow up or reinforce initial benefits are as follows:

Resolution of issues surrounding increased military presence

At Project approval (in 2004) the military was seen as posing the most significant risk to the Project. The Project planning team did note (Inception Report Section 3.2 Engagement of Armed Forces) that engaging the RCAF and Police Forces in

conservation would not be a simple matter, and this has proven to be a prescient and accurate observation.

The planning team did not foresee (nor could it reasonably be expected to foresee) the border dispute with Thailand that began in August 2008, and that has been followed by a greatly enlarged military presence, the ongoing settlement of soldiers and their families, and currently increasing threats to forest cover and biodiversity, and hence to the success of related Project activities.

Recent military activity in the region (along the Cambodia-Thailand border) accompanied by a more recent influx of additional soldiers and their families poses by far the largest current threat to the biodiversity of the area. This is documented in the current (updated 28 August 2009) risk log. Some damage has already been done (widening of roads, clearing of forest for housing and farming plots) and this will be exacerbated on a continuously larger scale as families settle, clear forest for agricultural land, and harvest biodiversity resources.

Damage has so far not impacted the most valuable forest/biodiversity areas, but the presence of large numbers of military personnel poses an uncontrollable (by the Project) threat. It appears likely that there will inevitably be clearing of forest for agriculture on a relatively large scale, although the hope is that this can be excluded from currently intact areas with the highest biodiversity value.

There is no indication that additional hostilities with Thailand are likely, and hence the most valuable forest areas along the Cambodia-Thai border are not directly threatened at the moment. However, the presence of large numbers of military in the area both poses an incipient threat and constrains the scope and scale of conservation activities. This situation remains to be resolved. Although clearly illegal activities can potentially be dealt with under existing legislative/enforcement mechanisms, the larger issue is the pending applications for social land concessions for military family settlements. These include several areas inside the PVPF, and have high level support consistent with the national policy for settling military families in border areas.

Relations of Project staff with the military were not directly explored, although it appears that senior Project staff do have at least some access to military field commanders. While the Project is extremely constrained in how it can respond to the military presence and concomitant threats to biodiversity, at least some discussion has occurred at field level. However, it remains unclear exactly how much influence the Project can bring to bear on this issue. Rapid and effective resolution of large-scale military settlement and land use conversion, efforts at which were ongoing at the time of the evaluation, will be a primary determinant of the ultimate success or failure of the Project.

Recommendation 2: Resolution (or stabilization) of military activities in the area will be critical for the success of the Project. It is recommended that the government counterpart institutions continue all efforts to find an effective, long-term political and administrative solution that will minimize forest and biodiversity loss to military activities and the presence of large numbers of troops and their families, back-stopped as necessary by the technical/advisory and associated financial resources available through the Project. Linkages with the ITTO-supported/FA-implemented

Transboundary Project, which operates in the northern part of the CALM project area, also need to be explored in terms of harmonizing the use of technical and financial resources available for the timely resolution of this situation (see also Recommendation 7).

Integration with provincial and commune-level planning

Recommendation 3: *The Provincial and Commune Development Plans provide a natural entry point for Project activities (conservation, livelihoods,) and the feasibility of linking CALM interventions with these should be explored.*

Land use planning

Recommendation 4: *The PLUP process should be reviewed and any necessary adjustments made to improve the impact of Project inputs. The potential for using PLUP in future commune development plans should be explored.*

Boundary demarcation

Recommendation 5: *The needs for demarcation of protected area boundaries, appropriate methodologies, costs and constraints need to be clarified. WCS and some of the other Project partners appear to have widely differing views on boundary demarcation methodologies, and it is understood that boundary demarcation remains incomplete. Methodology and budget issues need to be resolved promptly and demarcation completed in at least the most vulnerable areas.*

Use of NGOs:

Recommendation 6: *The NGOs engaged by the Project and met by the Mission all articulated their activities well, and appeared to be enthusiastic and technically capable of carrying out their assigned tasks. The quality of their work is monitored by the Project through WCS and reportedly is satisfactory, with no major issues or problems identified; however, their work needs to continue to be monitored and adjustments made as necessary.*

Cooperation with other conservation initiatives

Recommendation 7: *Another biodiversity conservation initiative (the Transboundary Project), funded by ITTO and implemented by FA, is active along the border with Cambodia and Laos and at least partially overlaps the CALM Project area. There has already been some cooperation in terms of coordination of funding and activities, most notably regarding preparation of the PVPF Management Plan, and construction of a new high quality FA field post at a strategic location in the PVPF. This type of collaboration needs to continue as long as both projects (and/or others) are active in the area.*

Project oversight

Recommendation 8: *The need for a Project Steering Committee that is operational and effective at national level should be reviewed, particularly with regard to giving the Project a higher profile and possible increased political influence.*

Coordination

Recommendation 9: *The coordination mechanisms established to-date between the relevant government agencies (including staff embedded in the Project) and Project activities need to be maintained.*

Communications

Recommendation 10: *Communication of Project progress/reporting of results has been informative and adequate. Reporting has included quarterly progress reports, meeting and trip reports, position and policy papers and technical reports. An indicative list of reporting received and reviewed by the Mission is appended. Most if not all of these reports are presumably also available in Khmer. Reporting at the current standard needs to be continued to the end of the Project.*

3.4.3 Proposals for Future Directions Underlining Main Objectives, Particularly on Project Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability

The Project has been adequately designed with due consideration of effectiveness and efficiency, and adequate management and monitoring mechanisms are in place to ensure a timely response to any future needs. However, sustainability over the longer-term remains an issue that requires monitoring and periodic re-examination, and further consideration in conjunction with planning for Project closure.

Capacity Development

Recommendation 11: *Project efforts should continue to focus on building local capacity for biodiversity management, including both government staff and local residents, and both through training and mentoring of appropriate livelihood activities and natural resource use. The good progress made to date in initiating biodiversity conservation activities and building local support needs to be continued and widened.*

Financial Reporting

Recommendation 12: *Because Project activities are funded by a number of sources (in addition to GEF) attribution of specific results to individual donors is not necessarily clear-cut. There does not appear to be a simple solution to this and in the opinion of the Review Mission it is questionable if there needs to be, the ongoing and cumulative results of the Project in relation to its aims, objectives and specified outputs being the primary measure of success. In terms of financial accountability, detailed, audited financial reporting is provided to each donor (specific to their funding) on a regular basis. WCS has indicated that, to ensure transparency, all reports are available for scrutiny by all donors upon request. It is recommended that broader questions (if any) regarding coordination of funding among donors and most appropriate use of funds should be taken up at Project Board and/or Steering Committee level.*

Future Directions

Additional specific proposals for future directions of the Project have been provided by various stakeholders. The following suggestions have been examined by the

Review Mission and are considered likely to contribute positively to the outcomes of the Project, and hence are listed below as additional recommendations.

Recommendation 13: *The gender strategy developed during the initial phase of the Project should be followed up by the development and implementation of a gender mainstreaming plan.*

Recommendation 14: *Opportunities for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into Commune Council and provincial development planning and budgets need to continue to be explored.*

Recommendation 15: *The support of local and provincial stakeholders needs to continue to be built through a mainstreaming approach.*

Recommendation 16: *The impacts of in-migration (in response to improved economic opportunities) and natural population growth on resource use and demand levels should be considered and incorporated in planning processes.*

Recommendation 17: *Opportunities for future funding of protected areas offered by REDD appear to be much larger than those from ecotourism, and therefore should be pursued. Protected areas supported by REDD should be promoted as a viable land use alternative.*

Recommendation 18: *Needs and opportunities for the Project to align with decentralization and deconcentration activities need to be further explored.*

Recommendation 19: *The Forestry Administration should be represented at Board Level by an independent member. The National Project Manager (an FA staff member) should continue to attend Board Meetings to represent the interests of Project Management.*

Recommendation 20: *The Project should maintain dialogue with other projects in the area to maximize synergies.*

Recommendation 21: *The importance of the Project in the context of the National Forestry Program, and how the two initiatives align, needs to be examined.*

Recommendation 22: *The Project Managers should attend Provincial Executive Committee meetings to ensure good coordination.*

Post-Project Planning

In addition to these immediate future directions, consideration needs to be given to the post-Project situation.

Recommendation 23: *The following questions should be considered in a clearly defined exit strategy to be developed well before Project closure:*

- *how do the Project results fit in with RGC's planning for capacity development?*

- *what is RGC's vision for post-GEF funding, both in the Project area and elsewhere in Cambodia? Specifically, how will field staff salaries and benefits be paid on the termination of GEF/other donor funding?*
- *what are the plans to transfer the MIST database and responsibility for its maintenance to government?*
- *how can biodiversity conservation be further mainstreamed into the development planning process?*

3.4.4 Lessons Learned

The major lessons learned (or reinforced) from Project implementation to date are summarized below. As the Project is only at its mid-term stage these should be viewed as being “preliminary”, and subject to re-evaluation and confirmation at project closure.

- effective biodiversity conservation, while currently a stated priority of many if not most countries in the world, and demonstrably a critically important determinant of sustainable rural livelihoods, is a fragile commodity that is highly sensitive to external influences. The still unresolved influx of military personnel into the Project area in response to the border tensions with Thailand, and attendant threats to biodiversity resources at the regional/ecosystem level, are a case in point.
- related to the above, contingency planning and preparedness for unforeseen events are important elements of biodiversity conservation implementation.
- empowerment of local people to participate in management of local biodiversity resources can be a powerful incentive for conservation, particularly when penalties or prohibited access to resources are seen to be countered by sustainable economic benefits. The nascent success of locally run bird-watching excursions, and provision of accommodation and food services, is a good illustration of the ability of communities to conserve biodiversity resources when they are rewarded rather than penalized for doing so.
- the development of protected areas facilities (headquarters buildings, Ranger stations, ecotourism accommodation) involves special challenges with regard to appropriate design and functionality, and construction and operation in remote sites. Correcting design errors post-construction is both difficult and expensive. Adequate consideration of power and water supply, waste management (both solid and liquid), flood-proofing, lighting and ventilation in relation to facilities use needs to be undertaken at the design stage.
- time and resources spent on meaningful environmental education, while expected to have some immediate result, are essentially an investment in the future success of conservation activities. Progress/results assessments and indicators need to take this extended timeframe into account.

Recommendation 24: *Experience in the design and construction of protected areas facilities needs to be incorporated in a manual or guidelines for future use by MoE*

and FA planners and managers, in order to avoid wastage of funds on inappropriate or poorly designed or constructed facilities.

Recommendation 25: *Lessons learned should be revisited at the end of the Project for incorporation into future externally funded initiatives, and ideally into the operational procedures of MoE and FA.*

3.4.5 Desirable and Undesirable Practices in Addressing Issues Relating to Relevance, Performance and Success

The Project has utilized and incorporated both innovative and best practice techniques during the first half of its implementation. Examples include:

- support to the growing and marketing of “wildlife friendly” rice (ibis rice). This organically grown rice is marketed at a premium price to the benefit of local farmers who have agreed to protect the surrounding forests and wildlife in exchange for a higher price for the product, and a share of the overall profits.
- development and operation of a community-based ecotourism enterprise (offering accommodation and guiding services) at Thmatbouey, a globally important site for populations of giant and white-shouldered ibises, both of which are listed as critically endangered. Tourists contribute to the local economy through payments for accommodation and meals, transportation and guiding, and through donations to a village development fund.
- feasibility assessments and planning for Reduced Emissions from Degradation and Deforestation (REDD) pilot projects, which will compensate Cambodia for reducing emissions from degradation and deforestation, in this case by maintaining and protecting forest cover in the Project area. This mechanism is expected to generate significant and sustainable funding for future conservation operations.
- continuation of a bird nest protection programme across the Northern Plains, under which local people are provided a reward for reporting nests of vultures and large waterbirds, and are employed to monitor and protect the nesting sites until the chicks successfully fledge.
- support to staff training and implementation of MIST, an information management system with proven utility in both law enforcement and biodiversity monitoring and management.
- support to appropriate infrastructure development in protected areas.
- adoption of a pro-poor policy to ensure that those who are most reliant on exploitation of natural resources and wildlife for their livelihoods also benefit from conservation activities.
- adoption of a gender strategy to ensure integration of women’s needs into community and land use planning activities.

- use of local NGOs as partners in implementing Project activities. This is both cost-effective and supportive of national capacity development.

3.5 Conclusions

Conclusions of the CALM Mid-term Evaluation, categorized on the basis of the Terms of Reference provided, are as follows:

- **relevance of the project concept, design and implementation arrangements in the current context.** The Project remains highly relevant within the broader global and national contexts. Its relevance can be argued to have increased as a result of the ongoing border dispute with Thailand, the subsequent and continuing influx of the Cambodian military into the area, and greatly increased land use pressures (for forest clearance, road construction, settlement and agriculture). The Project has provided a useful counterweight to these pressures, and has achieved at least partial success (to date) in maintaining biodiversity values in accordance with GEF and UNDP biodiversity agendas and stated country priorities for biodiversity conservation.
- **Project ownership at the national and local levels.** Government staff interviewed during the evaluation demonstrated a uniformly high level of commitment to the Project, both at central and local (field) levels. The project design predicates success on effective government “ownership”, engagement and participation, and this is being satisfactorily achieved to date.
- **other stakeholder participation, including community, civil society and gender balances in participation and influence.** Stakeholder participation at all levels appears to have been appropriate and adequate to date.
- **mainstreaming gender, including whether the Project has taken adequate measures to ensure that gender concerns are mainstreamed in the implementation of Project activities.** Gender mainstreaming has occurred primarily in terms of participation in activities at community level (e.g., ecotourism, other livelihoods), where results are judged to be satisfactory to date. Attention needs to continue to be paid to consolidating women’s participation in the planning and implementation of community-based activities. Mainstreaming at other levels (government planning and implementation of field activities) is severely constrained by the lack of gender balance in the institutions involved in implementation of field activities. The Project can (and should) raise this issue and identify potential interventions, but is hardly in a position to quickly influence rapid or large-scale changes within government institutions.
- **Project effectiveness, i.e., progress achieved to date against planned outputs and suboutputs, and the likelihood of achieving planned objectives in time.** Implementation progress is assessed and reported against planned outputs, activities and timelines in quarterly progress reports, which also include an assessment of project implementation challenges. Considering the unexpected challenges faced by the Project, effectiveness can be judged to be satisfactory to-date.

- **partnership and complementarity with other relevant ongoing or past activities.** The Project has developed effective partnerships with the relevant government institutions, other projects, NGOs and Community-based Institutions.
- **likely sustainability of the Project achievements and impacts, including financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental sustainability, as well as an assessment of the feasibility of planned replication and exit strategies.** Project activities implemented to-date have been of high technical quality and designed with environmental sustainability in mind. Some activities (capacity development and strengthening of government institutions, Ranger training and implementation of MIST) are based on existing models or at least a good experiential background in Cambodia and elsewhere, which enhances the probability of success. Other activities (*e.g.*, community-based ecotourism) are at least partially based on past experience in Cambodia and currently exhibit a good likelihood of success and replication. Balanced against this, low government salaries, constraints on hiring additional staff, and the consequent need to engage field staff and provide either basic salaries or salary supplements from donor funds work against sustainability. However the latter is an issue impacting virtually the whole of Cambodia's protected areas system and other conservation interventions, and cannot reasonably be expected to be resolved at Project level.
- **any catalytic role played by the Project.** The Project has catalyzed an array of effective biodiversity conservation activities across the northern plains of Cambodia. It has also (of necessity) played a catalytic role, along with other organizations, in helping to focus attention on current and proposed military activities and consequent threats to biodiversity resources and conservation effectiveness within and adjacent to the Project area. It is hoped that this attention will effectively influence pending government decisions on proposed military family settlement concessions in and adjacent to key Project sites. .
- **financial aspects of the Project, including planning, execution and sustainability, and the timely delivery and use of co-financing.** Financial aspects of the Project were not examined in depth by the Mid-Term Review Mission, which concentrated on technical planning, activities and outputs. Financial status and utilization reporting in the Quarterly Progress Reports, and the routine auditing requirements of the donor, appear to be sufficient to ensure appropriate use of funds. As noted above, the continuing need to pay Ranger staff from donor rather than government funding is a serious concern with regard to long-term sustainability of biodiversity conservation measures, and this issue needs to continue to be addressed by government and the donor community. On the other hand, progress is being made in setting up self-sufficient community-based organizations geared to the delivery of ecotourism services, with good prospects for sustainability in the long-term. The primary areas of budget shortfall (*i.e.*, where additional funding could immediately and productively be employed) are with regard to boundary demarcation and law enforcement.
- **Project efficiency, defined as cost effectiveness and financial supply.** No major issues regarding cost-effectiveness and financial supply were identified.

Concerns regarding the cost of engaging expatriate advisory services (through WCS) need to be balanced against WCS's global and local reputation for technical excellence and effective transfer of knowledge/development of national expertise, and the relatively lower cost of their services in comparison to the international donor community and private sector. The cost of protected area boundary demarcation as implemented by WCS was raised as an issue by one of the donor partners, but the WCS approach (to concentrate permanent demarcation on the most sensitive/vulnerable portions of protected area boundaries, and to insist on full and informed consultation with all interested parties), and the relatively low cost of the selected methodology (fixed boundary pillars) compared to other available techniques, can be argued to be the most cost-effective in the long run.

- **effectiveness of the application of adaptive management principles through monitoring and evaluation (including effective use of the logical framework, the UNDP risk management system, Annual Project Implementation Reviews, and other monitoring tools and mechanisms as appropriate.** The monitoring and evaluation, risk management and review system used by the Project appears to have been appropriate and effective in ensuring the implementation of activities to-date.
- **any other unplanned achievements.** The (to-date) largely effective prevention of loss or damage to the most valuable conservation assets, relative to sudden and dramatic increases in military presence in the Project area beginning in third quarter 2008, is a major achievement that was unforeseen at the time of Project planning and activities inception.

Table 1. CALM progress status at mid-term as measured by indicators in the logical framework (information provided by WCS)

Component 1. Incorporating biodiversity into the implementation of new laws		
Output 1. Integrated conservation and development planning at the landscape-level		
Activities	Indicators	Status at mid-term (end June 2009)
1.1 Training of officials from MoE, MAFF, MLMUPC and communities in conservation priorities and planning and project management	1.1 Training completed during years 1-4. Number of people trained	Total 1,367 (at least 195 women, but data not recorded before 2008). Annual figures: 2006 (430), 2007 (273), 2008 (285), 2009 (379)
1.2 Holding of integration workshops and stakeholder consultations to disseminate project plans and receive input from other planning agencies	1.2 Number of people consulted or attending workshops, agencies involved	Numerous and too detailed to record in this format. Details of all workshops recorded in each quarterly report
1.3 Co-ordination of conservation activities with military, concessionaires and development agencies. Formation of agreements	1.3 Meetings and resultant agreements. Monitoring reports of agreements	Numerous and too detailed to record in this format. Details of all meetings and agreements recorded in each quarterly report as are monitoring arrangements and findings
1.4 Commune Development Plans (supported by <i>Seila</i> /PLG) consider village PLUP land-use plans	1.4 Commune Development Plans from the villages where PLUP is completed (Component 2)	Three CDPs include PLUP land use plans
1.5 District integration workshops (supported by <i>Seila</i> /PLG) consider conservation priorities and village land-use plans	1.5 District integration workshops, and provincial plans shown to include village PLUP plans	One District Development Plan
1.6 Integration of conservation priorities into sectoral development planning processes, including provincial government, five-year Provincial <i>Seila</i> Development Plan, MoE, MAFF and Ministry of Tourism	1.6 Endorsement of plans in land-use by <i>Seila</i> /PLG committees, MoE committees, PLG committees, MAFF committees, Ministry of Tourism. Government support for key sites for conservation. Inclusion of conservation priorities into the five-year Provincial <i>Seila</i> Development Plan	Details of all reviews of plans and endorsements recorded in each quarterly report. Cooperation with NCDD program ongoing to include NRM and conservation priorities in CDP/CIP by year 2010 in 16 communes

Table 1. CALM progress status at mid-term as measured by indicators in the logical framework (cont'd)

Component 2. Applying Mainstreaming Measures		
Output 2. Establishment of appropriate community land tenure and resource-right use and engagement in conservation management		
Activities	Indicators	Status at mid-term (end June 2009)
2.1 Education, awareness-raising and training courses in years 1-3 in new laws, land-use planning and community-based management. Visits to other relevant national projects	2.1 Number of people attending education events, training courses and visiting other projects	Total 1,367 (at least 195 women, but data not recorded before 2008). Annual figures: 2006 - 430; 2007 - 273; 2008 - 285; 2009 - 379
2.2 Land-use planning for 5 priority villages ¹ inside KPWS, PVPF and O'Scach-O'Dar key sites by year 3. Extension to 8 villages by year 5	2.2 Creation of village natural resource management committees. Completion of land-use plans. Approval and demarcation of plans by the FA, DNCP and Preah Vihear provincial government	Community land use plans have been completed at 4 sites and are being completed in 8 more sites. Approval of process by FA, GDANCP and provincial government
2.3 Rapid zonation of the areas of KPWS, the PVPF and O'Scach-O'Dar that are adjacent to the key sites. Demarcation of boundaries	2.3 Zonation process completed in the PVPF by end of year 2, approved in year 3. Completed in KPWS by end of year 3, approved in year 4	Zonation completed for PVPF with agreed rules and regulations across 112,616 ha. Demarcation process for PVPF completed in key site with final review of land claims underway. KPWS land claims collected at key sites. Community zoning completed or underway in 6 villages
2.4 Consolidation of outputs into GIS system for national registration	2.4 All project data stored in database and linked to a national-level GIS system	All project data stored in database and linked to a national-level GIS system
2.5 Design of appropriate mechanism for an incentive scheme: how the scheme will function and be monitored	2.5 Reports on mechanism design	Incentive schemes including bird nest protection scheme, ecotourism and ibis rice have been developed
2.6 Development of village agreements for management of natural resources, including implementation of the incentive scheme for key conservation issues. Initiation of agreement monitoring system	2.6 Agreements and incentive scheme contracts completed between priority villages, the project and government authorities	Incentive schemes benefit people in 8 villages and approved by government. Incentives to be expanded under ibis rice scheme to further villages
2.7 Framework for key species eco-tourism that benefits biodiversity and local villages through incentive schemes and agreements created	2.7 Eco-tourism guidelines, payment system and management system	Ecotourism with clear guidelines and management models established in two villages and being established in an additional village
2.8 Evaluation of village agreements and auditing of incentive scheme	2.8 Adapted village agreements and incentive scheme contracts resulting from evaluations	Monitoring and evaluation of participatory land use planning system, bird nest protection scheme and other incentive schemes integrated into management

Table 1. CALM progress status at mid-term as measured by indicators in the logical framework (cont'd)

Component 3. Strengthening capacity for biodiversity management		
Output 3. Improved management of the key sites for conservation		
Activities	Indicators	Status at mid-term (end June 2009)
3.1 Establishment of management structures within existing MAFF and MoE systems for key sites. Training of staff in law enforcement, management and financing	3.1 Government management structures and staffing. Number of staff trained. Management regulations	Appropriate management structures now in place and improved in both PVPF and KPWS. Clear reporting lines to both ministries have been established. Adequate staffing levels maintained. All PVPF and KPWS staff have received training in monitoring techniques (MIST) and patrol techniques. Patrol management staff have received training in patrol planning, use of data for planning and leading and monitoring patrols
3.2 Provision of equipment and adequate infrastructure for key sites.	3.2 Equipment purchased and buildings funded	New stations and headquarters established at appropriate locations. Sufficient and appropriate equipment available for all staff
3.3 Education and awareness workshops on the forestry, protected area and land laws conducted with communities, local authorities, police and military	3.3 Number of people who attend education and awareness workshops. Number of workshops	Total 1,367 (at least 195 women, but data not recorded before 2008). In 2008 over 350 people including 59 women attended education workshops. Annual figures for all training and education: 2006 - 430; 2007 - 273; 2008 - 285; 2009 - 379. Specific data on education not recorded before 2008
3.4 Development of monitoring program, including methodology, monitoring sites and training of staff	3.4 Report on the proposed monitoring program in year 1. Staff training materials; number of people trained	MIST program established. Reports on MIST training available
3.5 Implementation of land use monitoring program for key sites in year 1	3.5 Reports on land use in the key sites in years 1, 3 and 7	Forest cover and land use reports and data available
3.6 Implementation of wildlife monitoring program, including vultures and nests of key species in PVPF during year 1, extended to other key sites by year 3	3.6 Annual reports on wildlife in the Protected Forest from year 1 and from other key sites by year 3	Annual monitoring data available
3.7 Annual and long-term management plans for key sites	3.7 Written management plans for each key site produced annually and every 5 years, from year 3 for Protected Forest and year 4 for the Wildlife Sanctuary. Management plans are adapted based upon results of monitoring program	PVPF management plan draft reviewed by senior FA management. KPWS management plan initiated
3.8 Development of databases to monitor effectiveness of law enforcement and store wildlife monitoring data	3.8 Databases and documentation. Number of staff trained. Reports generated by the law enforcement monitoring database	GIS, MIST, wildlife, community land use, forest cover and other databases maintained. Staff trained appropriately in management of databases

Table 1. CALM progress status at mid-term as measured by indicators in the logical framework (cont'd)

Activities	Indicators	Status at mid-term (end June 2009)
3.9 Annual evaluation of site activities based on results of law enforcement and the wildlife to identify problems and priority interventions for following year	3.9 Reduced wildlife trade and illegal logging demonstrated by monitoring reports. Adaptation of workplans resulting from problems analysis	MIST reports and maps provide monitoring data that can feedback to inform management. Work plans use MIST each month
3.10 Determination of long-term running costs to maintain necessary project initiatives (especially Component 2 and Component 3) in at each key site	3.10 Incremental cost matrix	Regular management costs monitored and assessed
3.11 Securing of additional funding, including trusts funds, long-term government and NGO commitment to cover costs identified under Activity 3.10 and management costs under Activity 3.1	3.11 Necessary funding commitment from NGOs and Government	Long-term financing being assessed including other donors, a potential REDD project and other options
Component 4. Project Management and Evaluation		
Output 4. Adequate reporting on project outcomes and indicators		
Activities	Indicators	Status at mid-term (end June 2009)
4.1 Establishment of project office and administrative staff	4.1 Office and staff exist	Office and staff exist
4.2 Regular meetings of Project Executive Group to monitor and advise on implementation, ensuring initiatives are integrated into government strategy and approved	4.2 Minutes of meetings	Minutes of Project Board meetings and meetings with stakeholders and members of Project Advisory Group maintained
4.3 Rolling and annual evaluation of Project activities based upon results of monitoring program and progress made towards outcome indicators	4.3 Adaptation of rolling and annual workplans for project implementation units resulting from analysis	Work plans completed quarterly and annually
4.4 Mid-term and final reviews	4.4 Reports from reviews	Draft being prepared

¹ Priority villages have already been identified during the PDF-B (defined as villages particularly close to keystone resources for wildlife, where establishment of land management systems is an urgently required intervention)

² Key Species: Asian elephant, giant ibis, Eld's deer, large cats, dhole, sarus crane, vultures, wild cattle (gaur and banteng), white-shouldered ibis, white-winged duck

Table 2. CALM progress status at mid-term as measured by Project impact indicators (information provided by WCS)

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status at Project Start	Status at Project Mid-term
Increasing Wildlife Populations				
1. The percentage of km squares where key species ² are recorded (patch occupancy)	Baseline data exists for 3 key sites	20% increase in total key species ² records at three sites by year 5, 30% by year 7	166 nests (2005)	More than 364 nests (May 2009)
2. Encounter rates with wildlife on monitoring transects and points in Preah Vihear Protected Forest	Results of monitoring transects and points established at Preah Vihear Protected Forest in year 1	15% increase in key species ² populations at Preah Vihear Protected Forest by year 7	2.3/10km(2005)	Analysis from 2008 underway. Camera-trapping continues to record highly threatened species
Maintenance of Habitat				
3. Number of hectares of forest within core areas of key sites	Protected Forest - 118,860	No decreases in forest area across key sites in comparison with baseline in years 3 and 7	PVPF: 112,616 ha total, of which 1.24% (1,407 ha) is deforested or allocated to communities. KPWS: 98,614 ha total, of which 2.56% (2,543ha) is deforested or allocated to communities. O'Scach-O'Dar:23,125ha total, of which 4.9% (1,134ha) is deforested or allocated to communities	PVPF: 298 ha (0.19%) total forest cover loss 2007-2009. Cherndar (O Schach and O Dar): 229 ha (0.22%) total forest cover loss 2007-2009. KPWS: Completion of analysis expected by late 2009
	Wildlife Sanctuary – 100,802			
	O'Scach-O'Dar – 22,943			
Reduction in illegal or unsustainable resource use				
4. Number of hunting incidences (traps/dogs/guns) per km-square surveyed during patrols	Baseline data exists.	50% reduction in Protected Forest site by year 2, achieved at remaining sites by year 4. 75% reduction at all sites by year 5	PVPF:4.0/100km ² (2005) and 1.0/100km ² of patrols (2006/7) and 0.12/100km ² of patrols (2006/7) (there are issues related to data collection for KPWS and it may have been substantially under-reported)	PVPF: 2.7/100 km ² (2008/2009) and 0.16/100km ² of patrols (2008/2009). Improved patrol strategy and tactics have reduced hunting to low levels. Reporting of hunting activity may have improved through increased patrol activity, thus hunting levels compared to patrol effort is a more appropriate measure

Table 2. CALM progress status at mid-term as measured by Project impact indicators (information provided by WCS)

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status at Project Start	Status at Project Mid-term
				now and this has declined. KPWS: 1.4/100 km ² (2008/2009) and 0.24/100km of patrols (2008/2009). Improved management has reduced illegal hunting; however, comparison with the baseline is not useful. Data collection monitoring is ongoing to ensure that illegal activity monitoring will be improved for the remainder of the project
5. Number of logging incidences per km-square surveyed during patrols	Baseline data exists	50% reduction in Protected Forest site by year 2, achieved at remaining sites by year 4. 75% reduction at all sites by year 5	PVPF: 7.6/100km ² (2005) and 1.9/100km of patrols (2005). KPWS: 4.8/100km ² (2006/7) and 0.52/100km of patrols (2006/7) (there are issues related to data collection for KPWS and it may have been substantially under-reported)	PVPF: 2.7/100 km ² (2008/2009) and 0.24/100km of patrols (2008/2009). Improved patrol strategy and tactics have reduced logging to low levels. Reporting of logging activity may have improved through increased patrol activity; thus logging levels compared to patrol effort is a more appropriate measure now and this has declined. KPWS: 4.1/100 km ² (2008/2009) and 0.67/100km of patrols (2008/2009). Improved management has had some effect in controlling logging; however, comparison with the baseline is not useful. Data collection monitoring is ongoing to ensure that illegal activity monitoring will be improved for the remainder of the project
Improved Community Livelihoods				
6. Community tenure or title over agricultural and residential land	0 families in 2005	Land-use planning completed in 5 villages by year 3, 8 by year 5 ¹	0 villages in 2005	4 villages have improved tenure from land use planning and agreements with authorities. 7 are participating in further land use planning. 2 communities working on exclusion areas in 2 communes and 1 more on indigenous land tenure
7. Number of families that experience a sustained improvement in cash income as an	0 families in 2003	100 families at two sites by year 4. 150 families by year 7	0 families in 2003	Nearly 150 families benefit from improved income as a result of project initiatives, including: 58 families from Tmatboey and

Table 2. CALM progress status at mid-term as measured by Project impact indicators (information provided by WCS)

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status at Project Start	Status at Project Mid-term
indirect consequence of project initiatives (e.g. tourism, agricultural development, conservation contracts)				Dongphlat from tourism; 40 families which sold Ibis Rice at a premium as part of our wildlife-friendly agriculture program and 50 families took part in the bird nest protection programme.
8. Number of <i>Seila</i> /PLG Commune Development Plans (CDPs), Provincial Development Plans, Environmental and Social Impact Assessments, Sectoral Agency Plans, Land-use plans including or considering conservation priorities	Currently none consider conservation priorities of the Northern Plains	5 by year 3, 10 by year 7	No CDPs/PDPs/ESIAs consider conservation activities. There are no Government approved land- use maps. MAFF and MoE have no key site management plans	A total of 7 plans incorporate conservation activities. These include: 3 CDPs, 1 District Development Plan, 2 land use-plans (and 1 ESIA completed). An additional seven land-use plans underway. Community land use plans have been completed at 4 sites and are being completed in 8 more sites. PVPF management plan has been drafted and endorsed by FA Director General. KPWS man plan development initiated. Cooperation with NCDD program ongoing to include NRM and conservation priorities in CDP/CIP by year 2010 in 16 communes.
	There are no Government approved land-use maps	Land-use plans: 5 villages by year 3, 8 by year 5 to have established land and resource tenure		
	MAFF and MoE have no key site management plans	Key Site Management Plans: 2 by year 3		PVPF management plan drafted, reviewed, revised and endorsed by FA Director-General for finalization. KPWS management plan development initiated.

Table 2. CALM progress status at mid-term as measured by Project impact indicators (information provided by WCS)

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status at Project Start	Status at Project Mid-term
9. Number of villages and families with successfully implemented incentive scheme contracts.	Contract established with 1 village for initiation of eco-tourism, in exchange for reduction of hunting and wildlife trade	Incentive scheme contracts in 5 villages by year 3, 8 by year 5 ¹	1 village; 10 families. (2005)	Incentive schemes benefit people in 8 villages. Individual contracts are in place for 100 families for nest protection, 350 families benefit from ecotourism through payments for services, 30 families have signed agreements to carry out wildlife friendly agriculture, 140 families benefit from cooperative development
	Contracts with 10 families for bird nest protection (2005)	Individual contracts with 30 families		
10. Protected Areas zoned and demarcated.	None exist	Protected Forest zoned by the end of year 3, Wildlife Sanctuary by year 4	None exist	Zonation completed for PVFP with agreed rules and regulations across 112,616 ha. Demarcation process for PVFP completed in key site with final review of land claims underway. KPWS land claims collected at key sites. Community zoning completed or underway in 6 villages
11. Protected Area management plans	None exist	Protected Forest management plan by the end of year 3, Wildlife Sanctuary by year 4	None exist	Draft PVFP management plan reviewed by senior FA management and endorsed by FA Director General. Final edit and translation underway, and printing and distribution of Khmer and English versions anticipated by late 2009. KPWS management plan initiated

¹Information provided by WCS; supplementary information on PVFP Management Plan provided by Transboundary Project

²Priority villages have already been identified during the PDF-B, defined as villages particularly close to keystone resources for wildlife, where establishment of land management systems is an urgently required intervention

³Key Species: Asian elephant, giant ibis, Eld's deer, large cats, dhole, sarus crane, vultures, wild cattle (gaur and banteng), white-shouldered ibis, white-winged duck

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MID-TERM EVALUATION

Project title: Conservation Areas through Landscape Management (CALM) in the Northern Plains of Cambodia
Project no: 00047478
Duty station: Phnom Penh, with travel to the Preah Vihear
Duration: Maximum 23 working days

1. Background and Project Overview

The Northern Plains of Cambodia are the largest remaining extensive intact block of a unique landscape of exceptional global importance for biodiversity conservation. The area is either a last refuge for, or maintains a key population of over 40 species on the IUCN Red List, including five listed as Critically Endangered. The project addresses the problem of escalating biodiversity loss across the Northern Plains, caused by increasing human land and resource use. This is achieved through a seven-year, three-pronged approach: (1) the introduction of biodiversity considerations into provincial level land use processes; (2) the demonstration of specific mainstreaming interventions at four key sites (including community land-use tenure, community contracts and incentives for biodiversity supportive land-use practices, as well as work to mainstream biodiversity into the forestry and tourism productive sectors); and (3) strengthen biodiversity management by government at the three key sites.

Establishing Conservation Areas Landscape Management (CALM) in the Northern Plains is a seven year (2006-2012) UNDP/Global Environment Facility (GEF)-supported project aiming at developing the management capacity for biodiversity conservation in the Northern Plains. The project is consistent with the GEF Strategic Priority BD-2 (Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors) and facilitation of mainstreaming of biodiversity within production systems. The project interventions work to introduce biodiversity values into landscape-level land-use planning processes. Implementation is focused particularly on building the capacity of provincial departments and authorities and integrating specific project initiatives with established provincial planning processes. These specific project initiatives include the direct implementation of the new land law and sub-decree on community forestry to develop management plans for natural resource areas that include conservation of key components of biodiversity. The project also works with the forestry and tourism sectors, and the provincial departments of agriculture and environment, to enhance the recognition of key components of biodiversity in planning and management strategies.

The Project is nationally executed by the Wildlife Conservation Society and project assurance is provided by the UNDP Cambodia Country Office.

The Project design includes provision for an independent Mid-Term Evaluation to be completed in 2009. The broad aims of the evaluation are to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of implementation of the Project from inception in 2006 to mid 2009, and to identify and recommend any corrective actions that need to be taken in order to ensure that the Project achieves its goals and objectives by scheduled closure at the end of 2012.

2. Objectives of the Mid-Term Evaluation

The Monitoring and Evaluation policy in UNDP/GEF at the project level has four objectives:

- to monitor and evaluate results and impacts – particularly on global biodiversity values;
- to provide a basis for decision-making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- to promote accountability for resource use, including efficiency and effectiveness of implementation; and
- to provide feedback on lessons learned.

A mid-term evaluation is a monitoring and evaluation process that occurs at the project level at the mid-point of project implementation. Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. They are expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and to make prompt necessary adjustments. Mid-term evaluations also assist transparency and better access to information during implementation.

The CALM Mid-Term Evaluation is being initiated by UNDP pursuant to the evaluation plan in the Project Document, and donor reporting requirements. The CALM Mid-Term Evaluation aims to assess the relevance, performance and success of the CALM at the mid-point of its seven-year implementation period. It will examine current impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and rural livelihood improvement, and the achievement of global and national environmental goals. It will also identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that will maximize the impact of the CALM going forward, and/or that might improve design and implementation of similar projects.

The Mid-Term Evaluation is intended to be a systematic learning exercise for project partners. The exercise is therefore structured so as to generate and share experience and practical knowledge. To achieve this, the evaluation will take place in a consultative and participatory rather than advisory manner.

3. Principles and Scope of the Evaluation

The CALM Mid-Term Evaluation will be conducted in such a way to ensure that key principles of evaluation are closely respected. The Mid-Term Evaluation will be independent, impartial, transparent, ethical, useful and credible.

The following broad areas will be covered by the Evaluation:

- relevance of the project concept, design and implementation arrangements in today's context. This includes overall relevance of the Project in the broader global and national context, *i.e.* whether the Project outcomes are consistent with the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and country priorities;
- Project ownership at the national and local levels;
- stakeholder participation, including government, community, civil society and gender balances in participation and influence;
- mainstreaming gender - whether the project has taken adequate measures to ensure gender concerns are mainstreamed in the implementation of the project activities;
- Project effectiveness, *i.e.*, progress achieved to date against planned outputs and sub-outputs, and likelihood of achieving planned objectives in time;
- partnership and complementarity with other relevant on-going or past activities;
- likely sustainability of the Project achievements and impacts, including financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental sustainability, as well as an assessment of the feasibility of planned replication and exit strategies;
- any catalytic role played by the Project;
- financial aspect: planning, execution and sustainability, including the timely delivery and use of co-financing;
- Project efficiency: cost effectiveness and financial supply;
- effectiveness of the application of adaptive management principles through monitoring and evaluation (including effective use of log frame, UNDP risk management system, the

- Annual Project Implementation Reviews, and other monitoring tools and mechanisms as appropriate); and
- any other unplanned achievements.

It is proposed that the assessment be grouped into the following four components. Drawing lessons from the analyses of these components, the Evaluation Team will make recommendations on any necessary adjustments to the Project design, and to Project activities, procedures and implementation for the remainder of the implementation period. The Evaluation will also highlight lessons learned to-date and best (and worst, if applicable) practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success. Finally, the evaluation will recommend activities, including possible donor-funded interventions, to consolidate and build on Project achievements going forward.

3.1 Project design assessment

In light of experience with activities implementation to date, the Mid-Term Evaluation will assess the extent to which the overall Project design remains relevant in the national and global contexts. The Evaluation Team will review the Project's concept, strategy and approach within the context of effective capacity development of the government and sustainable protected area and forest management. Specifically, the Evaluation Team will:

- assess the extent to which the underlying assumptions remain valid;
- assess the approach used in design, and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the Project area;
- assess the plans for replicating or scaling up the experiences of the Project.

The Evaluation Team will also ascertain the current level of comprehension of the Project concept, focusing on three specific sets of actors: (i) Project management; (ii) Project staff; and (iii) field operations.

3.2 Project implementation assessment

The Mid-Term Evaluation will assess the extent to which Project management and implementation has been effective, efficient and responsive. Specifically, it will:

- assess overall institutional arrangements for the execution, implementation, management, monitoring and review of the Project. This covers a number of issues, including: the appropriateness of joint implementation and coordination; whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities; the effectiveness of government counterparts and Project managers; the effectiveness of relationships among key stakeholders such as Ministry of Environment (MoE), Forestry Administration (FA) and WCS; and set up of the Project team and technical support services provided by the team;
- assess the use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation;
- assess effectiveness of adaptive management;
- assess the quality, objectivity, frequency and relevance of Project reporting;
- assess the mechanisms for information dissemination in Project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management;
- assess quality of risk logs identified;
- describe and assess efforts of UNDP and the Executing Agency (WCS) to support implementation activities;
- analyze the Project financing model, specifically how the Project has materialized/leveraged co-financing for various components (preferably to be presented in a matrix form); and
- assess the Project's complementarity and partnership (including communication and information sharing) with other on-going activities and projects for biodiversity conservation in the Northern Plains.

3.3 Results assessment

The Mid-Term Evaluation will examine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of operational activities and tangible results achieved within the Project to-date, by assessing how the Project's processes and outputs so far have contributed to the achievement of expected outcomes and results of the Project, as well as the national and GEF's global biodiversity conservation goals. The Mid-Term Evaluation will:

- assess, quantitatively and qualitatively, Project achievements and impact in terms of outputs and outcomes as defined in the Project Document;
- assess the extent to which the Project has leveraged other partners to promote biodiversity and forest conservation, community management, government capacity building, sustainable livelihoods and demarcation of protected area and forest boundaries in the Northern Plains.
- assess contribution of the project towards the CPAP outcome " National and local authorities and communities are better able to conserve biodiversity and respond to climate change", and CPAP output " Capacities of government and local communities enhanced for biodiversity conservation and livelihoods improvement".
- assess the sustainability of Project results.

The Evaluation Team will develop and use a set of time-bound, quantifiable and benchmarked indicators to determine the overall contribution of the Project outcomes to the development and global environmental goals. These indicators will preferably be presented in a matrix and be based on the Project's logical framework, as well as higher-level development and environmental goals. These may include, for example, targets/indicators set out in the Cambodia Millennium Development Goals, the National Strategic Development Plan 2006-2010, UNDP Country Programme Action Plan 2006-2010, and GEF biodiversity objectives.

In addition to identifying possible areas where the Project may be falling short in achieving its intended objectives and goals, the Evaluation Team will distil the key achievements of the Project as concisely as possible, with a focus on identifying the Project's positive contributions to issues such as protected areas governance, conservation and rural livelihoods, with particular emphasis on those changes that would not have occurred but for the Project activities. The Evaluation Team is also invited to highlight any contributions that may have been brought by the Project, or catalytic roles played by the Project, while not necessarily envisaged within the original Project scope.

3.4 Capacity-building assessment

The Evaluation Team will assess how and to what extent the Project has built management, planning and operational capacity among the Project's government partners, particularly at the national and provincial levels. This should include an overview of capacity-building techniques employed by the Project (*e.g.*, training, mentoring, learning by doing, coaching), and an assessment as to:

- how national and provincial staff have contributed to the achievement of Project objectives; and
- how the skills, knowledge and attitudes of government staff involved in the Project have improved against baseline levels as a result of the Project's capacity-building activities.

4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

4.1 Involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation process

This evaluation exercise is intended to be inclusive and participatory, engaging multiple actors, within as well as outside the Project, in its execution as well as learning process. The Evaluation Team will meet and engage in discussions with key stakeholders of the Project at different stages during the evaluation period. The preliminary results of the evaluation will be

shared with all key stakeholders, from donors to community partners and beneficiaries. For example, Project partners, having been presented with the preliminary results, will assist the Evaluation Team to identify key questions and issues, conduct further research where necessary, analyze findings and make recommendations. The Evaluation Team plays the role of facilitator or mentor in this participatory process, conducting workshops, guiding the process at critical junctures and consolidating the final report. Experience has shown that establishing a cooperative relationship between Project partners and the Evaluation Team increases the likelihood of the Project partners adopting and achieving the intended objectives.

4.2 Establishment of a Core Learning Team

To improve stakeholder engagement in the evaluation process, a “Core Learning Team” will be established to help guide the process. The Core Learning Team (10-15 members) will comprise:

- key executing and implementing agency staff;
- the managers and key staff of the Project; and
- the UNDP task manager of the Project.

The Core Learning Team will serve as the direct focal point for the Evaluation Team. Cooperation between the Core Learning Team and the Evaluation Team is expected not only to increase the quality and relevance of the evaluation, but also to increase ownership of and commitment to the evaluation exercise by the Project partners. This is expected to lead to greater acceptance and adoption of the evaluation outputs. The Core Learning Team’s main purposes, in addition to the above-mentioned role as the direct focal point to help facilitate effective and efficient evaluation process, are threefold:

- to discuss the draft evaluation report and preliminary findings, and to develop the related follow-up plan to implement recommendations;
- to lead the process of negotiation and approval of the agreement/understanding among the partners regarding results of the evaluation; and
- to ensure that recommendations of the evaluation are, to the extent possible, adopted and implemented over the remainder of the Project.

A suggested list of the Core Learning Team members will be provided by the Project, for finalization and confirmation upon the arrival of the Evaluation Team.

4.3 Evaluation methodologies

The Evaluation Team will follow internationally recognized standard, norms and ethics of evaluation. Methodologies for conducting the evaluation will include but not necessarily be limited to the following:

- desk review of key documentation, including: 1) Project materials such as the Project Document, consultant reports, Annual and Quarterly Work Plans, field reports, monitoring reports (including GEF annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs)), financial reports and correspondence; 2) relevant policy documents and laws; and 3) reports of other relevant projects, researchers and conservation organizations;
- briefings with UNDP, MoE, MAFF, WCS, CSPPM, UNDP/IFAD Rural Livelihood Improvement Project (RULIP), SLM, PSDD and other stakeholders;
- interviews, questionnaires and other approaches for collecting and analyzing data;
- consultations with major donors and national institutions involved in natural resources management activities;
- field visits to selected Project sites, to meet with local Project staff, government counterparts, residents and resource users, to assess the extent to which the Project is addressing their needs effectively and how it could address their needs better; and
- workshops to discuss and agree upon findings and recommendations.

Following the GEF evaluation guidelines, the Evaluation Team is expected to assess project effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, and any other relevant key aspects against a set of criteria and rating system (e.g. highly satisfactory etc.). The evaluation methodology, including such criteria, will be developed by the Evaluation Team and finalized upon the Team's arrival and before commencement of the evaluation exercise.

5. Planned Process and Output

5.1 Process

The steps below outline the major phases and activities in the Mid-term Evaluation process. This is intended only to be a guide to the Evaluation Team in formulating their approach, methodology and timetable. The consultants engaged to undertake the Mid-term Evaluation will be given reasonable flexibility to modify the processes and approaches as they see fit, within the bounds of the specified Terms of Reference and outputs required.

1. Preliminary assessment, on the basis of information available, of key issues to be addressed (refer to Section 3 above).
2. Briefing for the Evaluation Team, as well as the Executing Agencies and the CALM Project Team, in order to contextualize the activities and scope, and finalize the methodologies of the Mid-term Evaluation.
3. Preliminary review process. Stock-taking of existing knowledge (identification of key stakeholders, the roles of partners, key sources of information and reports; identification and understanding of key challenges, opportunities, risks and expected outcomes).
4. Field work and further investigations. Field visits and investigations aimed at deriving preliminary findings about the effectiveness and relevance of Project interventions/activities.
5. Presentation of preliminary findings of the Mid-Term Evaluation to the Core Learning Team and wider stakeholders.
6. Preparation of a draft report with recommendations. This process includes:
 - agreement on conclusions, recommendations and follow-up actions (to be determined jointly between the Evaluation Team and key stakeholders through a consultative process facilitated by the Core Learning Team);
 - articulation of lessons learned; and
 - sharing of the draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report with stakeholder groups for review and validation.
7. Generation and dissemination of Mid-Term Evaluation Report, through the following process:
 - finalization of the report incorporating inputs from stakeholder groups (by the Evaluation Team working through the UNDP Country Office);
 - debriefing with the Executing Agency, implementing agencies, other Project partners, and the Core Learning Team. This debriefing will provide a consolidated picture of the findings, recommendations and lessons learned from the evaluation process;
 - submission of the Mid-Term Evaluation Report to the UNDP/GEF unit in Bangkok, to UNDP-GEF Headquarters, and to the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (UNFIP) Office, and subsequent posting on the GEF website;
 - sharing of the Mid-Term Evaluation Report with the GEF independent Monitoring and Evaluation Unit and UNFIP as a public document; and
 - dissemination of the final report to national stakeholder groups by the Executing Agency.
 - the Evaluation Team will also be requested to present the key findings at a UNDP Staff Learning Session.
8. Follow up activities which include:
 - submission of a management response, compiled by UNDP in consultation with key stakeholders, within one month after the finalization of the evaluation report; and
 - implementation of recommendations by the Project Management Team.

5.2 Outputs

The Mid-Term Evaluation will produce the following outputs:

- a detailed Mid-Term Evaluation Report in concise English, including lessons learned and recommendations, using on the specified UNDP/GEF format (no more than 50 pages, excluding Executive Summary and Annexes); and
- record of key outputs from the evaluation process, including workshop outputs, and minutes of meetings with stakeholders..

Although the Evaluation Team will have certain flexibility in structuring the report, a suggested format is provided in Annex A.

6. Implementation Arrangements

Roles and responsibilities of different partners for the execution of the Mid-Term Evaluation are as follows:

UNDP Country Office:

- helps to initiate and finalize the Terms of Reference, finalise budget with partners, recruits consultants in consultation with UNDP/GEF regional centre and other project partners, and finalizes the agenda for the Evaluation Mission;
- is responsible for all logistical and administrative arrangements;
- communicates with the National Project Manager to facilitate the Mission;
- circulates the final report to national stakeholders as well as relevant offices of the UN and GEF;
- based on discussions with key stakeholders, compile a management response in accordance with UNDP's internal requirement and format, within one month after the completion of the evaluation report.

National Project Directors of the Main Beneficiaries:

- assists in coordinating the Evaluation Mission;
- helps to review and provides inputs and insights on the findings of the Evaluation Team; and
- chairs meetings/workshops during the evaluation process.

Implementing Partner (WCS):

- provides input on the recruitment of consultants and endorses budget;
- reviews and endorses the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation; and
- assists in coordinating the Mission, and facilitates consultation between the Evaluation Team and relevant stakeholders.

General Department of Nature Conservation and Protection Administration under MoE and Forestry Administration under MAFF:

- facilitates field visits and local meetings at the Project sites.

Project Team:

- facilitates all aspects of the Evaluation Mission including provision of relevant documentation.

7. Composition of the Evaluation Team

Two Consultants, one International and one National, will be responsible for conducting and reporting on the evaluation, under the guidance of and reporting to UNDP's Environment and Energy Cluster. The International Consultant will be designated as Team Leader and will carry overall responsibility for organizing and completing the evaluation and delivering the final report. The National Consultant will assist with technical analysis and with translation/interpretation, and coordination of logistical arrangements.

The Evaluation Team will draw lessons learned and make recommendations that will maximize the impact of the CALM in moving forward, and that may improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF/UNF projects. The International Consultant will have overall responsibility for the coordination, drafting, completion and delivery of the Mid-Term Evaluation Report, including methods, findings / lessons learned, recommendations and follow-up actions to be taken. The National Consultant will, under the overall direction of the International Consultant, have responsibility for the day to day coordination and implementation of evaluation activities, and will assist with reporting of the evaluation findings. The National Consultant will provide particular support with methodologies and with Khmer language interpretation and translation.

Qualifications - International Consultant

1. Minimum of a master's degree or equivalent in natural resource management, environment, development or related field demonstrably relevant to the position.
2. Strong technical background and proven competency in biodiversity conservation, protected areas management, or related areas of natural resource management, including demonstrable expertise in project formulation, implementation and evaluation. A minimum of 15 years of relevant experience is required.
3. Experience with UNDP's current project formulation, implementation and evaluation procedures is useful, but not essential. Familiarity with GEF programming and procedures, as well as its evaluation policies and guidelines, will be a useful asset.
4. Excellent English writing and communication skills. Demonstrated analytical skills, ability to assess complex situations, to succinctly and clearly distill critical issues, and to draw practical conclusions.
5. Demonstrated ability to work with developing country government agencies and NGOs. Previous work experience in Southeast Asia, and ideally in Cambodia.
6. Previous work experience with United Nations or other multilateral/bilateral development assistance agencies is a useful asset.
7. Experience leading multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams in high stress. Ability to meet short deadlines.
8. Excellent interpersonal, coordination and planning skills. Sense of diplomacy and tact.
9. Ability and willingness to travel to provincial areas.
10. Computer literate (MS Office package).

Qualifications - National Consultant

1. Master's degree or equivalent in natural resource management, environment, development or related field demonstrably relevant to the position.
2. Strong technical background in biodiversity conservation, protected areas management, or related areas of natural resource management in Cambodia. A minimum of 5 years of relevant experience is required.
3. Good understanding of RGC and local/international NGO programming and implementation procedures. Familiarity with GEF programming and procedures will be an asset.
4. Good writing and communication skills in English.
5. Experience working with local communities.
6. Previous relevant work experience with United Nations or other multilateral/bilateral development assistance agencies.

7. Excellent organizational skills with attention to details. Experience of technical translation / interpretation (Khmer-English) is an asset.
8. Excellent interpersonal, coordination and planning skills, and ability to work in a team.
9. Ability and willingness to travel to provincial areas.
10. Computer literate (MS Office package).

8. Mission Schedule

The Mission comprises three components: 1) start-up, a period of 1-3 days during which the International and National Consultants, working from their home base, will familiarize themselves with background materials; 2) stakeholder consultations and field visits, report drafting and in-country presentation, currently planned for the period 3-19 August 2008; and 3) receipt of stakeholder comments on the draft final report, currently planned for latest 4 September, and incorporation into a final report to be submitted by the International Consultant (working from his/her home base) to UNDP by 14 September 2009.

Terms of Reference Annex 1A: Suggested structure of the Final Evaluation Report

Executive summary

Brief description of project
Context and purpose of the evaluation
Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Introduction

Purpose of the evaluation
Key issues addressed
Methodology of the evaluation
Structure of the evaluation

The Project and its Development Context

Project start and its duration
Problems that the project seek to address
Immediate and development objectives of the project
Main stakeholders
Expected results

Findings and Conclusions

Project formulation

- implementation approach
- country ownership/driven-ness
- stakeholder participation
- replication approach
- cost-effectiveness
- UNDP comparative advantage
- linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- indicators
- management arrangements

Project implementation

- financial planning
- monitoring and evaluation
- execution and implementation modalities
- management by the UNDP Country Office
- coordination and operational issues

Project Results

- attainment of objectives
- sustainability of project results
- contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

Recommendations

- corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Project
- actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the Project
- proposals for future directions underlining main objectives, particularly on project effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability
- lessons learned
- desirable and undesirable practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Attachments

Terms of Reference

Itinerary

List of Persons Interviewed

Summary of Field Visits

List of Documents Reviewed

Set of Evaluation Questions Asked and Summary of Results

Terms of Reference Annex 1B: Consultants' Task Schedule

Dates	Task	Time Suggested
	Consultants prepare for evaluation including desk review of documents provided in advance and preliminary evaluation methodology	1 day
16 Aug	International consultant arrives in country. Consultants attend briefing session with UNDP (AM) and key project staff (PM)	1 day
17 Aug	Consultants attend briefing session with UNDP CO and Regional Technical Advisor (AM)	1 day
18-19 Aug	Further desk review of relevant documents and reports, preparation and presentation of evaluation design review and discussion	2 days
20 Aug	Meetings with project stakeholders, refinement of methodology and development of proposal comments, and further desk review	1 day
21 Aug	Meetings with key stakeholders in Phnom Penh	2 days
22 Aug	Travel to Preah Vihear (AM) Meeting with project staff (PM) Overnight Tbeng Meanchay	1 day
23 Aug	Site visit Tahkung Headquarters (AM) Visit Tmatboey village and meet community members and local stakeholders (PM) Overnight in Tmatboey guesthouse	1 day
24 Aug	View ecotourism facilities and key species (AM) View site management issues Overnight Tbeng Meanchay	1 day
25 Aug	Other field visits and discussion with Preah Vihear-based staff and stakeholders.	
26 Aug	Return from Preah Vihear (AM) Initiate preparation of first draft report in Phnom Penh (PM).	1 day
27-30	Preparation of first draft report in Phnom Penh, including meetings to validate/clarify findings	3 days
31 Aug	Presentation of findings to Core Learning Team (10-15 core persons) and follow up discussion Presentation at UNDP Staff Learning Session.	1 day
1-2 Sep	Incorporation of comments in report	2 days
3 Sep	Submission of first draft report to UNDP for further circulation and clarification. International consultant departs	1 day
4-15 Sep	Stakeholders provide comments on first draft (this is outside the consultants' brief)	N/A
16-18 Sep	Home-based work to finalize report based on comments from stakeholders, followed by submission to UNDP for further circulation	3 days
28 Sep	Board meeting review to adopt the final report as well as a management response	N/A
end Sep	Compilation and submission of a management response	N/A
Oct	Publication of the final report	N/A

Note added: total consultancy time comprises 23 working days for each of the National and International Consultants. Dates have been adjusted to reflect actual dates of the Mission.

ANNEX 2: REVIEW MISSION ITINERARY

Dates	Activity	Location
16 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> International Consultant arrives 	Phnom Penh
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
17 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> meeting with Lay Khim (UNDP) regarding Review Mission itinerary and project background comprehensive briefing at WCS Office by Hugo Rainey, Mark Gately and WCS field staff regarding Project activities and results to date 	Phnom Penh
18 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> document review and mission planning 	Phnom Penh
19 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> document review and mission planning 	Phnom Penh
20 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> document review and mission planning 	Phnom Penh
21 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> meetings with UNDP/GEF Tonle Sap Conservation Project staff (Hourt Khieu and Julian Colomer) regarding livelihoods and environmental education activities, and TSCP's GEF implementation experience meeting with Sophie Baranes (UNDP) regarding Review Mission planning and expected outcome 	Phnom Penh
22 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> traveled by road Phnom Penh to Tbaeng Meanchey comprehensive briefing by Project staff 	Phnom Penh/ Tbaeng Meanchey
23 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> interviewed Project staff and rangers at Takoeng station travelled to Tmatboey and interviewed ecotourism committee members assessed accommodation and other ecotourism facilities supported by the Project viewed ibis roosting site (Tmatboey's primary ecotourism resource) in evening 	Takoeng Tmatboey village
24 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> viewed ibis roosting site in morning interviewed head of Village Marketing Network travelled to Preah Vihear Protected Forest and visited areas being settled and cleared by Cambodian military 	Tmatboey village Choam Khsan
25 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> comprehensive briefing and discussion with NGO partners traveled to Kampong Thom 	Tbeng Meanchey Kampong Thom
26 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> traveled Kampong Thom to Phnom Penh interviewed Mr. Seng Pho, SPPA/PSDD 	Phnom Penh
27 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> interviewed Mr. Man Soriyun, Deputy Director, FA interviewed Mr. Sy Ramony, Director, MOE interviewed Ms. Privan Limpanboon, Asia Foundation interviewed Mr. Tao Sarath, WCS Finance Manager interviewed Mr. Ung Dararath Moni, IFAD/UNDP 	Phnom Penh
28 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> interviewed Mr. Jacob Kahl Jepsen and Cheap Sam An, DANIDA meeting and clarification of issues with Mark Gately, Hugo 	Phnom Penh Phnom Penh

Dates	Activity	Location
	Rainey and Ashish John, WCS	
29 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preparation of draft report 	Phnom Penh
30 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preparation of draft report 	Phnom Penh
31 August 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wrap-up/review meeting at UNDP • preparation of draft report 	Phnom Penh
1 September 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preparation of draft report 	Phnom Penh
2 September 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preparation of draft report 	Phnom Penh
3 September 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International Consultant departs 	Phnom Penh

ANNEX 3: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Names	Position	Organization
An Dara	Community Research and Management Advisor	WCS Cambodia
Ashish John	International Community Conservation Management Advisor	WCS Cambodia
Chan Onn	Village Marketing Network	Tmatboey village
Cheap Sam An	Programme Officer	DANIDA
Chheang Dany	Project Manager, ITTO Trans-boundary Project	Forestry Administration
Chhum Sovanny	Programme Analyst, Environment and Energy Cluster	UNDP Cambodia
Chhoun Samour	Project Officer	KIPD
Ea Sokha	Director of KPWS	MoE
Eduardo Quablatin	Consultant, SLM Project	UNDP
Hourt Khieu	National Project Manager	UNDP/GEF Tonle Sap Conservation Project
Hugo Rainey	International Technical Advisor	WCS Cambodia
Hunter Weiler	Technical Advisor, Forestry Administration, ITTO Trans-boundary Project	Phnom Penh
Jacob Kahl Jepsen	Counsellor - Development	DANIDA
Julien Colomer	UNV/Livelihoods Advisor	UNDP/GEF Tonle Sap Conservation Project
Keo Sovanna	PLUP Team Leader	WCS
Kep Bunna	Ranger Team Leader	WCS
Lay Khim	Team Leader, Environment and Energy Cluster	UNDP Cambodia
Leap Konn	Project Officer	PK
Linh Sim Lot	Project Officer	SMP
Mam Ream	Project Officer	FLD
Mark Gately	Country Director	WCS Cambodia
Men Soriyun	Deputy Director	Department of Wildlife and Biodiversity, FA
Nhem Sitith	Commune Councilor	Pring Thom Commune
Phork Panha	Demarcation Officer	MoE/WCS
Privan Limpanboon	Director, Civil Society Program	The Asia Foundation
Sok Chan Thorn	Community Trainer	SVC
Sok Sony	Project Officer	WCS
Sok Vathin	Participatory Planning of Community Zones	WCS
Sophie Baranes	Deputy Country Director (Programme)	UNDP Cambodia
Soth Mary	Chief of Forestry Administration in Chhep	FA
Soun Samai	Project Officer	SMP
Sy Ramony	Director	National Parks and Wildlife Sanctuary Department, MoE
Tan Setha	National Project Manager	FA/WCS Cambodia
Tao Sarath	Finance Manager	WCS Cambodia
Ung Dararath Moni	IFAD Advisor	UNDP
Yan Bunsoeuny	Law Enforcement Team Leader	

ANNEX 4: EVALUATION QUESTIONS ASKED AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Project Formulation

1. Are you satisfied with the overall design and approach of the Project? Are any changes in Project design needed at this stage?
2. Does the Project document/inception report provide sufficient guidance on the selection of activities and monitoring of results? Are these documents still relevant and useful guides for the Project implementation?
3. Has the Project organization and Project decision-making process been effective and efficient? Would you change anything in the current arrangement given the experience to date?
4. Are government officials developing the capacity to maintain technical quality of outputs during the remainder of the Project?

Project Implementation Modalities

5. Has the Project implementation process been effective and efficient in terms of how the activities have been delivered in the field?
6. What have been the particular challenges or issues in implementing the Project to date? Have any specific constraints been encountered that affected the quality of Project delivery?
7. What is the status of the relationships and coordination between the Project team, Project consultants and government staff? Would you change anything with regard to how they have functioned?
8. What are the relationships between the Project and other development assistance initiatives in the Project area? What types of linkages have occurred, if any, and have they been productive?
9. Have the financing, disbursement and contracting processes operated as planned?

Project Management

10. Has the Project Steering Committee been useful in providing strategic direction? Provide specific examples if possible.
11. Has the Project's management team been effective in providing operational guidance to the Project? Has it been capable of addressing key issues, concerns or questions that have arisen during implementation?
12. Have any major Project management or supervision issues affected the Project results or created any uncertainties or tensions?
13. Have the Project monitoring indicators been useful in measuring progress? Have the planned indicators been applied? Has the Project monitoring and reporting provided the necessary

Project Results

14. What are your observations and impressions of the effectiveness of the capacity building and training activities of the Project to date? How sustainable are these results?
15. What are your observations and impressions of the effectiveness of the biodiversity monitoring activities of the Project to date? How sustainable are these results?
16. What are your observations and impressions of the effectiveness of the awareness and outreach activities of the Project to date? How sustainable are these results?
17. What are your observations and impressions of the effectiveness of the livelihoods-support activities of the Project to-date? How sustainable are these results?

Capacity Building

18. Are there any observed changes in awareness, methods or practices that can be specifically attributed to the training provided by the Project?

19. Is there any firm evidence of the effect of these activities compared to the baseline conditions at the start of the Project? How would you rate the improvements in capacity to date?
20. Are there changes at the institutional level that can be attributed to the Project, particularly with regard to biodiversity conservation and management?

Summary Assessment

21. In summary, what aspects of the project have gone according to initial plan?
22. In summary, what aspects of the project have not gone according to initial planning?
23. In hindsight, what could have been done differently to meet Project objectives?
24. In summary, what important activities remain to be completed, or need to be added to meet

WCS RESPONSE TO CALM MTE QUESTIONNAIRE
H. Rainey and M. Gately, 27 August 2009

Project Formulation

1. Are you satisfied with the overall design and approach of the Project? Are any changes in Project design needed at this stage?

The project seems well designed and the original project document is still very appropriate for management at this stage. Our approach of working at a landscape level and engaging with stakeholders in central, provincial and local government; international and local NGOs and CSOs; and local communities is proving successful.

2. Does the Project Document/inception report provide sufficient guidance on the selection of activities and monitoring of results? Are these documents still relevant and useful guides for the Project implementation?

The Project Document is still useful and relevant, however, new situations (e.g. development of REDD projects and carbon trading, military situation on border, etc.) and new ideas (e.g. Ibis Rice, monitoring techniques) mean that we are moving away from the specific items in the reports. However, the general framework of activities and planned monitoring remain the same and are still current.

3. Has the Project organization and Project decision-making process been effective and efficient? Would you change anything in the current arrangement given the experience to date?

Project management, comprised of WCS collaborating with two ministries, is effective as it brings WCS's technical support, financial management and ability to collaborate with multiple partners together with the government's mandate, access to high level power and local knowledge. Without this structure the three project partners would probably find it difficult to work at a landscape level. The development of close relationships with government partners has allowed us to resolve complex management issues in a robust manner and still continue with effective management.

We have changed (in 2008) the Project Executive Group (PEG) to a more useful Project Advisory Group (PAG). The PEG, a group of all partners with whom we engage and planned to meet together regularly, was not very functional as most people that are influential are too busy to come to big meetings such as this and nothing useful can be decided at this type of meeting. Thus, the PAG, a group of partners with whom we engage and meet with individually regularly, was created. This is more flexible and functional.

4. Are government officials developing the capacity to maintain technical quality of outputs during the remainder of the Project?

Government staff have received considerable training and mentoring to ensure that their capacity has risen throughout the life of the project. Government staff are now in senior positions in all activities including: landscape and community land use planning and monitoring; livelihoods development and monitoring; law enforcement; demarcation (activity now suspended until further funding is available); and wildlife monitoring. Areas where government staff are not yet involved at a high level include highly technical activities

such as forest cover monitoring and some wildlife monitoring analysis. However, we will continue to work with both provincial and central government staff to develop their capacity, including in developing areas such as the REDD project.

Project Implementation Modalities

5. Has the Project implementation process been effective and efficient in terms of how the activities have been delivered in the field?

We have been successful in meeting almost all of the targets within the log frame as well as more directly in the development of activities. This is due to careful planning of the project documents and implementation. We are developing our capacity to engage with provincial development planning committees and this will assist in ensuring that conservation is mainstreamed into provincial plans.

6. What have been the particular challenges or issues in implementing the Project to date? Have any specific constraints been encountered that affected the quality of Project delivery?

The major challenge facing the project is the involvement of military in illegal land-grabbing, logging and hunting. This has become severe over the last year as a result of the border crisis in Preah Vihear. The project has received considerable high level government support within the two main partner ministries and we anticipate that this support will continue. Although the developments of the last few days (authorisation of settlement of 3,000 military families in northern PVPF) is the most serious challenge the project faces, we are still optimistic that a suitable solution can be found which prevents this action having a large effect on the project. Other than this major problem, we are addressing other challenges with some success and developing new means for mitigating challenges where necessary.

7. What is the status of the relationships and coordination between the Project team, Project consultants and government staff? Would you change anything with regard to how they have functioned?

As stated above, the collaboration between WCS and the two ministries ensures effective delivery of activities and results with effective technical quality, capacity building and financial responsibility. We would not change this partnership as it is.

What are the relationships between the Project and other development assistance initiatives in the Project area? What types of linkages have occurred, if any, and have they been productive?

We have been fortunate to find five local partner NGOs who carry out livelihood activities and community management with whom we can work. These have been important for the project as they enable us to carry out a broader range of activities as well as covering a large area. This also helps develop national capacity and will create a broader national constituency to support conservation in the future. We have found that some development partners engaged in activities which are deleterious to conservation are unaware of the status of the conservation areas in the landscape. This has required some expenditure of time to ensure that this does not become a problem.

We have tried to develop links with other GEF/UNDP projects, particularly SLM, as this could have increased the rate of implementation of activities such as PLUP. Unfortunately, this has become a more desk-bound study which will be unlikely to contribute to the success of this project.

We have worked with the government and the World Bank to change the planned route of a World Bank-funded road which had been planned to cut through the core zone of PVPPF.

Many partners do not engage in activities which influence conservation and thus are of limited concern for us.

8. Have the financing, disbursement and contracting processes operated as planned?

Financing is operating as planned. One issue is that disbursement to the project can take up to one month and this delays project activities. Tao Sarath has met Prom Nga and described this and UNDP has said that they would be happy for us to request an additional month of funding as a buffer.

Project Management

9. Has the Project Steering Committee been useful in providing strategic direction? Provide specific examples if possible.

The PSC/Project Board has been helpful in overseeing the project's activities, in particular in monitoring successful achievement of targets. Recently, the PB has assisted in obtaining additional UNDP financing (from UNDP core funds) to initiate a REDD project feasibility study in the CALM landscape. The PB has been active in encouraging the project to monitor its activities effectively. This has been helpful in maintaining our focus. The PB is also useful for reporting on project activities to ensure partners are aware of activities.

10. Has the Project's management team been effective in providing operational guidance to the Project? Has it been capable of addressing key issues, concerns or questions that have arisen during implementation?

We have been capable of addressing effectively almost all issues that challenge the project. We have been able to work with all partners at many levels to ensure that challenges are managed. Only land-grabbing by the military and concessions granted at very high level have been difficult to manage and even these are not insurmountable problems.

11. Have any major Project management or supervision issues affected the Project results or created any uncertainties or tensions?

We have had to resolve some problems related to management in KPWS and this has taken some time. However, management here is now more effective and improving each month. This may have affected the pace of project, but we are still on target to meet out planned outcomes/outputs/results/indicators.

12. Have the Project monitoring indicators been useful in measuring progress? Have the planned indicators been applied? Has the Project monitoring and reporting provided the necessary information to assess progress in meeting Project objectives and targets?

The monitoring indicators are still useful and are used regularly (including monthly for law enforcement targets). The forest cover monitoring is especially pertinent with the planned development of a REDD project. Project monitoring and reporting is adequate in providing appropriate information.

Project Results

13. What are your observations and impressions of the effectiveness of the capacity building and training activities of the Project to date? How sustainable are these results?

Training of project staff directly involved with management has involved formal training and mentoring on the job. This has been effective in developing capacity and providing feedback. As management is so complex, much of the capacity-building of more senior staff has involved mentoring by technical advisors and project managers during management activities. The government staff in the different management roles are now reasonably competent, in some cases, very competent. The main concern is maintaining the focus of staff in the long term and keeping their motivation levels high (this is not just related to salaries). One option for the project is rotating staff occasionally between project sites to keep their ideas fresh.

Training of staff and other stakeholders has been very effective. Law enforcement and monitoring staff have been trained in MIST and patrolling techniques and this has raised their capacity as well as the project's ability to monitor staff. The training provided to community members and local NGO staff has demonstrated its strengths in the various community-related projects that we have developed including Tmatboey and Dangphlat ecotourism sites, Ibis Rice, PLUP in 12 villages, etc. As an example, the production of Ibis Rice should continue in the long term as long as monitoring by NGOs is effective and marketing continues. Monitoring structures and protocols are established and will ensure that the reputation of Ibis Rice as a wildlife-friendly product is maintained.

The construction of the two new headquarters has improved management capacity as management and other staff are spending more time on site and less time in the WCS office in Tbeng. This provides them with better oversight of project activities and management of illegal activities. Monitoring staff are able to download their data on site and provide instant feedback to field staff. Thus management is more efficient and feedback can be given to management and law enforcement staff more rapidly. As discussed with the MTE team, the construction design is not perfect, but the new buildings are high quality and fulfill their role. Some improvements will be made to them, including a roof extension and installation of solar power and these will improve capacity further.

14. What are your observations and impressions of the effectiveness of the biodiversity monitoring activities of the Project to date? How sustainable are these results?

The flagship Bird Nest Protection Scheme is highly effective at providing monitoring data for large threatened birds: the flagship species of the sites. This has recently provided information on the differing fortunes of Greater and Lesser Adjutants in the Northern Plains enabling us to adapt management to address the problems facing Greater Adjutants. Large mammal monitoring (focusing on large ungulates) is relatively useful, but the amount of effort required to obtain data to monitor species such as Banteng and Gaur may not be feasible given current resources. We have adapted this for certain highly threatened species such as Asian Elephant. The latter species is the subject of any ongoing project to establish a

baseline population estimate using DNA sampled from dung. This is more cost effective for smaller populations. Forest cover monitoring has recently produced high quality outputs which will enable us to assess the effects of management activities. We currently have three time periods (2002, 2007 and 2009) at which we can assess forest cover change. These correspond roughly to the initiation of the project and the mid-point. This type of analysis will be used to development of a REDD project and will therefore be useful in the future.

15. What are your observations and impressions of the effectiveness of the awareness and outreach activities of the Project to date? How sustainable are these results?

Our awareness-raising activities, as outlined in the inception report are generally integrated into our other activities. Community management activities rely to a great extent on stakeholders being informed about conservation and the need for management activities. Thus, a large a part of this activity includes community meetings to discuss land use planning and conservation management planning. The effectiveness of our approach is demonstrated in our expansion of the PLUP process to 12 villages in the landscape. Awareness-raising on national laws and individual site rules and regulations is undertaken by the project and patrol managers. This is addressed at stakeholders at all levels from communities to senior government officials such as provincial governors and military generals. This is effective as these people are involved in ensuring good governance and are thus knowledgeable about laws. We are focusing additional attention on some individuals in positions which can influence land concessions, new villages and other potential threats to the landscape. Increasing the intensity of our awareness-raising activities would be possible and productive, but at the expense of implementation of other activities. Therefore, our current activities are probably a reasonable level of investment given current resources. The (mostly government) staff involved in this activity are likely to be involved with the project for some time. They have sufficient training to carry out this activity well beyond the life of the project. Additionally, the significant investment of time spent engaging with stakeholders will be productive for some time. However, government officials are rotated relatively frequently so this is an activity which must be repeated frequently.

16. What are your observations and impressions of the effectiveness of the livelihoods-support activities of the Project to-date? How sustainable are these results?

Ibis Rice and ecotourism are self-sustaining and can be expanded to more villages.

Capacity Building

17. Are there any observed changes in awareness, methods or practices that can be specifically attributed to the training provided by the Project?

Communities in many areas now are integrated into the bird nest protection scheme and in these areas reduce their hunting of wildlife and land clearance. Many government staff in FA and MoE are more aware of conservation activities are more supportive than before.

18. Is there any firm evidence of the effect of these activities compared to the baseline conditions at the start of the Project? How would you rate the improvements in capacity to date?

Land clearance rates in the project area are lower than in areas outside the project area. Wildlife numbers are increasing in the project area.

19. Are there changes at the institutional level that can be attributed to the Project, particularly with regard to biodiversity conservation and management?

The MoE has made the new senior KPWS staff member the KPWS director of the Preah Vihear sector rather than making him subordinate to the KPWS director of the whole protected area.

Summary Assessment

20. In summary, what aspects of the project have gone according to initial planning?

Most aspects have gone according to plan, including wildlife monitoring, community land use planning, law enforcement in PVPF and periphery (and now KPWS), livelihoods development and improvements in capacity including training and construction.

21. In summary, what aspects of the project have not gone according to initial planning?

Military concessions and land grabbing have increased as a result of the border conflict.

Management in KPWS has taken some time to become fully effective, but better structures are now in place with better managers. Demarcation took longer to implement than planned as we had to learn and design new techniques, await government decisions and funding has not yet been renewed.

22. In hindsight, what could have been done differently to meet Project objectives?

Increased liaison with MoE to ensure that management staff are effective. Earlier and more frequent awareness-raising with government staff and commune and district chiefs on KPWS and PVPF boundaries and laws.

23. In summary, what important activities remain to be completed, or need to be added to meet Project objectives?

Effective law enforcement across the whole of KPWS and in Cherndar. Demarcation of the boundary of large parts of the landscape. REDD project development. Development of community fisheries in the Stung Sen and in PVPF. Completion of PLUP in all 12 target villages.

ANNEX 5: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Anonymous. No date. World Bank Provincial and Rural Infrastructure Project (PRIP) – planned road rehabilitation in Preah Vihear Province.

CALM. Project Document. Section II: Total Workplan and Budget, Section III Other Agreements Section IV Approved Executive Summary and Annexes. Wildlife Conservation Society, Cambodia.

CALM. 2007. CALM annual workplan. Wildlife Conservation Society, Cambodia. **CALM.** 2007. Annual Project Review report, 1 January-31 December 2007. Wildlife Conservation Society, Cambodia.

CALM. 2008. Updated risk log 15 December 2008. Wildlife Conservation Society, Cambodia.

CALM. 2008. Annual work planning workshop agenda. Wildlife Conservation Society, Cambodia.

CALM. 2008. CALM annual workplan 2008. Wildlife Conservation Society, Cambodia.

CALM. 2009. Quarterly project report Q1 2009. Wildlife Conservation Society, Cambodia.

CALM. 2009. Updated risk log 28 August 2009. Wildlife Conservation Society, Cambodia.

Clements, T. no date. Tmatboey Ecotourism Project. Wildlife Conservation Society Cambodia.

Clements, T., Ashish John, Karen Nielsen, Chea Vicheka, Ear Sokha and Meas Piseth. 2008. Case study: Tmatboey Community-based Ecotourism Project, Cambodia. Ministry of Environment, Cambodia and WCS Cambodia Program.

Ferguson, A. and Kong Vutheary. 2007. Mid Term Evaluation of the Tonle Sap Conservation Project, Cambodia. Prepared for UNDP Cambodia. Project: 00038552, GEF PIMS:962.

Forestry Administration and Wildlife Conservation Society Cambodia. 2008. Preah Vihear Forest Rules and Regulations (in Khmer)

GEF. 2004. Establishing Conservation Areas Landscape Management (CALM) in the Northern Plains. Project Executive Summary, GEF Work Program Submission.

Glenarec, Y. 2005. PIMS 2177 Full-Size Project for Cambodia: Establishing Conservation Areas through Landscape Management (CALM) in the Northern Plains Atlas BU KHM 10, Proposal No. 00041572, Project No. 00047478.

ITTO. 2008. Management of the Emerald Triangle Protected Forests Complex to Promote Cooperation for Transboundary Biodiversity Conservation between Thailand, Cambodia and Laos (Phase II). Project Document #289/04 Rev. 1(F).

ITTO. 2009a. Management of the Emerald Triangle Protected Forests Complex to Promote Cooperation for Transboundary Biodiversity Conservation between Thailand, Cambodia and Laos (Phase II). Progress Report #3, Cambodia Component.

ITTO. 2009b. Management of the Emerald Triangle Protected Forests Complex to Promote Cooperation for Transboundary Biodiversity Conservation between Thailand, Cambodia and Laos (Phase II). Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the Project Steering Committee.

KPMG. 2008. Financial statements and auditor's report for the year ended 31 December 2007. KPMG Cambodia Ltd, Phnom Penh.

Ministry of Environment, Forestry Administration and Wildlife Conservation Society Cambodia. No date. Ibis Rice. Protecting wildlife in Cambodia...one grain at a time.

Ministry of Planning. 2007. Progress in achieving Cambodia Millennium Development Goals: challenges and opportunities. 2007 annual Ministerial review of the high level segment of ECOSOC. Geneva, 2-4 July 2007.

Pearson, T., S. Petrova, N. Harris and S. Brown. 2008. Assessing the potential for generating carbon offsets in the Seima Biodiversity Conservation Area, Cambodia. Report submitted to WCS by Winrock International.

Rainey, H. 2009. Review of current events in northern Preah Vihear Protected Forest. Wildlife Conservation Society Cambodia.

Rainey, H. 2009. Meeting report. Quarterly CALM Project Board Meeting, 5 August 2009.

Rainey, H. 2008. Meeting report. Project Board Meeting for GEF CALM Northern Plains Project, 11 April 2008.

Rainey, H. no date. Gender strategy document. WCS Cambodia, Phnom Penh.

Rainey, H. no date. Bird nest protection in the Northern Plains of Cambodia. WCS Cambodia.

Rainey, H. no date. Revision to Project Management Framework of CALM (Establishing Conservation Areas through Landscape Management in the Northern Plains of Cambodia). WCS Cambodia.

Rainey, H. 2008. Meeting report. Project Board Meeting for GEF CALM Northern Plains Project, 11 April 2008.

Sovanny Chhum and Cecilia April. 2009. Field visit report, Project No. 00047478 – Conservation Areas through Landscape Management (CALM).

Sovanny Chhum. 2009. Project Board Meeting for GEF/UNDP CALM Northern Plains Project.

Stokes, Emma. no date. MIST- a tool for law enforcement monitoring. WCS Cambodia, Phnom Penh.

UNDP. 2002. Guidelines for outcome evaluators. Evaluation Office, UNDP New York.

UNDP. 2004. Country Office Local Advisory Committee (LPAC) Report. Establishing Conservation Areas through Landscape Management (CALM) in the northern plains of Cambodia. PIMS 2177.

UNDP 2004. Project of the Government of Cambodia, Project Support Document. Establishing Conservation Areas Landscape Management (CALM) in the northern plains.

UNDP. 2008. Project Cooperation Agreement between The United Nations Development Programme and WCS Conservation Program.

UNDP Cambodia Country Office, Local Program Advisory Committee (LPAC). 2005. Local Program Advisory Appraisal Committee Meeting 27 January 2005. Establishing Conservation and Landscape Management in the Northern Plains of Cambodia (CALM), PIMS 2177.

UNDP/GEF. 2007. APR/PIR 2007 – Biodiversity. 1 July 2006 – 31 December 2007.

UNDP. 2008. Conservation Area Landscape Management. Establishing conservation areas through landscape management in the northern plains of Cambodia. Project Fact Sheet 01/2008 (project 00447478).

UNDP. 2009. Terms of Reference for Mid-Term Evaluation. Conservation Areas through Landscape Management (CALM) in the Northern Plains of Cambodia. United Nations Development Programme, Cambodia.

UNDP EEG and GEF. Annual Performance Report (APR) Project Implementation Review (PIR). 2008 – Biodiversity. Reporting Period 1 July 2007-30 June 2008.

UNDP GEF. APR/PIR 2007 (1 July 2006-30 June 2007). Establishing CALM (Conservation Areas through Landscape Management) in the northern plains of Cambodia.

WCS. 2006. Establishing CALM (Conservation Areas through Landscape Management) in the northern plains of Cambodia. Inception Report. Wildlife Conservation Society Cambodia.

WCS. 2009a. Feasibility assessment for a Reduced Emissions from Degradation and Deforestation (REDD) project in the Northern Plains, Cambodia. Wildlife Conservation Society Cambodia.

WCS. 2009b. Establishing CALM (Conservation Areas through Landscape Management) in the northern plains of Cambodia. Quarterly Project Report Q2, 2009. Wildlife Conservation Society Cambodia.

WCS. 2009c. CALM updated risk log, August 2009. Wildlife Conservation Society Cambodia.

ANNEX 6: CALM MANAGEMENT RESPONSE FRAMEWORK

MTE Recommendations	Project Response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible
<p>Recommendation 1: <i>It is recommended that the adaptive management approach taken by the Project to-date be continued. This approach permits adjustments to Project activities in response to changing circumstances (including funding availability, successes that can be built on, and failures that require a modification in approach), based on clearly developed justification and the agreement of all Parties, and without losing sight of the fundamental goals and objectives of the Project.</i></p>	<p>We agree with this recommendation and will continue with adaptive management.</p>	<p>Project strategy will continue to be adapted as necessary.</p>	<p>Lifetime of project</p>	<p>WCS, FA, GDANCP</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: <i>Resolution (or stabilization) of military activities in the area will be critical for the success of the Project. It is recommended that the government counterpart institutions continue all efforts to find an effective, long-term political and administrative solution that will minimize forest and biodiversity loss to military activities and the presence of large numbers of troops and their families, back-stopped as necessary by the technical/advisory and associated financial resources available through the Project. Linkages with the ITTO-supported Transboundary Project, which operates in the northern part of the CALM project area, also need to be explored in terms of harmonizing the use of technical and financial resources available for the timely resolution of this situation (see also Recommendation 7).</i></p>	<p>Agree that engagement with military is essential to stabilize the situation. Linkages with the ITTO project will be maintained, but are constrained by lack of provincial presence and probable end of ITTO financing in March 2010.</p>	<p>A provincial meeting is being planned to develop agreements with the military to make government backed land use rules for CALM.</p>	<p>Meeting in 2009. Development of relations with military over lifetime of project</p>	<p>FA, GDANCP</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: <i>The Provincial and Commune Development Plans provide a natural entry point for Project activities (conservation, livelihoods), and the feasibility of linking CALM interventions with these should be explored.</i></p>	<p>Agreed – this is important.</p>	<p>The project will develop links to development plans in the coming months.</p>	<p>2009 until March 2010 (and will continue for the lifetime of the project).</p>	<p>WCS, FA, GDANCP</p>

MTE Recommendations	Project Response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible
<p>Recommendation 4: <i>The PLUP process should be reviewed and any necessary adjustments made to improve the impact of Project inputs. The potential for using PLUP in future commune development plans should be explored.</i></p>	<p>The PLUP process is effective and by its nature flexible and dynamic. Agreed that integration of PLUP outputs should be further incorporated into CDPs. PLUP process is regularly reviewed to be in line with legal situation.</p>	<p>PLUP community agreements are now used to manage illegal land clearance and as the basis for ensuring only families in compliance with land use agreements receive a premium on 'Ibis Rice' (national level recognition of land use being part of it).</p>	<p>Lifetime of project. Monitoring of land use agreements now being implemented.</p>	<p>WCS, FA, GDANCP</p>
<p>Recommendation 5: <i>The needs for demarcation of protected area boundaries, appropriate methodologies, costs and constraints need to be clarified. WCS and some of the other Project partners appear to have widely differing views on boundary demarcation methodologies. It is understood that boundary demarcation has now come to a stop due to a lack of funds. This issue needs to be resolved promptly and demarcation resumed in at least the most vulnerable areas.</i></p>	<p>Demarcation is a highly complex process with many different stakeholders involved. Thus the initial process undertaken by WCS was slow as we were developing methodologies following these laws and much consultation with stakeholders. This consultation is essential for the process to be legal and to ensure long term respect for the process. It was somewhat difficult to ensure that all partners appreciated this.</p>	<p>As soon as financing becomes available we will continue with this process.</p>	<p>Depending on new financing which is not on the horizon</p>	<p>FA, GDANCP, WCS</p>
<p>Recommendation 6: <i>The NGOs engaged by the Project and met by the Evaluation Mission all articulated their activities well, and appeared to be enthusiastic and</i></p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Monitoring and mentoring will continue.</p>	<p>Lifetime of the project</p>	<p>WCS, FA, GDANCP</p>

MTE Recommendations	Project Response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible
<i>technically capable of carrying out their assigned tasks. The quality of their work is monitored by the Project through WCS and reportedly is satisfactory, with no major issues or problems identified; however, their work needs to continue to be monitored and adjustments made as necessary.</i>				
Recommendation 7: <i>Another biodiversity conservation initiative, the Transboundary Project funded by ITTO, is active along the border with Cambodia and Laos and at least partially overlaps the CALM Project area. There has already been some cooperation in terms of coordination of funding, and this needs to continue as long as both projects are active in the area.</i>	Agreed. Coordination with the ITTO project will continue.	Notable collaboration includes the PVPF management plan.	Lifetime of both projects	FA, WCS
Recommendation 8: <i>The need for a high level Project Steering Committee that is operational at national level should be reviewed, particularly with regard to giving the Project a higher profile and possible increased influence at political level.</i>	Review of need for PSC interesting. Most importantly, the goals and ToR for such a group should be carefully agreed to ensure that it is functional and that its members are fully engaged with the project. One of the failures of the PEG was that members were not engaged.	Review suggested for next Project Board meeting.	January 2010	WCS, FA, GDANCP, UNDP
Recommendation 9: <i>The coordination mechanisms established to-date between the relevant government agencies (including staff embedded in the Project) and Project activities need to be maintained.</i>	Agreed.	Effective coordination as part of adaptive management will continue and develop.	Lifetime of project	FA, GDANCP, WCS
Recommendation 10: <i>Communication of Project progress/reporting of results has been informative and adequate. Reporting has included quarterly progress</i>	Agreed.	Project reports will continue to be produced including	Lifetime of project	WCS, FA, GDANCP

MTE Recommendations	Project Response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible
<p><i>reports, meeting and trip reports, position and policy papers and technical reports. Most if not all of these reports are presumably also available in Khmer. Reporting at the current standard needs to be continued to the end of the Project.</i></p>		<p>in Khmer versions and/or Khmer summaries.</p>		
<p>Recommendation 11: <i>Project efforts should continue to focus on building local capacity for biodiversity management, including both government staff and local residents, both through training and mentoring of appropriate livelihood activities and natural resource use. The good progress made to date in initiating biodiversity conservation activities and building local support needs to be continued and widened.</i></p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>We will continue to develop local capacity as a core activity of the project.</p>	<p>Lifetime of project</p>	<p>WCS, FA, GDANCP, local NGOs and CSOs</p>
<p>Recommendation 12: <i>Because Project activities are funded by a number of sources (in addition to GEF), attribution of specific results to individual donors is not necessarily clear-cut. There does not appear to be a simple solution to this and in the opinion of the Review Mission it is questionable if there needs to be, the ongoing and cumulative results of the Project in relation to its aims, objectives and specified outputs being the primary measure of success. In terms of financial accountability, the Review Mission has confirmed that detailed, audited financial reporting is provided to each donor (specific to their funding) on a regular basis. WCS has indicated that, to ensure transparency, all reports are available for scrutiny by all donors upon request. It is recommended that broader questions (if any) regarding coordination of funding among donors and most appropriate use of funds should be taken up at Project Board and/or Steering Committee level.</i></p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>All financing is clearly allocated to specific activities and is accounted for in an auditable fashion. Every donor is welcome to visit (and encouraged to visit the site more often) and staff are always available to meet donors.</p>	<p>Immediate and for lifetime of project</p>	<p>WCS</p>
<p>Recommendation 13: <i>The gender strategy developed</i></p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>We will coordinate</p>	<p>When</p>	<p>WCS, FA,</p>

MTE Recommendations	Project Response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible
<i>during the initial phase of the Project should be followed up by the development and implementation of a gender mainstreaming plan.</i>		with the UNDP advisor to develop and implement a mainstreaming plan when it becomes available.	mainstreaming plan is available	GDANCP
Recommendation 14: <i>Opportunities for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into Commune Council and provincial development planning and budgets need to continue to be explored.</i>	Agreed.	We will continue to improve our mainstreaming into commune, district and provincial development planning.	Lifetime of project	WCS, FA, GDANCP
Recommendation 15: <i>The support of local and provincial stakeholders needs to continue to be built through a mainstreaming approach.</i>	Agreed.	Provincial and stakeholder interests will be reviewed to maintain progress. A provincial stakeholder meeting for KPWS to review livelihood activities and threat to the site is being planned.	KPWS meeting in 2009. Provincial support for lifetime of project	WCS, FA, GDANCP
Recommendation 16: <i>The impacts of in-migration (in response to improved economic opportunities) and natural population growth on resource use and demand levels should be considered and incorporated in planning processes.</i>	To be determined.	To be determined.	Lifetime of project	WCS, FA, GDANCP
Recommendation 17: <i>Opportunities for future funding of protected areas offered by REDD appear to be much larger than those from ecotourism, and therefore should be pursued. Protected areas supported by REDD should</i>	Agreed. Ecotourism can provide some local income and incentives to a few communities. REDD	We will continue to work with all partners to develop a REDD feasibility for	Feasibility study until March 2010	WCS, FA, GDANCP

MTE Recommendations	Project Response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible
<i>be promoted as a viable land use alternative.</i>	potentially can provide high levels of funding for site managers.	all land management units in the landscape.		
Recommendation 18: <i>Needs and opportunities for the Project to align with decentralization and deconcentration activities need to be further explored.</i>	Agreed. All community based activities are being implemented in close cooperation with commune, district and provincial authorities. However patrolling activities may become complicated if there is too much involvement of many authorities.	The project will work to align PSDD activities with those of the project.	Lifetime of project	WCS, FA, GDANCP
Recommendation 19: <i>The Forestry Administration should be represented at Board Level by an independent member. The National Project Manager (an FA staff member) should continue to attend Board Meetings to represent the interests of Project Management.</i>	Agreed. This will improve oversight and develop support for the project within the FA.	This suggestion has already been taken to the FA and Mr. Ung Sam Ath, Deputy Director-General of the FA has been nominated to attend the Project Board meetings	Immediate	WCS, FA
Recommendation 20: <i>The Project should maintain dialogue with other projects in the area to maximize synergies.</i>	Agreed. We do maintain dialogue with other projects and provide information on the CALM project to partners.	We look forward to further dialogue with other projects.	Lifetime of project	WCS, FA, GDANCP
Recommendation 21: <i>The importance of the Project in the context of the National Forestry Program, and how the two initiatives align, needs to be examined.</i>	Agreed. Tom Evans of WCS drafted the conservation section of the NFP and thus the Project will align well with this.	We will continue to work with the FA to ensure that the Project is aligned with the NFP	Lifetime of project	FA, WCS
Recommendation 22: <i>The Project Managers should</i>	Agreed. This will aid	Project managers	Lifetime of	FA,

MTE Recommendations	Project Response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible
<i>attend Provincial Executive Committee meetings to ensure good coordination.</i>	mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation.	will attend the ExComm meeting.	project	GDANCP
Recommendation 23: <i>The following questions should be considered in a clearly defined exit strategy to be developed well before Project closure: how do the Project results fit in with RGC's planning for capacity development? what is RGC's vision for post-GEF funding, both in the Project area and elsewhere in Cambodia? Specifically, how will field staff salaries and benefits be paid on the termination of GEF/other donor funding? what are the plans to transfer the MIST database and responsibility for its maintenance to government? how can biodiversity conservation be further mainstreamed into the development planning process?</i>	All these are important questions which must be addressed by the Project and its partners to ensure sustainability.	Each question will be addressed over the coming year to ensure an effective strategy	Lifetime of project	WCS, FA, GDANCP
Recommendation 24: <i>Experience in the design and construction of protected areas facilities needs to be incorporated in a manual or guidelines for future use by MoE and FA planners and managers, in order to avoid wastage of funds on inappropriate or poorly designed or constructed facilities.</i>	Agreed. Appropriate national management building guidelines would be a useful output for lessons learnt from the project.	The Project will assist the government in this.	Lifetime of project	FA, GDANCP, WCS
Recommendation 25: <i>Lessons learned should be revisited at end of Project for incorporation into future externally funded initiatives, and ideally into operational procedures of MoE/FA.</i>	Agreed. This should be part of the final evaluation of the project.	Lessons learned to be incorporated into final project evaluation.	End of project	WCS, FA, GDANCP