2013 Annual Project Review (APR)

Project Implementation Review (PIR) OF UNDP Supported GEF Financed Projects

PIMS 3867 - Project Title: Promoting Climate-Resilient Water Management and Agricultural Practices in Rural Cambodia

Focal Area	Climate Change - LDCF
Lead RTA	
Lead Country(ies)	(CMB) Cambodia
Revised Planned Closing Date	30-Nov-2013
Overall Risk rating	High
Overall DO rating	Highly Satisfactory
Overall IP rating	Highly Satisfactory
GEF grant amount disbursed so far	1,906,551

Project Summary

The proposed project is based on priority interventions outlined in the Cambodian NAPA and focuses on climate change-resilient agricultural water management. The impacts of climate change on Cambodian agriculture, particularly on rice cultivation, are predicted to adversely affect food production and –security in rural areas. At present, there is emerging evidence that agriculture-based livelihoods and overall food security in Cambodia are affected by increased frequency and severity of floods, dry spells and drought events. A major constraint in moving from a focus on post-disaster relief management to anticipatory agricultural and water resources planning is the limited institutional and individual capacity in both government agencies and community organizations to understand potential climate change impacts on irrigation systems, communal freshwater availability and agricultural production, and to internalize a perspective of longer-term resilience into sectoral policy and development planning processes. LDCF support will be used to systematically address institutional and individual capacity gaps in affected rural communities to manage agricultural water resources in a changing climate, and to demonstrate resilient irrigation, freshwater management, and farming options. As Cambodia has been undertaking a concerted effort of decentralization, these efforts will primarily focus on provincial, district and communal planning systems, which include Planning and Budgeting Committees, Communal Councils and Farmer Water-Use Committees. The project will work in two contrasting agricultural districts, selected for their high vulnerability as well as for differences in agro-ecological and socio-economic circumstances. Lessons learned from the project will be systematically replicated in other high risk areas within Cambodia, and made accessible to other countries in the region which face similar climate risk projections for their agriculture-based economies.

UNDP-GEF Technical Advisor's Comments

Explanation for change to Overall DO Rating or Overall IP Rating:

Is this the terminal PIR that will serve as the final project report? No

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was started but not completed this reporting period, please explain how these are progressing and note if any delays are expected:

N/A

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was completed this reporting period, or if this is the final APR/PIR, please address the following points here:

N/A

UNDP Country Office's Comments

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was started but not completed this reporting period, please explain how these are progressing and note if any delays are expected:

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was completed this reporting period, or if this is the final APR/PIR, please address the following points here:

Responses to MTR Recommendations:

MTR Recommendation 1: UNDP needs to support the implementing agencies at provincial and district level in participatory processes and social mobilisation, especially with regard to understanding of local vulnerability, community power dynamics, household economy and participation of poor in development activities.

Actions: A series of thematic follow up missions were conducted over the past 12 months such as the joint field-monitoring and spotcheck mission by UNDP CO assurance team; regular technical field monitoring visits by the Advisors attached to MAFF-PSU and the Provincial Coordinators based in target provinces; Project Board field visit; and the recent RTA and CO field monitoring visit, which generated some recommendations in consultation with the provincial and district officials to focus on achieving the project targets at both output and outcome level and to follow-up the key recommendations from the MTR. With these follow-up missions, the project team has now agreed to conduct the impact assessment of the project activities; in particular, the project is willing to give special consideration to focus on the participation of the poor/landless families. So far, the project has already conducted focused group discussions with the beneficiaries to assess the results of the project.

MTR Recommendation 2: In the remaining duration of the project, the project needs to review and re-design how activities like income generation, household water supply, communal irrigation structures are planned, with whom they are planned, clear analysis of who benefits and how these generate adaptation solutions, and how these are implemented.

Actions: The project is recruiting a consultant to assess all farmer groups on their capacity and potential for income generation activities. The exercise is expected to be completed in August 2013, and the recommendations from this exercise are expected to inform the approach of the project implementation using the one-village approach which will be scaled up during the second phase of the project implementation under the CIDA fund.

MTR Recommendation 3: In order to generate evidence-based advocacy and communicate messages, the project needs to reorient some of its activities toward producing credible data to show how communities are generating adaptation solutions and increasing their resilience to climate change. One approach would be to take an entire village community – albeit small – as a unit of intervention. Through the latter approach, the project could enable a community to undertake a total village analysis – of their livelihood needs, resource requirements, bio-mass requirements, production and withdrawals from natural resources, vulnerability to climate changes, and development and adaptation needs. This would also help generate bottom-up adaptation solutions taking into account a community's multi-faceted needs.

Actions: The project has started to pilot the one-village approach in 4 villages within the existing target areas in 2013. The project is under the process of documenting experiences to be replicated in the second phase. A guidance note to conduct the impact assessment of the key project interventions under this one-village approach is being developed with technical support from the RTA. The project will use this guidance note to implement the impact assessment of the project interventions to generate results for the purpose of evidence-based advocacy and communication during the second phase.

MTR Recommendation 4: In order to address the delays caused by complex array of unclear procedures at PA level, the project needs to have regular dialogue with the office of the provincial Governors at senior level and resolve bottlenecks that arise.

Actions: MAFF/PSU team has discussed the issue with IP3 project managers. It was also discussed during the field monitoring visits by the technical level from UNDP CO and the Project Board members with representatives from the deputy Governors of the target provinces. As a result, the situation in Kratie province has improved. However, in Preah VIhear, there has been slow progress due to the dynamics within the key players involved at the Provincial Administration. UNDP CO will continue to bring this dialogue onwards during the meetings with the respective provincial representatives when appropriate.

MTR Recommendation 5: Implementing staff would require greater orientation to outcome-oriented planning, monitoring and implementation. The project staff needs to use cost-benefit and effectiveness measures in planning and implementing all activities.

Actions: UNDP CO has been working closely with the project team to provide guidance to the project team to ensure cost effectiveness in planning and implementation. This happened on a regular basis during the AWP development and Quarterly Progress/Financial Report review process. In addition, a project delivery clinic was conducted with the project team to review the project budget to ensure the project budget is accurately planned and any over budgeted lines will be reverted to other activities that contribute to achieve greater project results. A result-based M&E training was also conducted by UNDP CO for the project team both at national and sub-national level.

Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period:

January 2013

PROGRESS TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2009	Level at 30 June 2010	Level at 30 June 2011	Level at 30 June 2012	Level at 30 June 2013
Objective: To reduce the vulnerability of Cambodia's agricultural sector to climate–induced changes in water resources availability	Reduction of farmer vulnerability to climate variability and climate change	Farmer vulnerability to impacts of climate change is extreme, with virtually no adaptive capacity in place	At the end of the project the average VRA value as determined from interviews with central government and local agencies and stakeholders in pilot communities is at least 35% lower than the baseline value			A Vulnerability Reduction Assessment (VRA) was conducted in the target communes. The vulnerability index has been identified. Based on this assessment, the average VRA value is 4 which is highly vulnerable. To measure the achievement in vulnerability reduction , the project will conduct a mid-term and end-of-project VRA in 2012 and 2013, respectively. The VRA assessment with national and provincial governments is planned for August 2011.	The Vulnerability Reduction Assessment (VRA), which integrated the Rapid Gender Assessment (RGA) during the inception phase, was conducted between February to March 2012 in 14 additional communes (one village per commune). In total, the 16 communes rated 4 (i.e. highly vulnerable) out of 5 in the index of their vulnerabilities to the impact	The final VRA has been carried out in 6 out of the 16 target communes so far. The VRA in the remaining 10 communes are scheduled in early August. The interim result based on the final VRA in the 6 communes revealed that the average vulnerability index decreased from 4 to 3.1 (decrease by 22.5%).

							of floods and droughts on rice and water resources. VRA result is now available for the 16 target communes. The delay in the project implementation prevented the project from conducting the mid-term VRA. The final VRA will be carried out in June 2013.	
Outcome 1: Improved capacity within local institutions to manage agricultural water resources in a changing climate	Percentage of Commune Councils' Planning and Budgeting Committees utilizing climate information, forecasts and scenarios for decision making and water resource planning	No commune council planning and budgeting committees utilizing CC information in water resource planning	By the end of the project, 90% of commune committees in target districts are using climate information in water resource planning			In the first year of the project (2010), 2 communes representing 12% of the total target communes have incorporated climate-related information in its commune investment plans. The result came from project workshops, commune fora, VRA trainings, local exchange visits, and a specific training provided on Climate	16 communes, representing 100% of the total target, have received and used climatic information which was incorporated in the Commune Investment Programmes (CIP) through VRA trainings and exercises, trainings to	This target was achieved during the last reporting period. To date, the 16 communes continue to receive and use climatic information. In particular, during the annual Commune Investment Program formulation, new development priorities such as changes in rice varieties and rehabilitation of irrigation schemes, have been identified and incorporated by Commune Councils. The project team facilitates the dissemination of three types of climate information generated by MoWRAM: 1. Daily forecast (3 days) bulletin that is broadcasted every day. 2. Seasonal forecast (3 months and 6 months) 3. Extreme events (storms, cyclones, etc) These types of information are disseminated to PDoWRAM (Provincial office of MoWRAM) and to village volunteers whose capacity has been enhanced through project, and eventually to community members.

						Change Adaptation.	local authorities on climate change and the use of the Community-based Warning System. The climatic information is regularly generated from the Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology (MoWRAM): Department of Hydrology and River Works and Department of Meteorology.	
	Mainstreaming of climate risk reduction in water resource management programmes of MAFF and MOWRAM in the target districts	Existing agriculture and water resources programs do not incorporate climate risk projection, reduction activities	At the end of the project, all water resource management programmes of MAFF and MOWRAM in the target districts incorporate measures to reduce the impacts of climate risks			4 water resource programs in 2 target districts representing 30% of the total water resource management programmes have been identified as targets for the Project. Measures to integrate adaptation measures into these plans are proposed	As a result from the development of a climate resilient infrastructure guideline supported by the project, all 11 existing irrigation programmes (100%) in the provinces have	This target was achieved during the last reporting period. To date, the project completed the investment support to 4 out of 11 irrigation programmes in the target districts using the climate resilient infrastructure guideline. The 4 schemes are currently operational and the project team has collected anecdotal reports of increased agricultural productivity due to the irrigation programmes. More robust assessment of the impact of the programmes on enhanced productivity is planned with the additional resources from CIDA.

						for Q3/2011.	been reviewed and adaptation measures incorporated into all of them (e.g. spillway, water regulators etc.). 4 out of the 11 are currently implemented by NAPA FU in the target districts. These climate resilient irrigation programmes are also supported by the District Development Plans.	
	Number of commune development plans with climate risk safeguards and anticipatory risk reduction activities	Climate Risk Management is absent from commune development plans	By the end of the project, 10 commune development plans incorporate climate risk management and adaptation measures			2 Commune Investment Plans (CIPs) in 2 target communes have been formulated with inclusion of climate risk safeguards and climate change adaption priorities in 2010.	16 Commune Investment Plans (CIPs) in the two target districts have been incorporated climate risk management and adaptation measures. The project is in the process of	This target was achieved during this reporting period. Building on the progress reported last year, climate risk management and adaptation measures have been mainstreamed into Commune Development Plans (2012-2016). CDP is a multi-year development plan for communes while CIP is the annualized action plan based on the CDP. For this reason, CC mainstreaming into CDP has a much more significant and lasting impact. The advocacy work by NAPA FU, UNDP/GEF SGP and UNCDF to institutionalize the climate-sensitive planning has resulted in establishment of a road map and a core working group within NCDDS, which oversees sub-national development planning process. The revision of the sub-national planning guideline and development of an operational guidance note to mainstream climate change into this revised guideline are currently ongoing with assistance from this project. This process is expected to be finalised by the end of 2013 and present it for the endorsement from the government. If endorsed, the process trialed in the NAPA FU would be formally adopted by the government and expanded to the rest of the country, which would mainstream climate change at every administrative layer of the sub-national structure in

							mainstreaming climate change into the Commune Development Plans (2012-2016) in all communes of the target districts. It partners with UNCDF and the UNDP/GEF Small Grants Programme to advocate for the approach taken by NAPA FU, GEF SGP and UNCDF to the National Committee for Decentralisation and Deconcentration Secretariat (NCCDS), which is an inter-ministerial committee in charge of Decentralisation and Deconcentration reform. These three initiatives are jointly presenting	the target districts.

							lessons to NCCDS in November 2012, and if endorsed, the process trialled in the NAPA FU would be formally adopted by the government and expanded to the rest of the country, which would mainstream climate change at every administrative layer of the sub-national structure in the target districts.	
	Provincial development plans with explicit CC adaptation measures	Provincial development plans do not include explicit CC adaptation measures	By the end of the project, provincial development plans in the target provinces incorporate explicit measures to address risks associated with climate change			2 provincial development plans (2011-2016) and 2 district investment plans (2011-2014) incorporate climate change adaptation measures as identified in the VRA and RGA exercises.	This target is achieved as reported in the last reporting period.	This target was achieved during the last reporting period. To date, some priorities in the 2 provincial development plans are being implemented by the provincial administration such as annual emergency response action plan, awareness raising activities related to climate change, rehabilitation of river banks to prevent soil erosion and land slide, rehabilitation of irrigation schemes and establishment of FWUCs in other communes in the target districts, and implementation of resilient livelihood activities by local NGOs.

	Existence of mediative mechanisms to avoid or to manage conflicts resulting from access to water resources Number of potential conflicts avoided or resolved	No assessment carried out No conflict resolution mechanism exists to deal with conflicts related to water resources Two potential water-related conflicts have been initially identified in Bos Leav commune	At the end of the second year of the project, water use needs and projections in target districts and communities assessed in relation to current and future conflict potential At the end of the second year of project, a mediative mechanism is available to avoid or manage conflicts resulting from access to water resources By the end of the project, at least two conflicts are actively addressed through this new mechanism			Farmer Water User Committees (FWUC) have been identified as the primary institutional interface to resolve water related conflicts. To date, four FWUCs have been re-activated and supported in the target districts. No conflicts have been addressed during the reporting period.	An initial assessment on water use needs, projection and potential conflict has been carried out by PDoWRAM and will be finalised in Quarter 4, 2012. The mediative mechanisms are incorporated in the training curriculum provided by PDoWRAM to the FWUC. Based on the learning from the project, critical elements such as the involvement of Commune Councils at the earliest stage of the FWUC establishment and their role as an interlocutor between WUGs and	A water use needs assessment has not been completed yet due to staff turnover within MoWRAM. However, the project team is currently finalizing the assessment. Conflict resolution procedures have been specified in the four established FWUCs' rules and regulations. They are recognized by the local authorities and the PDoWRAM. Initially, project funds were used for the operational functioning of the four FWUCs and conflict resolution. However, the plan is for the FWUCs, once fully functional, to start a fee collection from the families benefiting from the investment managed by these FWUCs. The fees will contribute to not only the maintenance of the investment but also to be utilized for conflict resolutions once occur. There was no conflict occurred during the reporting period.

							FWUC, have been incorporated into the training curriculum. There was no conflict occurred during the reporting period.	
	Standardized communication structures for climate risk information are established	No climate forecast and early warning information is communicated in target districts.	By the end of the first year of project implementation, standardized communication structures are in place to collect, analyze and relay climate and hazard warning information to vulnerable community members			Gaps and needs for an early warning information system have been identified through participatory rapid gender assessment and consultation meetings with relevant stakeholders. The communication function for climate risk information which was established in 2006 in Bos Leav commune was re-activated with 10 volunteers (3 women) involved in 5 villages. Training on related roles and responsibilities will be conducted in July 2011.	To date, the community-based Early Warning System covers 52 villages representing 59.77% of the overall target. Along with the setting up of the system, trainings on basic concepts on early warning system had been provided to 239 persons (98 women) composed of village volunteers, members of the Water User Groups (WUGs),	This target was achieved during the previous reporting period. The community-based Early Warning System continues to cover the same 52 villages. The project team continues to support and strengthen the capacity of the existing 104 village volunteers in the 52 villages through regular quarterly meetings and monitoring visits. These meetings are used to maintain the knowledge of the information dissemination process and to share experiences with each other for improvement of the process. During monitoring visits, the project team ensures that equipment and gears provided to the villages such as loud speakers, notice board, and others are being utilized properly. These volunteers are responsible for disseminating climate information from PDoWRAM to local authorities and villagers. Overall, the project aims to ensure that the village volunteers are equipped with the updated knowledge and capacity to effectively disseminate the EWS information.

							Farmer Water User Committee (FWUC) and other farmers.	
	Number of vulnerable households in pilot districts utilizing climate forecast information on seasonal or shorter timescales	None of the households in the target areas use climate risk and early warning information to protect livelihood assets	By the end of the project, 60% (50% women and 50% men) of households in pilot sites have access to timely early warning information about impending drought and flooding hazards			Households'information needs have been identified in 5 villages of the two target districts through participatory rapid gender assessment.	Under the community-based Early Warning System's initiative, there are 104 volunteers (50 women) providing climatic information to the local families. In 2011, 437 households in 19 villages have received and used the information. It is assumed that 11,073 out of 19,932 households, representing 55.5%, will receive and use the information by the end of 2012	The project is on-track to achieve this Outcome indicator with 55.5% out of 60% achieved (or 92.5% towards the target). The village volunteers continued to disseminate climate information to 11,073 households in 52 villages, representing 55.5% of the target households. Through focus group discussions and quarterly village volunteer meetings, it was observed that with the information received, farmers started preparing themselves to cope with hazards that might affect their livelihoods. For example, they prepare water storage, seeds, land preparation, and advise children on lightning and heavy rains. Some have already changed their farming practices including doubling crops from growing late-mature rice varieties to early-mature ones to fit with seasonal changes.
Locally appropriate	Community-based adaptation	No systematic	By the end of the first year of			In the first year of the project (2010), a	To date, a portfolio of	This target was achieved in the last reporting period. Farmer groups in the 44 villages in 12 target communes continued to receive support both follow-up capacity building and additional

adaptation options demonstrated to reduce exposure to climate - induced risks	measures adopted by households in target districts	demonstration and rollout of community-based measures that increase long-term livelihood resilience in a changing climate	project implementation, a portfolio of adaptation measures are developed and demonstrated in at least 30 communities of the 2 pilot districts			portfolio of adaptation measures has been demonstrated and promoted through farmer field schools. The portfolio includes drought resilient rice varieties, the system of rice intesification (SRI), and rainwater harvesting. Demonstration activities are covering 10 villages representing 33% of the target villages.	adaptation measures has been demonstrated in 44 villages in 12 communes in the target districts meeting 147% of the target. The portfolio includes drought resilient rice varieties, system of rice intensification (SRI), and rainwater harvesting.	investment from the project. 4 out of these 44 villages started to pilot the one-village approach as per the MTR recommendation. Impacts on these pilots will be assessed in the CIDA-financed phase of the project. Dripping system, plastic mulching, solar and wind pumps have been added to the existing portfolio of adaptation measures. The project emphasizes on group mobilization to optimise the use the introduced technologies.
			By the end of the project, at least 70% of the households in the target districts are implementing at least one additional measure to reduce livelihood exposure to climate risk			622 households among 6492 households (30 villages) in the two target districts representing 9.6% of the target households has piloted adaptation measures to reduce livelihood exposures to climate risk. Lesson learnt from the pilot in those households will be disseminated to more households in the target districts in	3,679 households (56%) have implemented at least one additional measure to reduce livelihood exposure to climate change.	The 3,679 households (56%) in 44 villages continued to implement at least one additional measure to reduce livelihood exposure to climate change. 30% out of these households have implemented at least 3 different adaptation measures (common combination of these measures are integrated farming system, seed purification and access to water) as part of the one-village approach recommended by the MTR. A result from a focus group discussion conducted with the beneficiaries demonstrates that farmers to farmers “peer support” took place. On average, each member of a seed purification group could assist other 6 farmers in adopting the measure. In such case, the 293 members of the seed purification groups could reach to 1,758 indirect beneficiaries.

						2012.		
	Number of households harvesting and/or conserving rain water in target villages for household Number of women receive technical/leadership trainings on effective use of water	155 hhs (out of 7,976hh) in Choam Khsan and 447 hhs (out of 11,501 hhs) in Chhit Borey districts are harvesting rainwater for household use 0.1% of women received technical leadership trainings on effective use of water	By the end of the project, at least 30% of all households in the target districts are actively harvesting rainwater to conserve and safeguard water resources for household use 50% of women received technical/leadership trainings on effective use of water			Suppliers and beneficiaries for the demonstration of rain water harvesting technology have been identified. Technical specifications and procurement are in progress.	Rainwater harvesting (ponds, pump wells, solar pumps and tanks) has been introduced to 23 villages. So far 1,020 households representing 23.83% of the total of families in the target villages are actively involved in harvesting rainwater and using water pumps and water ponds. In early 2012, 990 women representing 60% of 1,651 participants received trainings on gender and climate change and effective use of water.	This target was achieved in the current reporting period. 1,470 households (among which there are 75 Water User Groups) representing around 30% of the total households in the targeted villages benefit from 62 pump wells, 3 community ponds, 41 rain water harvesting containers and 10 solar pumps. Based on a focus group discussion conducted with the beneficiaries, farmers reported that they could considerably save time and some reported an increase in crop production and income. Some families, who had never practiced home garden before, also started to grow vegetables and fruit trees in their land. So far 1,230 women out of 2,152 farmer group members representing 57.2% received training on gender and climate change and effective use of water and water management. They gained a better understanding on the rules and regulations within the water user groups, user fee collection and community participation. According to a focus group discussion result, around 60% of participated women learnt and applied the introduced skills of water saving in their families.
	Land hectarage under irrigation	355 hectares are irrigated	By the end of the project, hectarage			Two medium scale irrigation systems	Rehabilitation of two	This target was achieved in the current reporting period. Two medium-scaled irrigation systems have been rehabilitated in two target communes (Bos Leav and Teuk Krahom).The rehabilitated

	during dry spells	in 3 villages in Bos Leav commune, 0 hectare in Teuk Krahom commune.	under irrigation during the dry season should increase by 30%			have been identified for rehabilitation in line with climate resilience requirements. They will benefit 1,307 hectares in two target communes.	medium-scale irrigation systems is being undertaken. It is expected that the schemes will increase hectarage of irrigated land during the dry season from 693 hectares to 848.35 hectares (22.3% increase).	irrigation schemes increased hectarage of irrigated land during the dry season from 355 hectares to 733 hectares (106% increases) (Please see the Adjustment section for the change in baseline. Even with the original baseline of 693 hectares, an increase of areas under irrigation by 378 hectares represent more than 45% increase from the baseline). With this support, more than 2,000 households have access to water for rice farming, home gardening and animal raising. Farmers could save time and reduce amount of fuel to pump water to their fields.
	No of women who have benefited from climate resilient farming practices and crop varieties	No climate resilient farming practices and crop varieties are available	At least 30% of the women have adopted climate resilient farming practices and crops by the end of the project			176 women representing 1% of all women in 30 target villages are participating in Farmer Field Schools and pilot measures for resilient farming practices and crops: SRI, resilient seed testing and seed purifications program.	1,053 women representing 10.6% of all women in 30 villages benefited from climate resilient farming practices in 2012.	The project is on-track to achieve this Outcome indicator with 24% out of 30% achieved. So far, 2,379 women representing 24% of all women in 30 villages adopted climate resilient farming practices. They applied home gardening and water management skills and could earn two to three times higher income than before as their crop production increases.
	Number of agricultural practices evaluated for their performance and resilience under different	Agricultural techniques and prescriptions are not systematicall y analyzed	By the end of the project, at least 3 agricultural farming methods (including SRI) are evaluated for their performance and			3 resilient farming methods such as SRI, Intergrated Farming System (IFS), and resilient rice varieties under different climatic conditions	The mid-term review of the project conducted in June 2012 defined the introduction	After the MTR concluded that the three adaptation technologies introduced in the project were relevant, the project commissioned an additional evaluation to further assess the relevance and performance of the piloted methods as well as identifying additional relevant options to expand the current adaptation measures. The result from this evaluation concurred with the MTR findings that the resilient rice seeds, Integrated Farming System (IFS) and rice seed purification are relevant in the context of climate change adaptation. In addition, 3 other promising agricultural techniques have been suggested: 1. Dripping irrigation, 2. Community Aquatic Resource Enhancement Ring

	climatic scenarios Area of Agricultural Land on which climate resilient farming practices and/or crops are actively adopted	for climate resilience and cost/benefit under different climatic scenarios 0 hectres of agriculture land under resilient rice varieties.	resilience under different climatic scenarios By the end of the project, at least 500 hectares of agriculture land are under resilience rice varieties.			are being piloted. Evaluation of these pilots will be conducted in 2012.	of resilient rice seeds, IFS and rice seed purification as relevant. Introduction of rice varieties proved successful as it enabled two cropping patterns within the season instead of one. The yield for IR 66 rice variety distributed reached an average yield of 3.25 tons which is 18% higher than the varieties used by the farmers. 26 tons of IR 66 rice seeds have been distributed to 793 families from 45 villages to increase the cropping pattern after the flood incident in Kratie.	(CARE Ring) and 3. Cropping system through hedgerows or agro-forestry, which have been piloted in neighboring provinces. Starting in late 2012, dripping irrigation was introduced as an additional measure to the project adaptation portfolio. The project will continue to discuss with the provincial team on the need to include the two other technologies where appropriate in the next phase of the project as part of the expansion of the one-village approach. The project achieved and exceeded this target by 46.8%. As of June 2013, resilient rice varieties have been used on 734 hectares.

							As of June 2012, resilient rice varieties have been used on 325 hectares.	
	Availability of guidelines for climate resilient irrigation design in Cambodia	No easy-to-use guidelines on climate resilient irrigation design is available in Cambodia	By the end of the first year of project implementation, guidelines are available for climate resilient irrigation design			A guideline for climate resilient irrigation design is being developed and will be ready for wider consultation in Q4, 2011.	A draft of climate resilient irrigation training manual has been internally reviewed by the concerned parties. It was sent to MoWRAM for further feedbacks and endorsement by quarter 4 of 2012.	The project is on-track to achieve this target. The official endorsement of the resilient irrigation training manual is still pending approval by MoWRAM. The final consultation for official endorsement is planned by the end of 2013. The reason for delays in the endorsement process is due to the additional consultations with technical departments (Irrigation Engineering Department and FWUC Department) to ensure technical robustness of the guideline. However, despite delays in the official endorsement by MoWRAM, the training manual has been shared and used by relevant NGOs working to support irrigation scheme in Cambodia.
	Number of FWUCs able to operate and maintain climate resilient irrigation systems	FWUCs are not able to systematicall y operate and maintain CC resilient irrigation system	By the end of the project, 70% of FWUC, Technical Support Unit (TSU) and MOWRAM engineers in the pilot districts are able to routinely maintain and operate CC resilient irrigation systems			4 FWUCs representing 30% of all FWUC in the target districts have been assessed on capacity needs. Training on water management and planning, maintenance and financial management will be provided in Q4/2011.	With provincial structural change occurred in 2011, the Technical Support Unit (TSU) no longer exist. 3 FWUCs have been established. The	This target was achieved. To date, all FWUC members, PDoWRAM officials, and local authorities within the target provinces have been trained on management of FWUC, rules and regulations, management of irrigation system, and effective use of water. In addition, they also acquired additional knowledge and skills from exchange visits to other provinces in the country. The project has officially handed over the irrigation schemes to FWUCs to maintain routinely with supports from local authorities and PDoWRAM.

							recognition process (as stipulated in the FWUC guidelines of MoWRAM) will be completed by the end of 2012. All technical staff from the Provincial Department of Water Resources and Meteorology and project counterparts (19 persons) have been trained on resilient irrigation system.	
	Number of reservoirs, irrigation canals ponds and dykes re-designed accommodate longer dry periods and/or increased rainfall intensities	No modification of irrigation systems that actively incorporates changing climatic trends and projections	By the end of the project, modifications have been made to at least 1 small or medium-scale irrigation system in each of the target districts			Modifications of 2 medium scale irrigation systems have been initiated and will be completed in quarter 1, 2012.	In Kratie, the rehabilitation of irrigation system (spillway, concrete canal, earth canals, water gate and pumping station) is 50% completed, whereas in Preah Vihear is	This target was achieved during this reporting period. The two rehabilitated irrigation schemes in two target districts have been completed. This results in having access to water to cultivate dry season rice with a total area of 733 ha, benefiting 363 households.

							10%.	
	Number of women actively participate in FWUC	0% of women participate in FWUC in Preah Vihear and Kratie	At least 40% of women actively participate in FWUC				3 women are members of FWUC representing 11.5% of 26 committee members.	This target is off-track. The 3 women, representing 11.5% of the 26 FWUC members, remain their active participation in FWUC management committee. It is expected that the presence of woman leaders will increase women's participation in next FWUC member election. However, it is important to note that FWUC is a management body that oversees its member Water User Groups. As reported in the next target, the project has promoted participation of women in Water User Groups with now women representing more than half of WUGs.
	Number of women receive training	There have been 0% of trainings provided to women in FWUC	50% of women in farmer water user groups receive trainings on irrigation system's maintenance, management and utilization.				1,192 women representing 55.4% out of 2,152 of FWUC, WUGs and FSI members have received training on Participatory Irrigation Management and Development (PIMD), roles and responsibilities of FWUC and basic concepts of early warning system.	This target was achieved during the last reporting period. 1,213 women representing 56.4% out of 2,152 farmers in 9 target communes have received trainings and gained knowledge on gender, climate change and effective use of water.
Lessons learned in project pilot sites replicated in other vulnerable	Number of outside programmes, policies or projects incorporating project practices,	No follow-up projects to date incorporate project lessons and	By the end of the project, at least 5 programmes, policies or projects in other Cambodian districts			Practices, approaches and methods demonstrated by the project were incoperated into 2 projects namely (1)	In terms of discrete programmes, policies or projects that the NAPA FU has	In addition to what was reported in last year's PIR, the following is a list of new development that the LDCF project contributed to: • IFAD's RULIP has used information and educational materials produced by the project in all the target districts and communes in Preah Vihear and Kratie. • A UNCDF/NCDD-S initiative in Takeo province is expanding to one additional province (Battambang), and it has incorporated climate change awareness raising materials, VRA and climate change mainstreaming experiences from the project • CCCA programme has started to introduce VRA into their grant project implementation. VRA has been highly valued by the secretariat of the

areas of Cambodia	approaches or methods	experiences	incorporate project practices, approaches or methods that have been demonstrated in, and derived from, this project			Cambodia Community Based Adaptation Programme (CCBAP) of UNDP (2011-13) which expects to benefit 100 communities; and (2) the IFAD/RGC funded Rural Livelihood Improvement Project (RULIP) which is piloting and replicating the practices in two communes of Preah Vihear province. In addition, efforts have started to incoperate project-related practices into the next phase of the IFAD funded RULIP programme.	contributed: • CCBAP which particularly uses the awareness raising tool and experience of mainstreaming CC at commune level • Two new projects that are currently formulated with support from IFAD ("Agriculture Development and Economic Empowerment (PADEE)" and "resilience to shock strategy") will explicitly include climate change concerns into them, and this has been facilitated by the close collaboration between NAPA FU and RULIP/IFAD • A UNCDF	National Climate Change Committee who is coordinating the implementation of the CCCA programme. • Exchange of lessons with IFAD also will have resulted in an additional external program designed on the basis of the experiences from the NAPA FU project: the Agriculture Services Program for Innovation Resilience and Extension (ASPIRE) under IFAD's Country Strategic Opportunities Paper (COSOP) covering the period 2013-2018, will be designed in late November 2013 and will offer opportunities to scale up experiences generated from NAPA FU in term of process and investment. • Awareness raising materials and approaches that this project produced were incorporated and expanded by a number of other organizations and projects. The local NGO that carried out awareness campaigns for the project adopted the approach and materials to be replicated in another LDCF-CCCA funded project focusing on coastal adaptation supported by UNEP; the Department of Agricultural Extension of MAFF has officially requested the materials from the project to be re-used in all the provinces in Cambodia where their extension services are taking place; and in PADEE, awareness raising materials produced by the project are included in the compilation of relevant materials. The MAFF CC Working Group that was formulated with support from the NAPA FU project (as reported last year) is increasingly integrated into the project knowledge sharing platforms and training events. This strong engagement of the MAFF CC Working Group is exemplified in the revised management arrangement for the CIDA-financed phase (to commence with some overlap with the NAPA FU project) in which the Group is officially invited as a board member. This Group represents the commitment of the Ministry to mainstream climate change, and thus, close engagement of the Working Group in the project activities is likely to have a significant impact on defining policies and strategies in the Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries sectors. Through the gender support, the Ministry of Women\'s Affairs has not only developed a training manual on gender and climate change that can be utilized widely by various partners, the project also contributed, financially and technically, to influence the reflection of gender and climate change as one of the key pillars in the next 5-year strategic plan of the Ministry. Furthermore, as described under Outcome 1, the experience of mainstreaming climate change adaptation into provincial and commune level development planning and budgeting process is in the process of a formal adoption and upscale by the Government by the end of 2013.

							initiative in Takeo province that incorporate climate change awareness raising materials, VRA and climate change mainstreaming guidelines Apart from these discrete contributions, the NAPA FU contributed to the formulation of the MAFF climate change technical team through experience sharing from the field and involvement of the MAFF focal points in various knowledge and training events. In the long-run, this will have a significant impact on the sectoral	

							policies and approaches that MAFF takes. Through the gender support, a gender and climate change training manual is on the process of being finalised by the Ministry of Women's Affairs' Gender and Climate Change Committee. Furthermore, as described under Outcome 1, the experience of mainstreaming climate change adaptation into provincial and commune level development planning and budgeting process is in the process of a formal	

							adoption and upscale by the Government.	
	Percentage of households in pilot sites aware of precautionary measures to counter CC risks and minimize material losses	Virtually no households in pilot districts are aware of long-term climatic trends and projections that affect their farming outputs and livelihood security	By the end of the project, at least 60% of households in the target communes are aware of long-term climatic trends that potentially affect their livelihood security, and of potential small-scale adaptive measures to safeguard livelihoods			Until now 1,495 households representing 8% of households in the target districts have been made aware of climate change impacts and measures to address climate change through community fora and the project's contribution to World Environment Day 2011.	To date, the project has reached out to 3,000 households representing 16% of target households. An assessment to evaluate effectiveness of a climate change awareness campaign by the project was carried out. There were 280 households, representing 9% of total 3000 participated in the campaign, were assessed on their knowledge on climate change through focus groups. Results showed that the majority of respondents	The project is on-track to achieve this target with 56.5% of 60% achieved. To date, the project supported awareness campaign has reached out to 11,073 households representing 56.5% of the total households. As described above, the materials and approaches of awareness campaign developed by the project are being adopted and replicated by a number of donor-funded and domestic programmes.

							are aware of climate change, causes, and impacts on agriculture, water and livelihoods. Such a campaign constituted an opportunity for the recipients to adopt some adaptive measures such as rice varieties, water harvesting, and early warning information shown in educational and media tools used in the campaign. This awareness training is garnering significant success and is widespreading beyond the NAPA target areas e.g. RULIP and	

							other non-NAPA target. The public awareness and education programme will be likely internalized in the implementation of PADEE, an IFAD supported project that will start in July 2012.	
	Number of paper-based, web-based, audio-based and TV-based publications about project-related practices, approaches, methods or results	None	From year 2 of project implementation onwards, at least 5 TV and radio broadcasts per year			4 TV stories broadcasts: 3 news pieces about the project's World Environment Day campaign and 1 TV feature and interview about the project as a whole.	There were 3 newspaper pieces, 6 online articles, 3 radio clips and 4 TV reports were published reporting the project activities. In addition, the project team was exclusively interviewed 3 times by the local TV stations.	There have been 13 local TV news coverage and 4 local radio clip broadcasts, and 10 local newspaper pieces reported about the project.
		None	At least (5) paper-based and web-based publications			3 project-related stories published on UNDP Cambodia and	Four best practices on seed	There have been 9 pieces of web-based news coverage in national media and 5 featured stories on UNDP website. In addition, the project also published 5 paper-based publications and planned to

			in the lifetime of the project			regional websites; 1 project-related story in IFAD newsletter; updated project factsheet and results of VRA assessment were printed.	purification, well user group, early warning information, and water user group were drafted and will be printed in Quarter 3 2012. Two feature stories, a video clip, and a photo story on the project results were published on UNDP website.	produce 6 more by the end of 2013.
	Number of workshops at the national and regional levels on lessons learned	None	At least 1 national workshop per year			In collaboration with IFAD funded projects, 1 policy guidance workshop was conducted with 162 participants from national level and 6 provinces, during which the project has shared its experiences.	A knowledge sharing workshop was organized with 140 participants and practitioners from the national and sub-national levels to exchange and discuss experiences concerning climate change impacts and	There have been three national workshops organized: In 2011, in collaboration with IFAD funded projects, 1 policy guidance workshop was conducted with 162 participants from national level and 6 provinces, during which the project has shared its experiences. In 2012, a knowledge sharing workshop was organized with 140 participants and practitioners from the national and sub-national levels to exchange and discuss experiences concerning climate change impacts and adaptation in Cambodia. In 2013, the project worked with UNDP/SGP grantees, UNCDF/ LGCC, NCDD-S and MoP to host a national workshop to agree on a roadmap for integrating climate change adaptation into sub-national planning guidelines. The workshop brought 126 participants (28 women) from NGOs, government officials from both national and sub-national administrations and its line departments, and relevant development partners. As a result, NCDD-S and MoP agreed to develop a roadmap and establish a core working group to develop an operational mainstreaming guideline to integrate climate change into sub-national planning.

							adaptation in Cambodia.	
		None	During the lifetime of the project, at least 1 regional workshop			No regional workshop has been organised yet.	The project will discuss with SGP, UNCDF and UNEP to find out the possibility to organize a regional workshop in 2013.	The project is in the process of initiating a national/regional workshop. Projects that have relevant CCA experiences in the region and in Cambodia will be invited to exchange and share their experiences and best practices. The workshop is scheduled in September 2013.
	No. of women receiving extension services on CC resilient farming techniques	According to MAFF, only 0.1% of rural women receive extension services	Percentage of women receiving extension services on climate change resilient farming methods have increased by 30%			199 women (representing 13% of the baseline total of 1,587 women), recieved extension services on climate resilient farming methods . The methods were conducted through farmer field schools (FFS) on system of rice intensification (SRI) and rice seed purification.	1,752 women representing 65% out of 2,701 farmers received extension services on climate resilient farming methods in 2012.	2,379 women representing 65% out of 3,679 farmers have received extension services on climate change resilient farming methods.
	Project-related lessons learned are communicated through ALM and CC Solution Exchange	No lessons learned are available	By the end of the project, the ALM and Solution Exchange include lessons learned from this project and make these lessons accessible to other countries			The ALM is incorporating a project factsheet, photo album, and training posters. The VRA report was shared with other UNDP COs and project teams	A section of NAPA FU project has been set-up in ALM web-site. Documents uploaded in the website include (1)	The project has shared experience and knowledge through the ALM such as project factsheet, photo stories, posters, training manuals, VRA reports, video clips, and success stories. Success stories are also published on UNDP websites: http://www.kh.undp.org/content/cambodia/en/home/ourwork/environmentandenergy/successstories/solar-powered-pumps-bring-water-into-rural-homes-in-cambodia/ http://www.kh.undp.org/content/cambodia/en/home/ourwork/environmentandenergy/successstories/crop-diversification-builds-stronger-communities-to-tackle-clima/

			in Asia and beyond			(Thailand, Bangladesh) through the UNDP Regional Center	project factsheet (2) photo story (3) posters of climate change training (4) the final versions of VRA and RGA (5) video of farmers' benefits from the project's water filters (6) project success field stories and (7) a few training materials from the project's awareness raising campaign	
	Existence of draft modifications to relevant national policies on CC adaptation	National policies and strategies for Agricultural Water Managemen t do not contain reference to a changing climate	By the end of the project, at least 1 sector policy in water and agriculture revised to includes climate risk considerations and reflect lessons learnt through the project			No policy has been reviewed and revised on the basis of project lessons learnt so far. However, the project's progress and lessons learnt are being fed into the consultations of the Technical Working Group on Agriculture and Water (TWGAW) with a view on policy review.	The project's awareness raising campaign has passed on a climate change and gender training manual to the MoWA's Gender Climate Change Committee (GCCC). The	With experiences gained from the project, MoWA included climate change and gender as one of the key pillars of MoWA's next five-year strategic plan, Neary Ratanak IV. The project is currently supporting the NCDDS in developing the operational guideline in mainstreaming climate change in local planning. The project also shared experiences and lessons learned to the MAFF climate change working group, which the project also contributed to the establishment of this group. Currently the group has finalized its sectoral climate change strategy for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. The project will continue to support the group in the development of the climate change action plan for MAFF in the 2nd phase.

							team is finalizing it, which would become a potential national tool for trainings. Experiences of NAPA FU project has been shared with the Technical Working Group on Agriculture and Water (TWGAW). There were 72 participants (18 women) including government institutions and relevant development partners such as FAO, AusAID, AFD, CDRI, EU, WinRock International in Cambodia etc. The NAPA FU also contributed to setting up of the MAFF Climate Change	

							Technical Team through experience sharing from the fields and workshops outside Cambodia.	
	No. of farmers incorporated lessons learned with regards to climate risk into their livelihood activities	No farmers incorporate climate change related lessons as there is no accessible repository information about climate change impacts on farming in Cambodia	By the end of the project, 30% of farmers (50% is women) in the target areas incorporate lessons learned from the project in their practical livelihood activities.				3,000 households in the target areas representing 16% of total households, of which 1,450 women representing 48%, have adopted adaptive measures such as rice varieties, water harvesting, and early warning information in their livelihood activities.	This target was achieved during this reporting period. So far, 3,679 households representing 56% of farmers (more than 50% are women) in 44 villages have adopted adaptive measures such as rice varieties, water harvesting, seed purification, dripping system, integrated farming system, SRI, and early warning information in their livelihood activities.
	Repository of information established to collect data on lessons learned in CC risk reduction	No repository established	All project-related lessons learned are collected, systematically presented and available to the				Four project-related lessons learned have been documented. Their	Four best practices are being finalized in Khmer and English. They are early warning system, seed purification, well and pond benefits. They are expected to be finalised for stakeholder dissemination during the closing workshop of the project.

	and make it available to stakeholders		immediate districts around the target area through a designated learning/information focal point serving as a repository for information for CC adaptation				publications and dissemination will be done in quarter 4, 2012.	

RATINGS OF PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

DO Rating: Please review the Development Objective Progress page of this APR/PIR and then answer the questions below. A DO rating will be generated based on your answers.	
1 Please rate the cumulative progress being made toward achieving the end-of-project targets as reported in the project results framework in the DO page of this APR/PIR	
2 Please rate the likelihood that the project will deliver environmental and social benefits for an extended period after project completion?	
3 Please rate the likelihood that social or political risks may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes	
Project Manager/Coordinator: Is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress.
4.	Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	Moderately Satisfactory
Overall 2012 Rating	Satisfactory
2013 Rating	Highly Satisfactory
Comments	As June 2013, the Project has been implemented for 42-month period. It encountered many challenges such as mechanisms, adaptation measures and appropriate materials, and importantly, the termination of the Priority Operational Costs, an incentive scheme to the government civil servants who support donor-funded development projects. The project team has coped with those challenges through participations approach from regional to local communities, the annual expenditures are indicated from the first year is 71%, 94% and 100% in 2012, it shows a progressive improvement by the year. As for our performance, the project has completed 90% against its target in the project logframe. Main Outcome-level achievements are, (i)16 communes representing 100% of the total target have received and used climatic information, (ii) 52 villages representing 59.77% of the overall target are receiving Early Warning information, (iii) around 3,679 households (56%) in 44 villages have applied at least one additional measure to reduce livelihood exposure to climate change. Regarding the results VRA in early August 2013 and comparing with the baseline of the same communes, the average

	vulnerability index is decreased from 4 to 3.1 (decrease 22.5%).
UNDP Country Office Programme Officer: Is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating, for example, if your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress.
4.	Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	(MS) Moderately Satisfactory
Overall 2012 Rating	(S) Satisfactory
2013 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
Comments	This rating is justified by the fact that the project team has demonstrated their genuine ability to achieve many of the project targets as per the logframe such as the mainstreaming efforts into the sub-national planning process, the demonstrations of adaptation measures that has expanded not only the options but also the number of beneficiaries, the generations of lessons learned and best practices that have been adopted by many partners including government, development partners and civil society organisations. This achievement has been proven by the success of the project to be able to mobilise additional USD 2.2 million from CIDA to expand its best practices/lessons until 2015. All of these achievements happened despite the termination of the salary supplement to the government counterparts, which was highlighted in the previous reporting as one of the critical risks. The project also demonstrated its openness and willingness to take up all the recommendations from the Mid-Term Review (MTR) to improve the project effectiveness and efficiency and it is observed that significant progress has been made in the follow-up actions to address the MTR recommendations. During the reporting period, it also is observed that significant progress was made not only in achieving the key results as per logframe and resource mobilization, but also in strengthening its partnerships with key stakeholders which include the MAFF climate change working group in influencing the MAFF sectoral strategies and action plan, the Ministry of Women\'s Affairs, and the National Committee for Sub-national Democratic Development Secretariat and Ministry of Planning in influencing the sub-national planning process. Having said that, there are a few other areas that the project team needs to pay a greater attention towards the last quarter of the project implementation period. These include (1) the focus on expediting the progress of some targets in the logframe that is lagging behind such as the endorsement of the irrigation training manual, finalization and printing of gender and climate change training manual, and some gender related targets; (2) focus on a smooth transition of the project into the follow-on phase (financed by CIDA) in particular in the process of beneficiary selection process that will address the concerns raised by the MTR; (3) strengthen the capturing of project results and document it as lessons/best practices for wider dissemination; and (4) ensure key technical reports

	and lessons are properly finalized and documented ready for printing in an easy and effective communicable way to be disseminated during the high-profile project closing event in the next quarter.
Project Implementing Partner: Is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS).	
RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for projects under implementation in one country and regional projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Provide recommendations for next steps.
Project Implementing Partner	
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	
Overall 2012 Rating	
2013 Rating	
Comments	
GEF Operational Focal point: Is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.	
HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Provide recommendations for next steps.
GEF Operational Focal point	

Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	
Overall 2012 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
2013 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
Comments	The project works to pursue its objective and could achieve its objective and target as outlined in the project result framework. The project reduces significantly farmers' vulnerability to climate induced change. It is observed that farmers access to water resources for domestic and irrigation improved and agriculture productivities and income increase.
Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).	
RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for jointly implemented projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Provide recommendations for next steps.
Other Partners	
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	
Overall 2012 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
2013 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
Comments	(IFAD Focal Point): Project is very well on the way to achieve its objectives. The initiatives try to address the complex issues of the climate change on agriculture, water, and gender. The experiences and lesson learnt generated from this project constitute an evident added value to the formulation of the Agriculture Policy and Strategy on Climate Change.
UNDP Technical Adviser: Is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.	

MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for all projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating (do not repeat the project objective).
2.	Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet.
3.	Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress.
4.	Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.
UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser	
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	(MS) Moderately Satisfactory
Overall 2012 Rating	(S) Satisfactory
2013 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
Comments	This reporting period was the final "full" year of project implementation (with five months remaining in 2013) and the Implementation Partner (MAFF) has achieved almost all targets. This was a remarkable achievement considering that there were a few operational difficulties during the course of the project implementation. Specifically, delays in the project start up impacted the progress of the project up to the midway of the implementation, and termination of the incentive scheme for government officials working on development projects was another critical incident. Despite these, the IP maintained, and accelerated in the last two years, the progress towards development objectives. Notable achievement among the three Outcomes of the project is Outcome 1 – Improved capacity within local institutions to manage agricultural water resources in a changing climate. The significance of the achievement of this Outcome warrants some qualitative elaboration. What makes it distinct from similar "CC mainstreaming" outcomes in other adaptation projects is the level of ownership and potential sustainability of the results. It is not uncommon in adaptation projects that mainstreaming of climate concerns into a national or sub-national development plan is achieved only during one budget cycle during the project implementation followed by the resumption of the business as usual planning and budgeting process. The results achieved in this project are likely to have a much more lasting impact as the climate Vulnerability Reduction

	Assessment (VRA) process is now being integrated into the formal government planning guideline. This was made possible by a number of external and internal factors. First, the design of the adaptation project took into consideration UNDP's long-standing assistance in facilitating the devolution of authority to sub-national government that dates back to nearly 20 years (a nationally-promoted agenda that is locally known as D&D). This presented a critical entry point for this project to leverage the amassed experience and know-how in facilitating participatory development planning while integrating climate change concern into the process. Second, the implementation of the project coincided with the time when UNDP/GEF SGP was introducing the VRA at a small scale and UNCDF's CCA project was introducing the concept of climate change financing at the sub-national planning and budgeting process. This led to a natural tripartite partnership that later generated a stronger impetus in advancing the climate resilient local development planning agenda. Lastly, the achievement was, to a certain extent, attributable to the persistent effort of the project team in engaging the NCDDS (which oversees the D&D process) and the Climate Change Commission over the last 3 years of project implementation through formal workshops as well as informal meetings. While it is ultimately development impact that needs to be captured and reported, it is also important to recognize, acknowledge and assess these "drivers of change" that were critical in giving rise such a development impact. It is also important to note that the process of improving climate resilient development planning and budgeting will continue to be supported and further improvement expected in the extended phase of this project financed by CIDA and UNDP as well as the new LDCF project, with UNDP support, that is currently in the pipeline. Under Outcome 2, which is about delivering tangible adaptive investments to rural Cambodian communities, it should be highlighted that the project is behind one of the targets as of today (the target of "By the end of the project, at least 70% of the households in the target districts are implementing at least one additional measure to reduce livelihood exposure to climate risk"). This is due to the project team's conscious decision, based on a MTR recommendation, that adaptive value-for-money would be greater if the project approach changes from stretching adaptive investments thinly across many villages to concentrating a suite of adaptation investments in a limited number of villages. As of 2012 reporting, the project had achieved 56% of the original target (i.e. 3,679 households have implemented at least one adaptive livelihood measures). In 2013, while the total number of targeted households remains the same as 2012, the number of adaptive livelihood measures has increased from one to three in the same target villages. It is important to assess the progress of the project on RTA's recommendations made in last year's PIR. They are categorized into the following: • The need for critical assessments of less successful adaptation options • Improvement in targeting of the most vulnerable and the poorest • Realizing opportunities

	to expand the achievements made under the mainstreaming outcome (i.e. Outcome 1) Overall, the project team demonstrated a strong commitment in addressing these weaknesses in the last 12 months. As discussed in the IP Rating section, the second recommendation on the improvement of targeting is being fully addressed in the CIDA-financed phase of the project (as it was difficult to improve targeting during the course of this project cycle). In particular, the project team, in consultation with provincial partners, is preparing a table of all households in each targeted village with poverty ranking, gender-headed household status, etc, to help guide the selection of beneficiaries. This is an extraordinary sign of commitment to meeting the vulnerability reduction target of the project. For the third recommendation, as described above, the project team provided critical insights in the designing of the new LDCF-financed project which will further improve the process of climate risk mainstreaming into the sub-national development process. The first recommendation is one area where further efforts are required. In the next 3 months of the project implementation, a national workshop is planned to disseminate key lessons from the project, and as it was reported in last year's PIR, it is as important to analyze less successful adaptation options as presenting successes.
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING

IP rating: Please review the Implementation Progress page of this APR/PIR and then answer the questions below. An overall IP rating will be generated based on your answers.	
1 Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this APR/PIR)?	
2 Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?)	
3 Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively?	
4 Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the APR/PIR last year?	
5 Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation	
Project Manager/Coordinator: Is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	Explain why you gave a specific rating.
2.	Summarize annual progress and address timelines of projec output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans.
3.	Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	(MS) Moderately Satisfactory
Overall 2012 Rating	(S) Satisfactory
2013 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
Comments	It is the last year of project implementation, the implementation mechanism and project activities that the project team focused on are relevant. They are also considered sustainable as sufficient emphasis was placed on capacity building and improving regulations and operations of existing community groups. As a result of those activities, FWUC members have a better understanding about their roles and

	responsibilities; community members are in general more aware of climate risks through participating in the final Vulnerability Reduction Assessment (VRA); and water user groups have better understanding on group work, fee collection and participation. The project is coordinating between CCD/MoE and MAFF Climate Change Working Group to prepare the Climate Change Action Plan of the MAFF. Based on the commitment from our colleagues in National and sub-national level observed during the sixth Technical Meeting, we expected the project delivery of 100%.
UNDP Country Office Programme Officer: Is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	**Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why.**
2.	**Summarize annual progress and address timeliness of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans.**
3.	**Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.**
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	(MS) Moderately Satisfactory
Overall 2012 Rating	(S) Satisfactory
2013 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
Comments	This rating is justified by the outstanding performance of the project team in delivering key results during the reporting period. This has been testified by the fact that the project has successfully mobilised additional fund of USD 2.2 million from CIDA to expand the project lessons learned and best practices in other districts within the same target provinces until December 2015. On the financial delivery, there was significant improvement on annual project delivery rate compared to the previous reporting years. The project annual delivery rate against the planned budget was 72%, 95% and 102% in 2010, 2011 and 2012 respectively. Please note that the delivery rate in 2012 was 2% over-delivered due to the availability of additional UNDP TRAC resources that the project took the opportunity to absorb this additional resources to increase its investment on water access for households.

	Cumulatively, the project has delivered more than 90% of the total project budget of USD 3.159 million. The project managed to deliver the results despite the termination of POC has taken place since July 2012.
Project Implementing Partner: Is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS).	
RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.	
1.	**Explain why you gave a specific rating.**
2.	**Note trends, both positive and negative.**
3.	**Provide recommendations for next steps.**
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	
Overall 2012 Rating	
2013 Rating	
Comments	
GEF Operational Focal point: Is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.	
1.	**Explain why you gave a specific rating.**
2.	**Note trends, both positive and negative.**
3.	**Provide recommendations for next steps.**
Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).	
RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for jointly implemented projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep	

word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.	
1.	**Explain why you gave a specific rating.**
2.	**Note trends, both positive and negative.**
3.	**Provide recommendations for next steps.**
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	
Overall 2012 Rating	(S) Satisfactory
2013 Rating	
Comments	
UNDP Technical Adviser: Is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.	
MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for ALL projects.	
Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.	
1.	**Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the UNDP Country Office Programme Officer and/or the Project Manager please explain why.**
2.	**Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans.**
3.	**Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.**
UNDP Technical Adviser	
Overall 2009 Rating	
Overall 2010 Rating	
Overall 2011 Rating	(MU) Moderately Unsatisfactory
Overall 2012 Rating	(MS) Moderately Satisfactory
2013 Rating	(HS) Highly Satisfactory
Comments	The Implementation Progress of this project in the last 12 months is "highly satisfactory." The justification for this rating can be made from

	various perspectives. First, in early 2013, this project successfully mobilized additional US$3.25 million from two separate sources: US$2.25 million from Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and US$1.0 million from a fund within UNDP that aims at expanding successful initiatives. These funds will be used to scale up the highly successful adaptation measures that have been pilot-tested in the LDCF project. To assess the implementation performance of a pilot project, there is no better performance measurement than its ability in mobilizing additional funds because it needs to stand the test of development/adaptation effectiveness assessed by external evaluators. In particular, the CIDA fund will be used to scale up concrete adaptation investments that are currently carried out under Outcome 2, and the UNDP fund will be used to advance achievements in Outcome 1. Second, the exceptionally committed project team has done well in the last 12 months addressing many of the recommendations put forward in last year's PIR. Effecting changes inevitably takes time and require a change in the mindset of sub-national administrations at different levels, and hence not all recommendations have been fully addressed to date. Nonetheless, the team demonstrated its strong commitment in addressing the recommendations by first tackling relatively easier ones during the lifecycle of this project and attempted to address more time-consuming ones during the follow-on phase of the project financed by CIDA and UNDP. For example, one of the critical reviews made in the MTR (and hence in 2012 PIR) was the suboptimal cost-effectiveness of the adaptation investments employed in the project. This was because a number of interventions had been carried out in a rather unsynchronized manner (e.g. one village receiving alternative livelihood support – through for example livestock rearing – did not receive sufficient support to mitigate water scarcity, which ultimately resulted in a failure to unleash the full potential of these two investments combined). So the review recommended selecting a few pilot villages where a suite of adaptation investments are made in a holistic manner. This recommendation was immediately adopted and put to implementation. Moreover, when the project team was seeking the fund mobilization opportunity from CIDA, this approach (known as "one-village approach" within the team) was standardized in the design of the follow-on phase. Another critique from the review, that the project can improve its strategy to target the most vulnerable and poorest, was more difficult to address during the course the current project cycle because the selection of beneficiaries had largely been completed. However, in designing the CIDA proposal, the team took up the recommendation fully by developing a thorough beneficiary selection criteria and, more importantly, organizing multiple discussion sessions with sub-national decision makers to ensure a smooth rollout of the strategy. Third, improvements in operational effectiveness have been observed as both annual and overall financial delivery have improved with nearly 90% of the total project fund has been delivered to date. This shows improvement in planning and budgeting. Lastly, the highly satisfactory rating was because of the project team's (and UNDP Country Office's) openness and commitment to establish partnerships with other stakeholders, projects and programmes for greater impact. Greater development impacts from new partnerships can only be achieved through continuous discussions/negotiations which cannot be

	underplayed. Many country projects in my RTA portfolio fail to establish such partnerships because this administrative burden is perceived to outweigh the potential benefits. This team has pulled off partnership building better than any other country project teams that I know as an RTA, and the impact is visible: The level of progress in development objectives in the area of mainstreaming climate change concerns into sub-national planning process (see Outcome 1 under DO) would have been much more limited had it been promoted by this LDCF-financed project alone. The tripartite efforts by GEF/UNDP/SGP project, UNCDF's climate change adaptation project and the LDCF project provided sufficient impetus at the national level. Despite the highly satisfactory IP rating, the project is not without caveats. Although the LDCF-funded implementation cycle is coming to an end in September/October, the assessment of areas of improvement should be used to improve the follow-on phase of the project financed by CIDA and UNDP. Most importantly, the project team needs to place an increasing emphasis on analyses of the impacts of adaptive interventions delivered (or will delivered in the CIDA-financed phase) in the final months of the project implementation. In other words, the natural tendency towards input-based reporting is still prevalent. Given that the project team is staffed with competent support staff (national and international technical advisors, knowledge management officer and M&E officer), this area can be improved greatly. Capturing what worked and what didn't in the last 4 years of project implementation, and the analysis that goes with it, will also be an important contribution for a better designs of future adaptation projects in the country. For example, dissemination of seasonal forecasts was one of the Outcome indicators that are reported to be achieved in this PIR. However, the development/adaptation impacts of this activity has been elusive throughout the project implementation because the project team failed to monitor whether there were subsequent behavioral changes among farmers that resulted in changes in the timing of planting or types of crops planted. The current reporting of the DO Progress in this regard is based on a big assumption that the delivery of seasonal forecasts increases the resilience of farmers, an untested assumption not only in Cambodia but in many parts of the world. As the project matures (and moves into the next phase of the project) with the same key project staff, an effort to unravel this assumption should be exercised. As described above, observing a behavioral change, if any, subsequent to the receipt of seasonal forecasts is one area that is currently unknown. Subsequent differences in crop yields for those farmers who changed or did not change behavior are another unknown. Fortunately, this has been addressed in the design of the CIDA-financed phase of the project and thus more proactive capture, synthesis and sharing of insights is expected.
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	**Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.**
Satisfactory (S)	**Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are**

	subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	**Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.**
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	**Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.**
Unsatisfactory (U)	**Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.**
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	**Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.**

PROGRESS IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Outcome 1- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: Outcome 1: Improved capacity within local institutions to manage agricultural water resources in a changing climate
1. The final VRA were carried out in 6 out of the 16 target communes. Since Cambodia is entering into the national election campaign, the conduct of VRA in the remaining 10 target communes will be postponed to early August 2013. However, during the reporting period, the project team managed to conduct the final VRA in the 6 communes and the interim result revealed that the average vulnerability index decreased from 4 to 3.1 (decrease by 22.5%). 2. During the reporting period, the project team successfully supported the commune councils of the 16 target communes, representing 100% of the target, to incorporate climate risk management and adaptation measures into their Commune Investment Plans and Commune Development Plans (2012-2016). 3. During this reporting period, the project coordinated to ensure that the conflict resolution procedures were specified in the four established FWUCs' rules and regulations. They were recognized by local authorities and the PDoWRAM. Funds have been initially allocated for conflict resolution and for the operational functioning of the four FWUCs. In addition to the initial capital fund provide by the project, the FWUCs, once fully functional, will initiate a fee collection mechanism from the families benefiting from the investment managed by these FWUCs. The fees will contribute to not only the maintenance of the investment but also to be utilized for conflict resolutions once occur.
Outcome 2- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: Locally appropriate adaptation options demonstrated to reduce exposure to climate - induced risks
1. During the reporting period 450 additional households (consisting 30 Water User Groups) benefit from 30 pump wells, 2 community rainwater harvesting and 7 solar pumps. 2. 27 FFS successfully organized with participation of 649 farmers (465 women) in 27 villages. Their knowledge and skills on SRI, vegetable growing and animal-raising increased. The farmers gradually change their behavior and adopt some of the introduced techniques. For example, they applied home gardening and water management skills and could earn two to three times higher of income. 3. 12 purification groups with participation of 293 households (189 women) successfully completed their learning program and are able to produce good-quality seeds, which have higher market price. Farmers could reduce three to five times of seed used in rice cultivations from 80 kg/ha to 20 kg/ha. 4. The two rehabilitated irrigation schemes have been completed. The project has officially handed over them to FWUCs to maintain routinely with supports from local authorities and PDoWRAM.
Outcome 3- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: Lessons learned in project pilot sites replicated in other vulnerable areas of Cambodia
1. The project has successfully mobilised additional fund of USD 3.25 million: USD2.25 million from CIDA's Fast Track Climate Change Finance to extend the project best practices until December 2015 and USD 1.0 million from UNDP\'s internal resources, which will focus on expanding the experience of Outcome 1 of the project. 2. The project published training materials on farming techniques and CC awareness-raising. Leaflets of seed purification, CC training flipcharts, VRA-result posters, and irrigation banners are among them. For web content, there were a feature story on solar pumping system and a photo story on resilient farming techniques improving livelihoods on UNDP Cambodia website. 3. During the reporting period, two video clips on project results were produced, broadcast and distributed. They cover stories on solar pumping biogas with

integrated farming system. They were broadcasted on UNDP Cambodia website and distributed to partners as DVDs.

Adjustments

Adjustments to Project Milestones, Project Strategy and Risk Management.

Key Project Milestones

Have significant delays occurred in the project start, inception workshop, Mid-term Review, Terminal Evaluation or project duration?

Yes

If yes, were these changes reported in a previous APR/PIR?

No

Key project milestone	Scope of delay (in months)	Briefly describe change or reason for change	Briefly describe the implications or consequences this has had on project implementation
Project Start (i.e. project document signature date)	3	The realignment of the project with the RULIP baseline project, the partnership building with IFAD and the re-orientation of target sites has caused a 3 months delay in the start up of the project.	Brought more coherence and collaboration with IFAD that enable the team to influence the activities of IFAD project on the ground
Inception Workshop	3	The delay in the start up phase has caused a 3 months delay in the organistaion of the inception workshop.	This caused the delay in the delivery of the key results of the project as per project result framework
Mid-term Review	3	The delay in conducting the Mid-term Review was due to 3 reasons: (1) delayed in recruitment of the consultants, (2) delay in the starting date of the consultants, and (3) the commune election	The delay did not have significant implications to the project implementation.
Terminal Evaluation	2	National Election Campaign had caused delayed in project implementation on the ground.	The delay does not have significant implications to the project implementation.
Project Duration (i.e. project extension)	3	National Election Campaign had caused delayed in project implementation on the ground. Therefore, some activities require additional time of implementation due to	The delay does not have significant implications to the project implementation.

		seasonal requirements for the activities to be undertaken.	

Adjustments to Project Strategy

Has the project made any changes to its strategy (i.e. logframe/results framework) since the Project Document was signed?

Yes

If yes, were these changes reported in a previous APR/PIR?

No

Change Made to	**Yes/No**	**Briefly describe the change and the reason for that change**
Project Objective	No	
Project Outcomes	Yes	One of the baselines for Outcome 2 – "Land hectarage under irrigation during dry spells" has been updated as a new official number was released recently. Originally, 693 ha was considered under irrigation in Bos Leav, but in a recent government report, it was adjusted down to 355 ha.
Project Outputs/Activities	No	

Risk Management

List number of critical risks as noted in the ATLAS risk log and briefly describe actions undertaken this reporting period to address each critical risk.

# of Critical Risks (type/description)	**Risk management measures undertaken this reporting period**
Political	Risk: The National Election Campaign that started in early June until end of July 2013 disrupted the implementation of the project activities on the ground. Mitigation Action: The project had requested the Project Board for a 3-month no-cost extension to ensure that the pending activities during June/July will be able to complete in a proper manner.
Organizational	Risk: Due to the dynamics in coordination between cross-departments within MoWRAM, there has been a delay in the endorsement of the climate resilient irrigation training manual. Mitigation Action: The project through the leadership of MAFF-PSU will formally communicate to MoWRAM to expedite this process. In addition, the project

	will allocate some budget to MoWRAM to facilitate the consultation process to endorse this manual. However, this is likely to happen in phase 2 under CIDA fund.
Operational	Risk: MTR pointed out that the project tends to provide support to better off families more than the poorest/landless families. This could divert the overall objective of the project intension in supporting the most vulnerable families. Mitigation Action: The project acknowledges this findings and has taken steps to discuss with the provincial team and the UNDP RTA and CO on how to address this issue in the second phase of the project implementation using a comprehensive beneficiary selection guideline to include the poor and landless families.
Environmental	Risk: Extreme weather events such as storms and floods may delay project implementation. Mitigation Action: The project team will work closely work with Department of Meteorology (DOM), Department of Hydrology and River Work (DHRW) and Regional Integrated Multi-hazards Early warning System (RIMES) to provide timely forecast and early information.

Adjustments general comments:

Finance: cumulative from project start to June 30 2013

DISBURSEMENT OF GEF GRANT FUNDS

How much of the total GEF grant as noted in Project Document plus any project preparation grant has been spent so far? (e.g. PPG + MSP or FSP amount. Do not break down by PPG or project budget.)

Estimated cumulative total disbursement as of 30 June 2013. (i.e.CDR information up to 20 June 2013)	1906551.00
Add any comments on GEF Grant Funds	

DISBURSEMENT OF CO-FINANCING

How much of the total Co-financing as noted in Project Document has been spent so far? Co-financing is the amount committed in the project document for which co-financing letters are available

Estimated cumulative total co-financing disbursed as of 30 June this year. Please breakdown by donor.	1130856.00
Add any comments on co-financing including other	The above figure is a cash co-financing from the

types and amounts of additional co-financing such as in-kind, private sector, grants, credits and loans.	UNDP TRAC fund that contributes to the project overall budget. The in-kind contribution from the Government of Cambodia is estimated as about USD 180,000.

ADDITIONAL LEVERAGED RESOURCES

These additional resources can be from the same donors or new donors.

Estimated cumulative leveraged resources as of 30 June 2013	3250000.00
Add any comments on Leveraged Resources.	The project has mobilised additional funds from CIDA of approximately USD 2.25 million to be commenced in September 2013 until December 2015 and USD 1.0 million from UNDP core resources.

Other Financial Instruments

Does the project provide funds to other Financial Instruments?	N
If yes, please discuss developments that occurred this reporting period only.	N/A

Communications and KM

Tell the Story of Your Project and What has been Achieved this Reporting Period

1. Crop diversification builds stronger communities to tackle climate change Preah Vihear, March 2013 – The sun has just emerged in the horizon but Cambodian farmer Tum Heng was already working in full swing in his vegetable garden. After watering the vegetables, he made his rounds fetching cow manure to spread on newly paved rows where yard-long bean and cucumber were going to be on. These will be the new additions to eggplant, cabbage, pumpkin and chili – just to name a few – that have already filled the sprawling garden within the compound of hi house in Teuk Kraham commune, Preah Vihear province in northern Cambodia. These days the 61-year-old man and his wife, Kuy Sameun, keep busy daily routines toiling hard to ensure food sufficiency for their family of six. “We go to the market only because we need to buy fish and meat, not vegetables,” Mr. Tum Heng said. Read more here: http://www.kh.undp.org/content/cambodia/en/home/ourwork/environmentandenergy/successstories/crop-diversification-builds-stronger-communities-to-tackle-clima/ 2. Solar-powered pumps bring water into rural homes in Cambodia Kratie, October 2012 – Clean water is a commodity often hard to come by for Cambodians living in the countryside. For the most part, running water is simply unheard of. That is beginning to change now for many villagers in Kratie province, about 315 kilometers northeast of the capital Phnom Penh. Pumping systems powered by solar energy channel clean water straight into people’s homes that are not even connected to the main power grid. “My house was the first to get the running water,” Chhae Sokhaeng, a 37-year-old woman, said with a chuckle while washing vegetable to fix lunch. Turning off the faucet to halt the water, she added “it is just so convenient and saves a lot of time.” Read more here:

http://www.kh.undp.org/content/cambodia/en/home/ourwork/environmentandenergy/successstories/solar-powered-pumps-bring-water-into-rural-homes-in-cambodia/ 3. Knowledge sharing and management: In addition to sharing its knowledge and experience regularly through the Adaptation Learning Mechanism (ALM) web portal, the project also communicates with partners especially government institutes and non-governmental organizations. Some of the communication materials have been reproduced and reused in some of the partners' climate change campaigns. Significantly, the project has worked with the Cambodian Climate Change Alliance (CCCA) to form a Climate Change Communication Team. It is a network for all relevant stakeholders who are working in climate change area to share and learn from each other. More importantly, it aims to create a national knowledge sharing platform on climate change information and educational materials, and recently the NAPA FU project has contributed all its materials and tools.

Adaptive Management this Reporting Period

Responses to MTR Recommendations: MTR Recommendation 1: UNDP needs to support the implementing agencies at provincial and district level in participatory processes and social mobilisation, especially with regard to understanding of local vulnerability, community power dynamics, household economy and participation of poor in development activities. Actions: A series of thematic follow up missions were conducted over the past 12 months such as the joint field-monitoring and spotcheck mission by UNDP CO assurance team; regular technical field monitoring visits by the Advisors attached to MAFF-PSU and the Provincial Coordinators based in target provinces; Project Board field visit; and the recent RTA and CO field monitoring visit, which generated some recommendations in consultation with the provincial and district officials to focus on achieving the project targets at both output and outcome level and to follow-up the key recommendations from the MTR. With these follow-up missions, the project team has now agreed to conduct the impact assessment of the project activities; in particular, the project is willing to give special consideration to focus on the participation of the poor/landless families. So far, the project has already conducted focused group discussions with the beneficiaries to assess the results of the project. MTR Recommendation 2: In the remaining duration of the project, the project needs to review and re-design how activities like income generation, household water supply, communal irrigation structures are planned, with whom they are planned, clear analysis of who benefits and how these generate adaptation solutions, and how these are implemented. Actions: The project is recruiting a consultant to assess all farmer groups on their capacity and potential for income generation activities. The exercise is expected to be completed in August 2013, and the recommendations from this exercise are expected to inform the approach of the project implementation using the one-village approach which will be scaled up during the second phase of the project implementation under the CIDA fund. MTR Recommendation 3: In order to generate evidence-based advocacy and communicate messages, the project needs to reorient some of its activities toward producing credible data to show how communities are generating adaptation solutions and increasing their resilience to climate change. One approach would be to take an entire village community – albeit small – as a unit of intervention. Through the latter approach, the project could enable a community to undertake a total village analysis – of their livelihood needs, resource requirements, bio-mass requirements, production and withdrawals from natural resources, vulnerability to climate changes, and development and adaptation needs. This would also help generate bottom-up adaptation solutions taking into account a community's multi-faceted needs. Actions: The project has started to pilot the one-village approach in 4 villages within the existing target areas in 2013. The project is under the process of documenting experiences to be replicated in

the second phase. A guidance note to conduct the impact assessment of the key project interventions under this one-village approach is being developed with technical support from the RTA. The project will use this guidance note to implement the impact assessment of the project interventions to generate results for the purpose of evidence-based advocacy and communication during the second phase. MTR Recommendation 4: In order to address the delays caused by complex array of unclear procedures at PA level, the project needs to have regular dialogue with the office of the provincial Governors at senior level and resolve bottlenecks that arise. Actions: MAFF/PSU team has discussed the issue with IP3 project managers. It was also discussed during the field monitoring visits by the technical level from UNDP CO and the Project Board members with representatives from the deputy Governors of the target provinces. As a result, the situation in Kratie province has improved. However, in Preah VIhear, there has been slow progress due to the dynamics within the key players involved at the Provincial Administration. UNDP CO will continue to bring this dialogue onwards during the meetings with the respective provincial representatives when appropriate. MTR Recommendation 5: Implementing staff would require greater orientation to outcome-oriented planning, monitoring and implementation. The project staff needs to use cost-benefit and effectiveness measures in planning and implementing all activities. Actions: UNDP CO has been working closely with the project team to provide guidance to the project team to ensure cost effectiveness in planning and implementation. This happened on a regular basis during the AWP development and Quarterly Progress/Financial Report review process. In addition, a project delivery clinic was conducted with the project team to review the project budget to ensure the project budget is accurately planned and any over budgeted lines will be reverted to other activities that contribute to achieve greater project results. A result-based M&E training was also conducted by UNDP CO for the project team both at national and sub-national level.

Lessons Learned

Lesson 1: The concept of climate change is relatively new. The nature of the issue requires cross sector coordination. Consequently, synergy and partnership building are vital for bringing forward greater impact and also crucial in ensuring that there is no duplication on what has already been tried by others. The project has aligned itself with other partners and initiatives engaged in supporting improved management of water resources in the agricultural sector in Cambodia. The project has developed strategic alliances with a number of partners including IFAD, Technical Working Group for Agriculture and Water (TWGAW), Cambodia Climate Change Alliance (CCCA), Climate Change Department of MoE, CARDI, SCW, UNDP/GEF Small Grants Programme, UNCDF etc… which the project has benefited from their expertise as well as to share experiences with them. With the developed outcome roadmap, the project is making sure the project outcomes are realized. Lesson 2: Mainstreaming activities need to be followed by concrete investment support with a strong focus on community participation and hand-holding support from local authorities. Without investment support, it demotivates the mainstreaming effort of provincial, district and commune level. Lesson 3: Involvement of the right, mandated institution to influence policy or endorsement of technical report or policy options is critical. As such, pioneering mainstreaming climate change into the local planning process, the NAPA FU in collaboration with UNDP/SGP and LGCC of UNCDF, is in the process of capitalizing the experiences into a national agenda with the National Committee for Democratic Development at Sub-National level (NCDDS), an inter-ministerial committee implementing the government policies on Decentralization and Deconcentration and the Ministry of Planning (MoP). Lesson 4: Women's participation in decision making level remains a challenge due to cultural context and responsibilities perceived within the society. In order to address this, package

vote is needed to ensure women's participation is secured. Lesson 5: Challenge of generating and managing data for evidence-based result reporting One of the consistent challenges encountered during the implementation of this project were the limitation of data on the livelihood impacts of the project. While a number of communication materials have been produced in the last 3 years, the result reporting was largely based on a few anecdotes. As efforts to promote climate change adaptation are still relatively new in the country and good practices need to be disseminated, it is important to gradually move away from anecdote-based result reporting to evidence-based reporting. Recognizing the importance of this, the project team attempted putting in place a robust system for data collection and monitoring. However, this effort has been beset with practical difficulties. For example, evidence-based reporting of the impacts of adaptive livelihood measures often require ex-ante data collection (at a much greater detail than the baseline data collection for Outcome reporting) and establishment of a comparison group. These are still a new concept for many of the stakeholders and require continuous awareness raising and skill development.

PARTNERSHIPS

Civil Society Organisations/NGOs

Despite no NGO is involved in the project implementation, NAPA FU had considerably built a significant network with CSO (national and international) through national workshops organized by NCDDS, particularly the Consultative Workshop on localizing climate change responses beyond 2015 in Cambodia in December 2012 and in the Workshop on Mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation in Sub-National Planning in January 2013.

More recently, NAPA FU had played a proactive role in influencing NCDDS on Mainstreaming DRR in the Sub-National Planning by bringing two international NGOs (Action Aid and DCA/Christian Aid Cambodia) having experience in Disaster Risk Reduction in the core group drafting the operational guidelines CCA in Sub-National Planning. The Senior Management of the NCDDS had agreed to mainstream DRR in the Sub-National Planning.

The project has facilitated the establishment and strengthening of 114 farmer groups (75 farmer water user groups, 27 integrated farming groups, and 12 seed purification groups). These groups are considered as community-based organisations that promote community's ownership and maintenance of project supported climate resilience investment.

Indigenous Peoples

N/A

Private Sector

N/A

GEF Small Grants Programme

NAPA FU is partnering closely with SGP/CCBAP and LGCC, a UNCDF supported project in capitalizing the best practices generated from the respective project through a National Workshop in mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation in Sub-National Planning organized by NCDDS in January 2013. As an outcome of the workshop, NCDDS agreed to establish a core group to draft the operational guidelines in mainstreaming Climate Change in the Sub-National level. Even if the Core group is not yet officially proclaimed, both NAPA FU and SGP are sitting as members and coordinating with NCDDS.

Other Partners

The project in collaboration with RULIP had reviewed the curriculum of the Farmer Field School (FFS) with integration of climate change that will be implemented in the PADEE five target provinces in South East part of Cambodia by the National IPM Program. The best practices of NAPA FU will be likely contributing to and scaled up in an upcoming IFAD program called Agriculture Services Program for Innovation Resilience and Extension (ASPIRE). This project will emphasize on mainstreaming resilience in extension services.

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING GENDER EQUALITY

Has a gender or social needs assessment been carried out?

No

If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what where the findings?

Does this project specifically target women or girls as direct beneficiaries?

Yes

Have there been any changes in specifically targeting women or girls as direct beneficiaries this reporting period?

No

If yes, please explain:

Please discuss any of the points above further or provide any other information on the project's work on gender equality undertaken this reporting period

Some points to consider: impact of project on daily workload of women, # of jobs created for women, impact of project on time spent by women in household activities, impact of project on primary school enrolment for girls/boys, increase in women's income etc. Be as specific as possible and provide real numbers (e.g. 100 women farmers participating in sustainable livelihoods programme).

Although it meant additional coordination requirements, the integrated approach involving three line departments in encouraging women participation had paid off. Women are empowered and gained confidence in participating in the agricultural and irrigation-based activities with a steadily increasing number. E.g. 53% of the Water User Groups and 11.5% of the FWUC leaders are women. Access to domestic water especially when provision of training is coupled with investment, revealed the highest uptake and appears to be most gender-responsive activity. It was reported that women could save up to 70% of their time in fetching water.

With experience gained from the NAPA FU project, the Gender Climate Change Committee of the Ministry of Women\\\'s Affairs (GCCC/MoWA) is able to formulate and implement a project supported by Cambodia Climate Change Alliance funds and influence the policy-making by rendering Climate Change and Gender as the 6th pillar of the upcoming Ministry’s 5-year Strategic Plan called Neary Ratanak IV.

ENVIRONMENTAL OR SOCIAL GRIEVANCE

What environmental or social issue was the grievance related to?

What is the current status of the grievance?

How would you rate the significance of the grievance?

Please describe the on-going or resolved grievance noting who was involved, what action was taken to resolve the grievance, how much time it took, and what you learned from managing the grievance process (maximum 500 words). If more than one grievance was addressed this reporting period, please explain the other grievance (s) here: