

# Phase-2 Program Final Evaluation and Phase-3 Proposal Development Partners for Forestry and Fisheries Program (PaFF 2)

Final Report

January 2021



**Prof Steven M Newman FRSA. Team Leader and environment specialist**  
**Dr Sokphea Young. Senior National Consultant**

## BioDiversity International Ltd

[www.biodiversity-int.co.uk](http://www.biodiversity-int.co.uk)

55-56 West St, Faversham, Kent ME13 7JH UK.

Telephone +44 (0)1795 533 487 Email [Steve@biodiversity-int.co.uk](mailto:Steve@biodiversity-int.co.uk)

Company registered in England No. 2855312. Data Protection Act No. X307402

## Contents

Acknowledgements and disclaimer .....	4
Abbreviations .....	4
<b>1. Executive summary .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Executive Summary .....	5
<b>Relevance and design (unsatisfactory).....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Recommendations .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1. Introduction and problem statement .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2. Programme summary.....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Programme organisation.....	10
2.2 The program’s intervention in response to the problem including a “theory of change”. .....	10
2. Purpose of the final program evaluation.....	11
<b>3. Methodology and limitations .....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Stages of the evaluation.....	11
3.2 Elements of the evaluation approach.....	11
3.3 Limitations .....	12
3.4 Other issues .....	12
3. Findings .....	12
3.1 Relevance and design .....	12
6.1 Outcome and findings about the program’s achievement and consequences .....	14
3.4.1 Outcome 1 Rights.....	14
6.1.2 Outcome 2 Income.....	18
6.1.3 Outcome 3 Policy .....	21
<b>6.2.1 Institutional and organizational set up of PaFF including staffing.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>6.2.2 Monitoring, evaluation, learning and reporting. ....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>7 Lessons learnt and case studies from the field.....</b>	<b>25</b>
7.1 Outcome 1 .....	25
7.2 Outcome 2.....	25
7.3 Outcome 3.....	26
<b>8 Conclusions and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>26</b>
8.1 Conclusions.....	26
8.1.1 Relevance and design .....	26
8.1.1 Impact.....	27
8.1.2 Sustainability .....	27
8.1.3 Outcome 1 Rights (satisfactory).....	27
8.1.4 Outcome 2 Income (unsatisfactory).....	27
8.1.5 Outcome 3 Policy (unsatisfactory).....	28
8.1.6 Management (highly unsatisfactory) .....	28

**8.1 Recommendations** ..... 29

8.1.1 Design and Relevance ..... 29

8.1.2 Overall sustainability and impact ..... 29

8.1.3 Outcome 1 rights ..... 29

8.1.4 Outcome 2 income ..... 29

8.1.5 Outcome 3 policy ..... 30

8.1.6 Direction, management, and MEL ..... 30

8.1.7 Vision for PAFF 3 ..... 30

### Acknowledgements and disclaimer

We would like to thank the partners and SDC for excellent support and cooperation. Views expressed are those of the independent consultant and do not represent those of any of the donors or partners. All errors are our own.

### Abbreviations

These are presented in Annex 1.

## 1. Executive summary

# Executive Summary

Deforestation and agricultural expansion result in the fragmentation of forests and the depletion of Natural Resources (NR). Rural communities, though extremely poor, are officially entrusted to protect agreed areas for a renewable period: Community Forests (CFs), Community Fisheries (CFis) and Community Protected Area (CPA), respectively under the Forestry Administration (FA) and Fisheries Administration (FiA) of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), and Ministry of Environment (MoE). However, the government has limited resources for law enforcement and none for rural livelihoods. Therefore, to balance conservation and economic development, these Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) groups require substantial financial support.

The Partnership Programme to Support Forestry and Fishery Communities (PaFF) started in November 2014, implemented by four NGOs: CEPA, NTFP-EP, RECOFTC and WWF. The first phase (PaFF I) was implemented in two provinces (Kratie and Stung Treng) and ended in June 2017. The second phase (PaFF II) runs from 01/08/2017 until 30/06/2021 and expands to Kampong Thom and Preah Vihear provinces. PAFF 2 had an “extensive” Mid Term Review (MTR) with field surveys in October and November 2019 and produced a report in December 2019. SDC Recommendation was provided, and PaFF management response has been discussed and followed up.

The overall aim of the evaluation of the second phase of PAFF 2 was “to learn from the intervention so that a more powerful final phase can be developed”. As such, the Phase 2 final evaluation aims to identify key program achievement, impact, challenges, lessons learned and best practices to inform the design and development of phase 3. Phase-3 will be the final phase of SDC’s support to PaFF, therefore, Phase-3 must be developed in a view of sustaining activities beyond June 2023. SDC’s support will end. The methodology was based on interviews of key informants and focus group discussions, underpinned by a field phase and a document review. Evaluation criteria included: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability, considering cross-cutting issues (gender equality, climate change, Disaster Risk Reduction -DRR)

The evaluation has led to the production of 39 findings in relation to the standard OECD DAC evaluation entities. The standard approach was augmented using appreciative inquiry<sup>1</sup>. This led to the following findings that are of central importance to the design of Phase 3.

PAFF is unique in Cambodia and if (1) PAFF 2 design problems identified by this mission are sorted out and (2) the management team is augmented by a new director post, and technical assistance, and (3) It is equipped to turn from being a “mother” to many initiatives and organisations to letting her “children” thrive by enabling them to learn from their own mistakes, it should be supported until 2023 so that it can build on the following positive and possibly unique attributes:

1. A catalogue of data and auspicious mistakes related to the development of community based natural resources management.
2. An incredible amount of social capital in terms of friends, community champions and advisors
3. The ability to produce good communication materials such as newsletters that appreciate the work of its champions.
4. Community natural resources management groups that are at a stage where they could be made more powerful by federation and self-governance.

This will require a new theory of change and a major change in direction. It is important to learn from the past to have a more positive future. The conclusions outlined below are not meant to be negative but represent missed opportunities for improvement. A perfect programme would have no utility in terms of leaning lessons.

### Relevance and design (unsatisfactory)

Policy relevance is high. Relevance to the poorest in the communities is questionable as they need better nutrition and jobs and cannot take the risk of enterprises in most cases. Agriculture and especially agroforestry is of central relevance to all in the programme operating area, but it is virtually ignored by the programme.

There are many problems with design that were not corrected by the mid-term review (MTR). There is also a problem with the theory of change.

Positive aspects of design include the wide geographical distribution of communities and the high number of citizens involved. This is **especially useful** for any rights-based approach. In addition, PAFF produces newsletters (not featured in the logical framework) and these are **particularly good**.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Locating the Energy for Change: An Introduction to Appreciative Inquiry | International Institute for Sustainable Development \(iisd.org\)](https://www.iisd.org/publications/locating-the-energy-for-change-an-introduction-to-appreciative-inquiry/)

### **Impact (unsatisfactory).**

Impact is probably being underestimated due to design. The indicators for resilience at the impact level are not powerful enough. These include simple and practical measures of environmental improvement. Improved health and social capital (number of friends and advisors). In relation to the four impact indicators:

- The area under formal agreements has increased and this is good.
- The numbers of household and individuals undertaking sustainable livelihood is an activity not an indicator.
- Increase in annual household income is good and has risen from \$36 to as much as \$228 in some cases (community-based ecotourism). However, the number of households involved is not significant and sustaining the income in the face of COVID and other factors may be difficult.
- Hectares of terrestrial and aquatic habitat conserved and managed has no evidence of achievement as indicators for the term conserved are absent.
- In addition, ownership, the next and final phase of PaFF must focus on the “impact” beyond the target communities and households. Lessons learnt from CBETs, through social media, should be adopted by every product (output) of PaFF. All CF, CFi, CPA and their subordinate groups should go online (social network sites) to increase the visibility of the PaFF. This would be the legacy of PaFF.

### **Sustainability (unsatisfactory).**

Target communities have probably gained new skills (not tested by the programme) and remain motivated by the opportunity to access state resources. However, this motivation continues to be eroded due to lack of adequate funds and adequate support by government. They derive their main income for agriculture. Agroforestry was not part of the design of the programme and remains a missed opportunity.

Government motivation is compromised by major reorganisation of responsibilities linked to shift of responsibility between ministries and decentralisation issues e.g., provincial officers now report to the provincial governor. It is difficult to see what incentives government officers would obtain in relation to assisting non profitable natural resources management e.g., in degraded forests or fishing areas.

### **Effectiveness (unsatisfactory)**

The production of natural resources management plans is a key part of the project approach and strategy. It is hoped that these will empower rural households to claim and secure their access to natural resources, as well as strengthen sustainable NRM and thus improve their income and livelihood resilience. At present the plans are too expensive, not profitable for anyone, and too complicated for target communities to use. In addition, they do not capture the voice and plans of the people adequately, or the opportunities now offered by the internet and digital media for linking with powerful advisors and allies, monitoring the natural resources (webcams), and generating funds by asking for donations and selling community produced commodities and service.

The synergy between outcomes of the programme is weak. A vital financial resource is invested in outcome 1, but a few in outcome 2 (livelihoods). In most cases, CFi and CF are not supported by outcome 2.

Outcome 3 has focused more on the national policies whereas the local issues (illegal encroachment, fishing, and logging) that need immediate solution are not dealt with. However, some of the policy briefs are excellent.

### **Efficiency (unsatisfactory)**

Many results are too expensive. This is especially the case with the cost of income uplift per unit project expenditure. The project spent a significant amount of the budget to uplift a selected number of households, especially the committee members. As in outcome 1, while the project obtained agreements from FiA and FA and developed management plans to secure rights over the resources, in practice the resources are still threatened by the illegal land encroachment, and illegal logging and fishing.

Monitoring of financial variance and physical outputs is excellent. Evaluation is extremely poor. This is linked to a lack of appropriate investment, appropriate human resources, and design issues linked to quality assessment of outcomes and outputs by the target communities and the government. Learning is also extremely poor linked to a lack of assumption testing and adequate recording systems for auspicious mistakes.

### **Management (Unsatisfactory)**

The limitations of the current HR design are now being manifested in several ways. The job description of project manager is not optimal for a project of this size which would normally have a dedicated project director with the gravitas and influence to lead advocacy and steer a complex project. Evidence of this is linked to the weak link with PDAFF, the overdependence on-line agencies concerned with conservation and a lack of success in accessing funds linked to the massive expansion in budget and sector support approaches by donors in addition the absence of a full-time post on monitoring evaluation and learning is also unsatisfactory and linked decision support systems is also satisfactory. Management is however currently highly satisfactory at the level of the administration of physical and financial variance

and activities. These issues will get worse due to the forthcoming greater challenges of management of a programme in its final phase.

### **Monitoring evaluation and learning (highly unsatisfactory)**

Although monitoring at the administrative level is highly satisfactory, the current Monitoring Evaluation and learning system is highly unsatisfactory. The systems do not provide an adequate decision support system linked to the quality assessment of all new outcomes<sup>2</sup> (behavioural change) and output quality (physical things) linked to customer satisfaction<sup>3</sup>. Adaptive management linked to the regular testing of critical and operationally useful assumptions is unsatisfactory as evidenced by the quality of lessons learned in the annual narrative reports. In addition, the M+E system is not capturing some of the key impacts observed in the field that are of critical importance to “resilience”. These can be expressed in terms of the “5 capitals”<sup>4</sup> of sustainable rural livelihoods: natural capital (population or biomass of a suitable proxy<sup>5</sup>), economic capital (physical and financial assets not income), human capital (health e.g., mortality and morbidity and education status) and social capital (number of useful friends<sup>6</sup>). The M+E system is not capturing attributable effects<sup>7</sup> and evidence linked to advocacy<sup>8</sup>.

### **Recommendations**

Recommendations are numbered in a way that show the link with the relevant conclusions in the text of the report.

**Recommendation 1.1:** Produce a clear programme purpose and beneficiaries’ statement so that the theory of change can be further development in phase 2 and set the basis for the design of phase 3.

**Recommendation 2.0.** Locate best practice in the programme areas in terms of financially sustainable and or profitable entities e.g., CBNRM groups and actions of champions outlined in the last two newsletters, replicate them at all scales including the landscape scale.

**Recommendation 3.0** Locate best practice in the programme areas in terms of impact defined as the spread of benefits away from programme areas and themes and replicate them using an understanding of impact pathways. The movement of champions is an especially important impact pathway.

**Recommendation 4.1:** FE acknowledges the achievements of CFi and CF management plans as a form of tenure, but this is not a permanent one. PaFF 3 should build on this achievement and move forward to permanent “ownership” by the CF and FA/PDAFF as a long-term aim.

**Recommendation 4.2:** CFi should focus on what they have been doing. However, as financial resource is limited for CFi to patrol the entire fishery sanctuary/ boundary, the emphasis of CFi patrolling activity should pay more emphasis on deep pools conservation and protection even patrolling the entire CFi remains an important activity.

**Recommendation 4.3:** Cultivating technology and social media to indirectly influence patrolling action. Other than the information dissemination through Telegram exchange, CFi, CF, and CFi and CF networks should show what they are doing, including reporting illegal cases and documenting evidence. There should Facebook page for each CFi and CF networks for them to circulate news and their activities which may be visible to the other communities across the border.

**Recommendation 5.1:** PaFF should focus on sustaining CFi and CF credits, and mini-trust-funds by actively engaging with PDAFF. PDAFF’s office of agricultural cooperation and community development should be engaged to support PaFF’s CFi and CF credit scheme.

**Recommendation 5.2:** Obtain indirect support and capital to enhance livelihoods of CF, CFi and CPA through strengthening partnership with PDAFF (ASPIRE, CHAIN, CAPFISH, IWRM) to complement and broaden the PaFF’s livelihoods approaches so that sustainability is improved. Agroforestry would be a good entry point.

**Recommendation 5.3:** Diversifying income of CFi, CF and CPA. As we found that income from credits and mini-trust-fund interests are not sufficient for the patrolling activities, CFi and CF need to diversify their income sources. Some have done so such as those areas which are potential for CBETs and CBEs, the rest should seek partner with private sectors: agro-industry companies (which can be part of their management plan).

**Recommendation 5.4:** for CFi, collective fishing for commercial purpose should be examined and explored. This would be an additional but vital source of income for the community to remain active and sustainable as support from FiA is limited.

**Recommendation 5.5:** Building on how CBEs, and CBETs, more should be investing in not only building visibility and impacts but also the markets for all community products that locals or foreigners may be interested in.

---

<sup>2</sup> Outcomes could be stated in terms of desired behavioural change (e.g., X% of specified group Y adopt practice by a specified date) and have only one quantitative indicator and one indicator of quality (using a scorecard or checklist approach).

<sup>3</sup> Quality can be assessed by the service receiver (government or recipient) at low cost and is more objective and relevant than measurement by the service provider. Customer feedback is a most important pre-requisite of learning.

<sup>4</sup> [Microsoft Word - B7\\_1\\_pdf2.doc \(glopp.ch\)](#)

<sup>5</sup> fundamental to any project dealing with protected areas and species.

<sup>6</sup> not currently measured by the partnership

<sup>7</sup> This is where key actors are happy to acknowledge in writing that PAFF made a key or vital contribution.

<sup>8</sup> Minute taking with clear agreed action points with dates and clear statements about how delivery can be independently verified.

**Recommendation 5.6:** reaching the poor members of CF and CFi. Credit schemes have benefited several CFi and CF committee members, but more investment/ lending is needed for the poor members of CFi and CF. A condition should be set, at least 30% of the borrowers of the credit schemes should be the poor members who actively participate in CFi and CF activities.

**Recommendation 6.1:** Empowering CFi and CF provincial network to dialogue with, and influence local decision and accountability of FiA, FA and PDAFF.

**Recommendation 6.2:** The most important advocacy activities to be carried out at the national level is to ensure a constant increase in FiA, FA and PDAFF (in overall) budget allocation from the national level.

**Recommendation 7.1:** Strengthen human resources to achieve better focus with emphasis on post dealing with direction and not just management and evaluation and learning and not just monitoring in phase 3. This is to be done with existing partners. International technical assistance is vital to improve evaluation and learning and the contract should be of the same value as PAFF3 implementation.

**Recommendation 7.2:** Carry on rotation of lead agency and reorganise to boost strengths on (1) land access and ownership and (2) helping to government to sustain active engagement and support poor communities. In other words, RECOFTC should take on the lead. Partners retain the same roles as PAFF 2.

**Recommendation 8.1:** Dramatically improve MEL in phase 3 and develop the M&E plan to include (1) learning, (2) professional independent evaluation (3) quality improvement using participatory development of checklists and their evolution to scorecards sensitive to customer satisfaction and capturing voice.

**Recommendation 8.2:** Adopt the five capitals approach to DFID sustainable rural livelihoods approach in phase 3 and develop low cost practical and simple methods to assess impact in this way in relation to beneficiaries.

**Recommendation 8.3:** Generate a simple conceptual logical framework with an overall objective, project purpose behavioural results and assumptions as a tool for thinking to be used by those in the partnership concerned with strategic thinking.

**Special Recommendation 9** for Phase 3 based on the entire evaluation. The theory of change stated at the end of the report should be used for discussion purposes. A workshop could be organised using the 25% retained evaluation budget.

## 1. Introduction and problem statement

Land, water, fisheries, and forestry play a significant role Cambodia's economy. They are also especially important for the subsistence of remote communities who in many cases are in the grip of **poverty**.

The forests and inland fisheries are in a **complex landscape**. Key areas include the Mekong flooded forest (MFF) and catchment area, and Tonle Sap great lake. The Mekong catchment area covers not only immediate riparian communities and provinces but also those areas where tributary rivers are linked to the Mekong mainstream.

The riparian communities' livelihoods depend on rice, fish, livestock, vegetables, and products gathered from the forest. In the rainy season, most of the focus is on rice and orchard cultivation and cattle raising, with fishing in the open-fishing season and dry season (family fishing for daily consumption is also allowed in the closed season). These have provided, to a certain degree, subsistent livelihoods support to the dependent communities, but the poverty rate and rate of forestland clearing, and deforestation are still critical concerns for these Mekong catchment areas.

The area is also **globally important for biodiversity** and according to WWF:

*Threatened species in the Mekong River **Ecoregion** include mammals such as the iconic Irrawaddy dolphin and gigantic fish like Mekong giant catfish, giant carp, and giant freshwater stingray, all of which can exceed 200 kg in weight. Many of the globally significant terrestrial fauna species of the ecoregion rely on riverine habitats such as riverbanks, island vegetation and midstream sandbars. Unfortunately, these vulnerable wetland resources are under increasing threat from human-induced changes to the Mekong River and its tributaries*□

Effort has been spent by the government and in partnership with development partners, donors, and NGOs, not only to protect the forestland and the fishery resources but also to develop livelihoods of the natural resource dependent communities, aiming at reducing pressure on forestland and fishery resources. The approaches to do so intersect between the notion of "integrated conservation and development", and "conservation for development". Of many approaches, rights to protect and access to natural resources for sustainable uses, and alternative livelihood enhancement are being adopted not only by the government (e.g., National Forestry Programme; National Fishery Programme) but also local and international development agencies. These includes the establishment of community forest and fishery to secure rights (obtain permits/agreements from the government) to these resources.

The ecoregion is subject to injudicious economic and social development. Such development has caused a reduction in the amount of harvested/managed terrestrial and aquatic products that can be sold and a degradation of the water and soils that (1) supports productivity, and (2) buffers people (physically and financially linked to **income**) from environmental disasters (many of which are becoming more frequent due to climate change). This buffering is a form of protection now referred to as **resilience**.

In response to this problem, the Royal Government of Cambodia has formulated strategies and **policies** to empower local communities to take part of resource management through community-based approaches such as community forestry (CF), community fisheries (Cfi) and community protected areas (CPA), with the objective of securing their access **rights** to lands and livelihoods.

Despite the conservation effort, the forestland clearing, and deforestation remains. As these riparian areas and forestland are potentially arable, it attracted not only the expansion of agricultural land but also **migration** of people from the resource scarcity (from other provinces and urban area). As if these forestland and fishery resources are over exploited, they will exacerbate the livelihoods of the dependent communities, especially the poorest, and they will also deplete the environment.

At the ground level, the community based Natural Resource Management (NRM) groups are facing constraints and may benefit from technical support for legalisation (acquiring tenure), development of management plans and the development of sustainable livelihood opportunities.

## 2. Programme summary

### 2.1 Programme organisation

To support the implementation of Royal Government of Cambodia's strategic (forest and fishery) sectors plan, a consortium of four organizations, WWF-Cambodia, RECOFTC-Cambodia, NTFP-EP, and CEPA who is each has its own unique capacity and strength in community based natural resource management, formed and led by NTFP-EP (Phase-1) and WWF-Cambodia (Phase2) to implement a programme called Partners for Forestry and Fisheries (PaFF). Key features of organisation include.

1. The PaFF program is designed for eight years and implementing in three phases from 2014 to 2023. PaFF Phase-1 ran from November 2014 to June 2017 and had a budget of 3.7M USD.
2. The program was led by NTFPEP and only implemented in Kratie and Stung Treng provinces.
3. PaFF Phase-2 is for four years (July 2017-June 2021), with a total budget 6.133M USD (49% from SDC and 51% from IUCN-Netherland-SRJS, CEPF, ForumSyd (Now called ForumCiv), Belgium DGD and BMZ through each partner's on-going projects).
4. The lead consortium for Phase-2 is assumed by WWF-Cambodia and the target area of the program was expanded to two more provinces, Preah Vihear and Kampong Thom
5. The extension of phase-2 target areas appears to be driven by conservation (outcomes 1 and 3) rather than livelihoods development (outcome 2); Kampong Thom is not covered by NTFP-EP.
6. The internal auditor of SDC (from Switzerland) assessed WWF Cambodia and NTFP-EP on the financial and the PaFF program implementation in November 2017.
7. PAFF 2 had an "extensive" Mid Term Review (MTR) with field surveys in October and November 2019 and produced a report in December 2019. MTR provided extensive recommendations, and SDC and PaFF management responses have been discussed and followed up (See Notes of meeting in October 2020 between SDC and PaFF ExeCom on the PaFF preparation and focus for the final phase)

### 2.2 The program's intervention in response to the problem including a "theory of change".

The response to the problem has been to implement a programme try to support resilience at the community level through the facilitation of the achievement of three outcomes by the end of June 2021 concerned with (1) rights, (2) income and (3) policy.

The ToR (Annex Two) states that the "theory of change" of PaFF-2 remains as outlined in Phase-1:

*Working with Government, private sector, civil society, and rural communities, PaFF' s **contribution** to improving stakeholders' implementation capacity, knowledge, and participation in development processes at national and local level will **empower** rural households to claim and secure their access to natural resources, as well as **strengthen** sustainable NRM and thus improve their income and livelihood **resilience**.*

The overall goal of the intervention is stated as

*Rural and indigenous communities and households increase their **incomes** and improve their **resilience to economic and natural shocks** by engaging in sustainable community-based livelihood approaches that protect their ecosystems **and reduce pressure** on their communal natural resource base.*

The outcomes that contribute to the overall goal are:

**Outcome 1:** Target communities have secure **rights** to their natural resources and are exercising them.

**Outcome 2:** Households in target communities increase their **income** through sustainable community-based forest and fisheries related enterprises and strategies<sup>9</sup>

**Outcome 3:** National and local enabling **policy** conditions support secure community rights over natural resources and the development of sustainable community-based enterprises.

---

<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that in some cases these activities can put greater pressure on natural resources.

## 2. Purpose of the final program evaluation

The overall aim of the evaluation of the second phase of PAFF 2 in Cambodia can be inferred as “to learn from the intervention so that a more powerful final phase can be developed”. As such, the Phase 2 final evaluation aims to identify key program achievement, impact, challenges, lessons learned and best practices to inform the design and development of phase 3.

A detailed Phase 2 mid-term review (MTR) was recently conducted, and the ToR stated that this final evaluation is “*not expected to be extensive and detailed as the MTR but rather focusing on top-line evaluation (headline issues) and put more time (emphasis) for designing and formulating a proposal for the PaFF Phase-3, the final phase of the program.*”

The key focus of the FE is to (1) identify negative and positive aspects, such as lessons learned from auspicious mistakes and emerging islands of excellence that form the basis of the **facilitation factors** linked to success and (2) to identify **constraining factors** because of missed opportunities in design (contained in the original project proposal and logical framework), management and technical issues during implementation.

## 3. Methodology and limitations

### 3.1 Stages of the evaluation

This is outlined in the ToR (Annex Two)

The Phase-2 final program evaluation:

- Broadly assess and updated the program achievements and impact, challenges, lessons learned and best practices of each outcome against the agreed program log-frame including its quality on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the existing scope (four target provinces).
- Assess the overall goal/objective of the program and theory of change whether they are met with a provision of concise quality statement including a projection of poverty reduction rate of each target district and province that PaFF contributed.
- Assess for the information to fill in the assessment grid for evaluation and put as an annex of the report. (Annex 11)
- Identify of any unintended impacts; and recommendations for avoiding any negative unintended impacts in Phase-3.

### 3.2 Elements of the evaluation approach

Design and relevance analysis was based on document analysis and any changes identified by a study of current context and discussions with stakeholders.

The fieldwork for this phase-2 evaluation was a blend of remote interviews (mostly with programme management team of PaFF, stakeholders: donors and government officials) and physical interviews and group discussions at the provincial, district and commune levels.

Appreciative inquiry<sup>10</sup> was used to locate the energy for change and some of the hidden positive effects of the interventions.

The national consultant assisted by a team of experienced interviewers, conducted many key informant interviews.

In addition to the findings of MTR, voices and stories told by these participants, provided the consultant team sufficient evidence, observation, and experience to assess the phase-2 project, and to render convincing conclusions and recommendations for Phase 3.

Outcome attainment was assessed by using the single most useful (SMART) indicator.

---

<sup>10</sup> [Locating the Energy for Change: An Introduction to Appreciative Inquiry | International Institute for Sustainable Development \(iisd.org\)](http://www.iisd.org)

Progress was assessed using data in the progress logical framework updated to December 2020 (See Annex 2).

Findings and recommendations were discussed and endorsed at a “Validation” workshop involving PAFF staff, Government Community members and SDC.

Further technical and administrative details are given in the following annexes.

3. Workplan itinerary and deliverables
4. List of persons met.
5. Number and type of interviews
6. List of focus group discussions
7. Documents consulted.
8. Organisational Set up

### 3.3 Limitations

#### **COVID**

The ability to interact with the ultimate beneficiaries (especially the poor was limited given the time constraint and personal avoidance of contacting directly with the villagers, especially the indigenous people whose culture prevents external visitors during crisis and pandemic). In addition, the highly experienced international team leader (natural resources management, biodiversity, and climate change) could not leave the UK due to COVID restrictions so was not able to see conditions in the field.

#### **M+E system and data availability**

The current M+E system as exemplified by the logical framework was found to be not fit for purpose and was based on a faulty “theory of change”. Key indicators of quality, behavioural change and environmental variables were missing. (Further detail is elaborated in the section on Design and Annex 9) No annual report for 2020 was available so only 2019 data (validated by SDC acceptance of the report) could be used.

The original idea of analysis of Provincial, District and Commune level poverty secondary data was found not to be appropriate. This was linked to the issue (identified by the MTR) that it is impossible to assess i.e., attribution/contribution to poverty reduction. Outcome 2 of PaFF stated clearly that the programme will “increase income of selected households” rather than the poor households or communities in the target areas.

### 3.4 Other issues

This is the first time that the project has been evaluated using the SDC assessment grid (see Annex 11). This was not available at the time of the MTR.

In terms of progress, use has been made of the programme logical framework and attainments with comments are included in Annex 12.

Finally work in progress on (1) developing the concept note, (2) thoughts on an ideal picture for the programme purpose and (3) a more useful approach to logical frameworks if behavioural change is an issue, is presented in Annexes 10, 11 and 12, respectively.

## 3. Findings

This section includes findings from the MTR. Due to limitations on report length, the section should be read in conjunction with the findings in the SDC assessment grid.

### 3.1 Relevance and design

Relevance in relation to government (policy) and civil society in Cambodia was **satisfactory**. Protected areas, fisheries and forests are of central importance to all.

Relevance to the needs and priorities of the target group are difficult to assess as the programme has not defined the target group. They are referred to as “target communities” in most of the programme documents. In other words, there is no beneficiary’s statement.

The programme area is characterised by high levels of food insecurity and child stunting exists. The needs of the poor are linked to selling their labour, obtaining food from agriculture, and obtaining state assistance and or receiving food supplements. On this basis the relevance of the programme is **unsatisfactory**.

The third dimension of SDC relevance is concerned with the adequacy of elements of programme design such as the theory of change. This has been given the grade **highly unsatisfactory**.

The theory of change in the project was used to develop the intervention logic (activity to output to outcome to impact results chain) in the programme logical framework.

*A Theory of Change is: “essentially a comprehensive description and illustration of how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context. It is focused on mapping out or “filling in” what has been described as the “missing middle” between what a program or change initiative does (its activities or interventions) and how these lead to desired goals being achieved. It does this by first identifying the desired long-term goals and then works back from these to identify all the conditions (outcomes) that must be in place (and how these related to one another causally) for the goals to occur.”<sup>11</sup>*

The theory of change of PaFF-2 remains as outlined in Phase-1: Working with Government, private sector, civil society, and rural communities, **PaFF’s contribution** to improving stakeholders’ implementation capacity, knowledge, and participation in development processes at national and local level will empower rural households to claim and secure their access to natural resources, as well as strengthen sustainable NRM and thus improve their income and livelihood resilience.

This may be true, but it is inadequate as a theory of change as it still has a **missing middle** related to the questions of (1) what is PAFFs contribution, (2) why a partnership is better than single entities and (3) why NGOs are more suited to the task than government or community-based organisation? It is also not clear what PAFF want to change. Improving implementation capacity, knowledge, and participation in development processes at national and local level is vague and far too broad.

There are many other problems in design (9) including (1) no clear end point description (programme purpose) for the programme or the partnership. (2) no overall objective showing the greater picture that PAFF contributes to e.g. a government policy, (3) No outcome with indicators in relation to the creation of a powerful partnership (4) no indicators for quality that could be verified by beneficiaries or government, giving a voice to these partners,(5) no clear indicator for the state of the environment that could be verified by a lay person, and (5) lack of indicators of behavioural change that would lead the programme to learn about possible motivation constraints to be overcome and incentives to be facilitated. The logical framework has no useful assumptions and therefore cannot be used as a tool for adaptive management. As pointed out by the MTR many of the indicators are in the wrong place in the logical framework (not SMART), some are, activities and there is repetition. Perhaps a more suitable name for the logical framework would be a muddled box lock frame. This has led to rigidity and an administrative approach. This was also pointed out by the MTR but unfortunately the situation remains at the time of the PFE.

Positive aspects of design include the wide geographical distribution of communities and the high number of citizens involved. This is **especially useful** for any rights-based approach.

PAFF produces newsletters (not featured in the logical framework) and these are **particularly good**.

---

<sup>11</sup> [What is Theory of Change? | Theory of Change Community](#)

## 6.1 Outcome and findings about the program’s achievement and consequences

### 3.4.1 Outcome 1 Rights

By using the 4-year total budget to June 2021, this component represents 42%

#### 6.1.1.1 Introduction —Outcome 1 indicators and strategies

As a contribution to the overall goal, this outcome aims to ensure that the “target communities have secure rights to their natural resources and are exercising them”. The emphasis of this outcome (1) is to formalise tenure of the CF and CFi, with the aim to develop and implement management plans of these communities. CFs are supported by RECOFTC in all 4 provinces and by WWF in Kratie, whereas CFis are supported by WWF and CEPA in Kratie and Stung Treng provinces, respectively. To support CFi and CF, credits schemes were introduced, and later mini-trust-fund was initiated (adopting from those experiences of CFis in Tonle Sap). The combination of these activities, PaFF believes the CF and CFi could secure and exercise their rights to natural resources (fishery and forest).

#### 6.1.1.2 Achievement of outcome

The revised logical framework of 13/7/20 has 12 indicators for this outcome (see Annex 2), the achieve of individual indicators at outputs level attached). The achievements of itemized by each indicator was well highlighted by the MTR.

The most powerful indicator for outcome 1 would be “area under formal agreement” which is assumed to be legally binding.

The table below shows the data for community areas.

Indicator	Baseline 2017	Achievement Dec 2020	Total gained	Target June 2021	Area remaining
Community forest area ha	153,972 (134 CFs)	182,160 (153 CFs)	28,188	241,376 (185 CFs)	59,216
Community fishery area ha	16,488 (24 Cfis)	41,148.5 (61 CFis)	17,909	139,335 (162 CFi)	104,938
Total of all community areas both direct and indirect	170,460	216,557	46,097	380,711	164,154

- 1) The achievement of over 46,000 ha of land with community rights can be described as good and this will have a contribution towards resilience (impact) in that rights can be used as to increase assets. In addition, formalisation, or legalisation of CFis and CFs in managing common pool resources is the cornerstone of governance and contribution to climate change mitigation. Based on our observation and conversation with different stakeholders, especially FA and FiA, they have given anecdotal evidence that CFis and CFs, with the support of NGOs, have contributed significantly to prevent the rapid rate of forestland clearing and deforestation, and illegal fishing. Without CFi and CF and NGOs, forestland and fishery resources would have been destroyed.
- 2) Based on our field observation, rights over the area (the natural resources) are questioned on the extent to which the community own these resources for their livelihood’s improvement, and the extent to which these resources contribute to their livelihoods. The ownership and rights of CFis and CFs are on a contractual basis and given resource use limitations they are subject to periodic assessment and could be stopped at any time. Land ownership must surely be the long-term goal and there are precedents linked to the private sectors acquisition of land (often degraded). Official land titles (by Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction) will be vital foundation for CFs to maintain CFs’ forestland and resources.
- 3) An important indicator for funding activities linked to rights relates to credit schemes and the mini-trust-fund. In addition to the number of CF and CF credit established (36 CFs of 18 CFs; 07 CFi of 07 CFi), PAFF claimed that these credit schemes benefited 931 hhs (503 female-headed fhhs) against the target of 553 hhs (286 fhhs) under CF, and 116 hhs (of which 83 fhhs) against the target of 118 hhs (85 fhhs) under CFi. Even the amount of credit being offered by consortium members of PAFF is relatively small in the amount: \$1000 per CFi and CF, the large number of household beneficiaries reported under these schemes manifest the needs on this for their livelihood enhancement. Most of the borrowers invested the money in crops plantation (e.g., cassava) and fertilisers for rice cultivation and farming. However, the

poor members of CF and CFi appeared not to benefit from these schemes. These schemes should be measured or reported under Outcome 2 given its major links to livelihoods.

### 6.1.1.3 Facilitating Factors.

The MTR found:

- A necessary impetus is given by PaFF in the form of a grant, therefore entailing the opening of a bank account by the CF/CFi. This forces committee members to exercise their financial skills, which strengthens the CBNRM group as an institution and contributes to building its management capacity. This is still the case.
- The prospects of financial sustainability are promising for CFis: the EU-funded intervention aims at the adoption of national mechanisms and guidelines on financial support to CFis.

Fieldwork and interviews have suggested that:

- 4) Rights and management plan achievements were driven by the good collaboration from the FiA and FA at the provincial and national levels. Not only FA and FiA *per se*, PaFF provincial officers have claimed that the consortium partners have established smooth relationships with FiA and FA. This relationship has accelerated the process of legalising CFi and CF, especially the ability to develop and implement 56 CFMPs (of 65 CFMPs planned by 2021) and 54 CFiMPs (of 70 CFiMPs planned by 2021)
- 5) Even the targets have not been met (due to the covid-19 pandemic), CF and CFi credits, and mini-trust-fund, have provided incentives to the CF and CFi management committee to commit working with consortium partners and FA and FiA.
- 6) Digital communication: CFi and CF network have now subscribed to Telegram for exchange ideas and documents, and these have eased the process of legalising and strengthen capacity of CFi and CF committee to obtain the agreement and to develop the management plans.
- 7) Women behind the credit schemes. One of the good lessons learnt from the field is that women are empowered as they are bookkeepers and those who have conducted due diligence on the borrowers in their communities. Group discussion among women members of the CF and credit schemes in Kampong Thom, for example, has confirmed their role and decision-making in disbursing loan. This finding corroborates with the survey on CFi and CF credits commissioned by RECOFTC in 2020.
- 8) 55 CFs have management plans for climate change and DRR adaptation and mitigation aspects. For Cfi this is 35. This is excellent.
- 9) High efficiency has acted as a facilitating factor. The budget for community natural resources management plans was \$171,932 based on the analysis in the spreadsheet model below. There should be 64 plans approved by the end of phase 2 giving a cost of \$1975 per plan which is good at this stage in the development of the approach. If the area of protected land is 46000 ha, then this works out at \$14 per hectare which is excellent.

Code	Item	Budget \$	Proportion allocated	Total
1.1	Output 1.1 - Capacity Development	227969	0.1	22797
1.2	Output 1.2 - Tenure Formalisation	147080	0.1	14708
1.3	Output 1.3 - Management plans	171932	1	171932
1.4	Output 1.4 - Management plans implementation	748649	0	0
1.5	Staff Cost	1247469	0.25	311867
1.6	Technical Assistance	26824	0.25	6706
	Sub-total	2569922		0
	Sub-total Management & Operations	1264067	0.1	126406
	Total management plan budget			654417
	number of management plans			64
	Estimated cost per management plan			1975
	Number of hectares protected			46000
	Estimated cost per management plan per hectare			14

- 10) A community forest management plan (CFMP) was taken as a sample of the key outputs of the programme. The quality of the sample CFMP was excellent in terms of the number of aspects covered.

11) RECOFTC has learned some excellent lessons as evidenced by the following valuable suggestions for improvements in Phase 3.

- *Capacity of CF management committee as CF/CFi institution are capable to support their members and engage with key stakeholders, promoting climate resilient natural resource management. In CF/CFi management there are 3 key stakeholders involved which including local authorities, forestry administration/provincial department of agriculture forestry and fisheries (PDAF). While local authorities and FA are strong institutions functioning through national budget, the CF institution functions as voluntary base and fully rely on support from projects which have limited activities, budget, and timeframe. Strengthening and enabling CF/CFi institutions to engage with local authorities and FAs are crucial important and specially to establish reliable financial sources for CF institution to function their basic roles when there is no funding from outsiders.*
- *Existing CF/CFi self-financing (CF credit & mini-trust fund) are strengthened through multi sources of fund contribution such as CF/CFi collect user fee, timber harvesting, NTFP collection, ecotourism etc.*
- *CF forest areas are stronger secure beyond CF agreement (CF land title) and forest quality improved through restoration, enrichment plantation and silviculture treatment.*
- *Number of women take active in management position, specifically their role in CF credit management, mini trust fund.*
- *Key stakeholders effectively involve in CF management such as resolving conflict, participatory monitoring, providing service and funding, and enabling policy to support CF/CFi sustainable financing.*

#### 6.1.1.4 Constraining Factors (negative aspects observed from the MTR field work and document analysis)

The following MTR findings still appear to be the case:

- CBNRM groups systematically complain about the lack of funds for patrolling: members very rarely contribute their fee, contributions from CBEs have started but are insufficient, none of the communes visited by the MTR ever dedicated any fund to NRM, and provincial funds are also insufficient. In addition, patrolling has **significant risk in some areas due to the common use of firearms**.
- The key issue behind financial sustainability stems from the fact that CFs and CFis are not allowed to exploit and generate a revenue from the resources they manage, even sustainably. This issue underpins the very rationale of PaFF II since all strategies implemented under PaFF II have the explicit objective of increasing funds for NRM.
- No clear indicator to measure financial sustainability. This is also the case for financial assets also. Both are design issues.
- However, the development context is far less dynamic for CFs. Their financial sustainability is a distant prospect, which partly depends on the implementation of the national Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD +) strategy 2017-2026, yet to be funded.
- Hence the risk that technical and management capacities of CFs will quickly erode when activities at CBNRM level stop, especially when they are at a key stage in their formalization.

In terms of missed opportunities with CFMP. Document analysis shows (a) a lack of information on what harvest levels would be sustainable (sustained yield), (b) the costs of implementing the management plan would be prohibitive for the communities in question without credit and (c) the lack of appreciation as what a management plan could look at if less than \$100 was available.

Findings from the field include:

- 12) Many CFi and CF are encountering ownership issues. Outcome 1 focuses on secure rights which defined by the ability to obtain contractual agreements/permits from FiA and FA (under MAFF) to extract resources rather than owning the latter. As such, it appears that CFi and CF's rights is periodically defined, and without the support of NGOs partners, CFi and CF will not be able to conserve the resources for their benefits. Likewise, FiA and FA will not able monitor (as they appear not to own CF and CFi) the resources.
- 13) While the legalisation process has appeared to exceed the expectation and target, the extent to which this process reduces illegal logging and deforestation for farmland and plantation, and illegal fishing is being questioned. Not many have confirmed that illegal activities are reduced as illegal logging and land clearing, and illegal fish are still happening.

- 14) COVID-19 pandemic has constrained the ability of PAFF consortium members to achieve their targets. Project officers have been restricted from visiting the field to carry out their activities, and the villagers have not welcomed the visitors.
- 15) In CF and CFi credits, not many poor members of the communities were partaking in borrowing the money for their livelihood enhancement. The amount of CF and CFi credits remain small and could be lent mostly to the committee of CFs and CFi. Out fieldwork confirmed a survey on CFi, and CF credit schemes commissioned by RECFOTC in 2020 that a few poor households were engaged or lent the money from the credit schemes. For CF credits, there were about 13% poor people (poor 1 and 2) were lent money<sup>12</sup>.

Effectiveness is **unsatisfactory** in that.

The production of natural resources management plans is a key part of the project approach and strategy. It is hoped that these will empower rural households to claim and secure their access to natural resources, as well as strengthen sustainable NRM and thus improve their income and livelihood resilience.

At present the plans are too expensive, not profitable for anyone, and too complicated for target communities to use. In addition, they do not capture the voice and plans of the people adequately, or the opportunities now offered by the internet for linking with powerful advisors and allies, monitoring the natural resources (webcams), and generating funds by asking for donations and selling community produced commodities and service.

The income from the livelihood assistance is not enough to help people protect the resource and carry out many resource management aspirations. There is a need for a change in strategic focus towards credit and better synergy with government. The level of evaluation and learning within the partnership is not adequate for a programme of this size and nature.

Sustainability issues include:

- 16) While PaFF consortium members have striven to formalise the Cfis and CFs (which is the core concept of securing rights to natural resources and tenure), most of CFs and CFi that our team have encountered and interviewed indicate that without the support of NGOs, CFs and CFi would not be able to survive. NGO consortium members of PAFF have provided a significant amount of financial support for CFi and CF committees to patrol the forestland and fishing activities.
- 17) Interviews with FA and FiA have corroborated the findings with MTR, indicating that they have not enough human resources/ manpower to assist Cfi and CF, especially joining patrolling and intervening illegal forestland encroachment, and illegal fishing reported by the communities. FiA in Kratie confirmed that there are many CFi established and left by NGOs for FiA to monitor. FiA complained that they did not know all information about this CFi. For example, out of the total CFi (66) in the province, there are only 45 CFi are officially recognised by MAFF. For all CF in Kratie and Steung Treng, doubt remains as to how these CFi are to be monitored by FA after PAFF completion.
- 18) The sustainability of CFs is the same CFi, after the completion of PAFF. Many CF committees that we met confirmed that they will be facing difficulties (in terms of financial support to patrol illegal forestland encroachment). Like FiA, FA confirmed that they have an extremely limited manpower and financial resource to support CFs without NGOs support.
- 19) As FiA and FA have confirmed that they have limited resources (financial and manpower), they would not be able to handle all CFi and CFs (which were supported mostly by NGO partners) without NGOs and development partner supports. CFi and CF committees have also confirmed this concern. Measuring the achievements based on the number of CFs and CFi, and areas covered by these communities is rather quantitative and to simplistic. This has raised a critical concern not only about the governance of the natural resources, but also the ownership and sustainability of CFi and CF, even their credit schemes, after PaFF.
- 20) The facilitation of networks by the programme could be good in terms of sustainable influence and all aspects of relevant policy reform especially if it leads to federations of (1) community forestry and fishery groups.

---

<sup>12</sup> *Assessment of the impacts of community forestry credit scheme to the forest resource management and individual households, 2020, Edward V. Maningo.*

### 6.1.1.5 Governance, gender and DRR/CCA mainstreaming

The MTR found the programme mechanism is especially attractive to women and is a positive factor of gender balance, with a high proportion of active women members. This is still the case.

21) COVID is now an important DRR issue. Increasing population pressure due to natural growth and immigration: while CFI, and CF have tirelessly maintained the forestland and fishery resources, these resources are being threatened by rapid influx of immigrants from other provinces linked to the COVID disaster. For example, the population increased from around 300 hhs in 2018 to 1000hhs in 2020 in Sam Ang commune of Talaborivate district of Steung Treng province. While the influx of immigrants in Sam Ang is overwhelmed, the trend of immigrants in the target areas, especially Steung Treng and Kratie, is similar. In Stung Treng, the population increase from 17,022 persons in 2008 to 159,565 persons (34,627hhs) in 2019 census (increasing about 90% per year)<sup>13</sup>. Due to the COVID-19, many workers, and overseas migrants (Thailand) have returned to their hometown, as observed in Kampong Thom, have duly put pressure on their families and natural resources.

### 6.1.2 Outcome 2 Income

By using the 4-year total budget to June 2021, this component represents 17%

#### 6.1.2.1 Introduction —Outcome 2 indicators

By design, Outcome 2 (OC2) aims at increasing the income of the "Households in target communities through sustainable community-based forest and fisheries related enterprises and strategies". *This outcome is presumably developed to support outcome 1, establishing and strengthening community-based enterprise (CBEs) that are attracted to the CFI and CFs of outcome 1. NTFP-EP support CBEs (honey, traing (talipot palm tree) processing, river fish processing) and Community Based-Ecotourism (CBETs) in in Preah Vihea, Kratie, and Steung Treng provinces, whereas WWF supported rattan CBEs and small-scale alternative livelihoods activities (chicken, fish, cow raising) in Kratie. The benefit from CBEs and CBETs operation are set to contribute to CFI and CF patrolling activities.*

#### 6.1.2.1 Achievement of outcome

The revised logical framework of 13/7/20 has 4 indicators for this (see the achievement of each indicator in Annex 2). Best practice in the use of logical framework would state that only one quantitative indicator of attainment is sufficient, possibly augmented with an indicator of quality. The most obvious quantitative indicator would be the Increase, measured as a percentage, in annual gross (profit) HH income of selected households (not the larger community) participating in CBEs and individual enterprises.

22) As of Dec 2020, against the plan of 27 CBEs (23 of NTFP-EP, and 4 of WWF), 25 CBEs (05 CBETs, 10 Honey, 05 Training, 2 fish processing, 01 Fish sauce and 02 Rattan) operated and were reported to have contributed to CFI and CF patrolling activities. While the number of CBE operation is lower than expected, the number of households involved in the process exceeded plan: 633 hhs against the plan of 580 hhs. Likewise, the people benefit from the operation of these CBEs were reported to 2,858 people (Dec 2020) against the plan of 1,515 people (by 2021). However, it is hard to trace and quantify how the extent to which the activities under outcome 2 contribute to income improvement and poverty reduction, except those who are directly and actively participated in the CBEs, CBETs, CFI and CF. Our fieldwork found that members of the mentioned groups are the main beneficiaries, not the poor community members. It is common that in many situations, the poor prefer wage labour so agricultural improvements rather than NTFPs and other enterprises may be of greater interest and relevance to them. Some of the poorest members of the communities are landless, no farmland or paddy field to cultivate. As income from animal husbandry is ranked the second source of income, the poor maybe engaged through cow or cattle raising where the CF's forestland is their grazing areas.

The table below shows the collated data for Increase, measured as a percentage, in annual HH income of selected households participating in CBEs and individual enterprises.

<sup>13</sup> <https://nis.gov.kh/index.php/km/15-gpc/79-press-release-of-the-2019-cambodia-general-population-census>

Indicator	Baseline, June 2017	Target by June 2021	Achievement as of Dec 2019	Achievement by 2020
Increase, measured as a percentage, in annual HH income of selected households participating in CBEs and individual enterprises	US\$ 36 per year for CBE members	US\$ 40 (10%)	Honey: US\$163, Traing/palm tree, Chopstick: US\$ 51, CBET: US\$ 228, Fish sauce: was US\$ 48 (average annual HH income of CBE members)	Annual HH income is stable

The MTR confirms that of all NTFP-based CBEs, honey CBEs have best performances, as far as profit is concerned (group performance) and in terms of contribution to livelihoods (HH income).

Out of 23 CBEs, only 8 contributed to NRM in 2018, for an average annual amount of USD 77. Honey is the biggest contributor (60% of all contributions in 2018), followed by ecotourism (34%).

Existing logframe indicators fail to establish a tangible link between CBEs and NRM.

23) Based on field interviews with many committees of CFi and CF, most members of them are not poor households by the government definition in that they earn less than US\$1 per day. Most of CFi and CF committees' livelihoods are above the poverty line and thus the project contributed to improve income of the active committees of CFi and CF. Only a few percentages can be claimed that poor households/persons have benefited from CFi and CF activities; this includes the benefit from being paid by NGOs and CFi and CF committees for their participation in patrolling activities, between US\$2 to US\$3.5 per day as in Preah Vihear (Chombok Hors CF where CF committee claimed that the unemployed poor families were paid). Another condition that the poor households received least benefit from the project was that they are mobile, landless, elders and lack of capital/ asset. The latter is an essential condition set to receiving loan from CFi and CF credit committees.

24) As with the MTR, the income uplift picture is **unsatisfactory**. Fish sauce process CBE in Koh Samseb failed due to the decline of fish (raw materials) and some species are no longer available according to NTFP-EP. Based on an end line survey of a project being funded by other donors of WWF in 2020 indicated the project beneficiaries' monthly household income increased from US\$145.4 (from the baseline in Jan 2017) to US\$191.7 (at the end line survey: Sept 2020). Having compared the monthly and annual incomes of the two groups, the survey found that that there was not significant difference between the income of the beneficiaries (all of them are members and committee members of CFs and CFis) (US\$2303 per year), and non-beneficiaries (US\$2304 per year). A main reason behind this similarity is that the livelihood enhancement project has not addressed the top priority livelihoods and income generation activities of the beneficiaries: i) farming and rice cultivation (cash crops and rice for all provinces); (ii) animal raising (cattle and buffalo) (all provinces); and (ii) fish raising (Kratie and Steung Treng) based on our focus group discussions and interview. The Endline survey also confirmed this. There are many projects funded through the government or by other donors, but the collaboration between these projects and PaFF was not well partnered to harness livelihood vis-à-vis conservation.

### 6.1.2.2 Facilitating Factors

25) The achievement in terms of the increase in the income, though not poverty reduction, of the active CFi and CF management committee is facilitated by several key factors: (1) Geographical potential: While many CFi and CF have established but not all of these can be developed into CBE and CBET. The case of Koh Sam Seb in O Krieng has combined CF and CFi together, and the resource is potential for eco-tourism (island and sand beach) where is the rest of CFi and CF have been relying on CF and CFi credit and mini-trust-fund. (2) Social media: CBET and honey CBE success have been induced by social media, such as Facebook, a platform of info dissemination for attracting visitors. It is also a platform for honey selling to those from outside the communities. CBET of Koh Samseb has attracted up to 10,000 likes for instance. Honey collection CBE of Prasat Tek Kmao CF in Kampon Cham commune, Kratie province, could sell their products by posting on the committees' personal Facebook accounts, for instance. and (3) CF and CFi credit schemes have contributed to income generation of the active CF and CFi management committees. Results from group discussions and individual interviews confirmed that the borrowers are mostly the active CF and CFi management committee. A case of CFi Sre Krasang credit in Stueng Treng confirmed that the same credit and CFi leader was lent the money to raise pigs for piglet, and had piglets sold with annual income from such activity about \$500 per year.

26) For positive facilitation from direct investment: the intervention of PAFF has directly improved the livelihoods of the CF and CFI committee, and that have motivated the committee to commit to working for CFI and CF conservation activities.

### 6.1.2.3 Constraining Factors

27) While the evaluation team acknowledges how CBEs and CBETs contributed to their committee income generation, and to CFI and CF (patrolling), though not much, the impact of this endeavour had **little contribution to poverty reduction**. This is because of

- *Exclusion* within inclusive and participatory approaches. The second outcome and its outputs are supported to be participate integrated development, but, by design, it is a way to marginalize the poor members of CFI and CFs. WWF livelihoods support in Koh Samseb, O' Krieng commune, of Sambor district, presented this finding. Those who involved in the livelihood scheme: chicken raising and fish raising failed. Fish raising was abandoned. Chicken raising was modified from raising for egg to just raising for meat. However, not many beneficiary families are active under this scheme following the first trial of the project. Moreover, the chicken raising was only offered to o those who could afford to cage the birds and had the initial capital.
- Pandemic: the global pandemic has not only worsened the livelihoods of the natural resource dependent communities but also increased pressure on natural resources. Most of the natural resource dependents' (household members of CFI and CF) children have returned (from the urban areas and abroad) to their communities; it increased their families' consumption burden. There are cases like in O' Krieng commune where the poor families (poor 1 and 2) increased due to the pandemic. The poverty rate based on ID poor increased from 627 persons in 2018 to 847 persons in 2020.
- Alternative livelihood issues: While the team acknowledged the CBE and CBET have contributed to income generation of CFI and CF committee, the extensive investment in these may create pressure on natural resources even sustainable extraction and exploitation are introduced. The team found that most of the CF and CFI's main sources of income are from (in order): (i) farming and rice cultivation; (ii) cattle raising; and (iii) fishing (for CFI). The livelihood intervention, mostly by counterpart donors, such as chicken raising (failed for the case of eggs), fish raising (totally failed) as in the case of Koh Samseb CFI and CF, are just supplement activities, and that cannot reduce (if not stop) the riparian communities from overfishing and exploiting land for farming and rice cultivation.

### 6.1.2.4 Effectiveness

The income from the livelihood assistance is not enough to help people protect the resource and carry out many resource management aspirations. There is a need for a change in strategic focus towards credit and better synergy with government. The level of evaluation and learning within the partnership is not adequate for a programme of this size and nature.

### 6.1.2.5 Efficiency

Income uplift per unit project expenditure is **unsatisfactory** as shown by the table overleaf:

Enterprise	2017 baseline (income from the enterprise only)	Dec- 19	increment over the year	no of household		mean per year
honey	36	163	127	10	1270	
traing chopstick	36	51	15	5	75	
cbet	36	228	192	2	384	
fish sauce	36	48	12	1	12	
ecotourism						
total				18	1741	97
total household December 2019	633					
total \$impact	61225					

SDC expenditure of component December 2019	387218					
SDC cost per dollar uplift sdc	6					
Total PAFF expenditure of component december 2019	863681					
SDC cost per dollar uplift sdc	14					

### 6.1.2.6 Gender, environment and DRR/CCA mainstreaming

The MTR found

- As for ecotourism CBEs (CBETs), the MFF is a powerful attraction and the development context is favourable. Members of CF, CFis and CPAs are well positioned to engage in ecotourism and can fix a fair price for core services (e.g. homestay, boat tour, food service). Therefore, core ecotourism services are profitable, with boat owners drawing the highest income, as estimated by the MTR.
  - Besides, ecotourism is an opportunity for women to earn income (homestay, food service).
  - As a result, CBE ownership was found rather good for two CBETs out of three, which bodes well for their sustainability.
  - On the negative side, management, and marketing capacities of CBETs are still limited, plastic pollution is mostly ignored. Here is an issue between NTFP-EP and the Department of Tourism in Stung Treng, which wants more control over PaFF activities. This is now being resolved through quarterly meetings and sharing of reports.
- 28) Gender findings in relation to outcome 2 were positive in terms of income for women and men also appeared to have a greater voice. Women are motivated to participated in community leadership and income generation activities, but the number of women participations does not prove that they are empowered. Little evidence of has shown how women are empowered. PaFF 2019 annual report claimed at least 20% of CBE management committee are women, and about 30% of CBE direct beneficiaries were female-head households.
- 29) Women are observed to have benefited significantly from the Traing (Talipot palm) processing, and the income generation from these activities have empowered their bargaining power vis-à-vis men and their communities. Even though women are reported not to have directly partaking in honey collection (as they are not climb tree), they have roles in the enterprise management. In addition to attending to household chores, alternative livelihood activities, such as chicken raising, have created positive impacts on women voices. As to when women (wives) could generate income from their home-based-activities, men (husbands), unlike before, start to respect and impress women. While women's participation in the foregoing activities are featured in the PaFF newsletters, there is little evidence on or documentation of the impact of this PaFF on women-men relations.
- 30) In terms of climate change and DRR, any increase in income is useful so that adaptation can be addressed in the case of climate change and first aid provision can be made in respect to disasters.

### 6.1.3 Outcome 3 Policy

By using the 4-year total budget to June 2021, this component represents 20%

#### 6.1.3.1 Introduction —Outcome 3 indicators

Implemented by the four partners in the four provinces, this outcome aims at ensuring that national and local policy conditions support the secure community rights over natural resources and the development of sustainable community-based enterprise. The ultimate objective is to improve the legal and regulatory framework and building the capacity of concerned stakeholders to support the CFi, CF, CPA, CBE and CBET.

#### 6.1.3.2 Achievement of outcome

The MTR found

- FA Cantonment directors and chiefs of provincial CF networks are unanimous on the excellent value (not captured by existing indicators) of regular coordination owing to PCFPCCs.
- The draft Sub-Decree on fisheries (under review) incorporates a chapter on CFi networks. This positive outcome can be put to the credit PaFF II.

- WWF's efforts to establish a trans-provincial landscape committee forum have not been successful.
- inputs from development partners, including PaFF partners, have resulted in a longer CFI agreement (from 3 to 10 years) in the draft sub-decree approved by the FiA and now under review at higher level.
- The simplification of CF guidelines, which PaFF partners have been advocating for many years on behalf of CFs, has now started. As far ENRC is concerned, consultations have been held since 2016 and as many as 11 versions were drafted, incorporating inputs from many development partners, including PaFF partners, under the coordination of NGO Forum. Consultations are now over but approval of ENRC is still pending.

The revised logical framework of 13/7/20 has 13 indicators for this. Compared with the plan (by June 2021), the achievement under this outcome and its output are available in the Annex 10. The most important achievements of outcome 3 are: CFI and CF networks, Contribution to CFI sub-decree, fishery laws, and other decisions.

- 30) Aspects of policy look, and networking look positive but clear evidence of attribution is missing in many cases. Contextualizing CF management under Cambodia's forestry law (2002): Experiences, Implications, and Suggested Revisions is excellent
- 31) CFI and CF provincial networks: CFI, CF, FiA and FA congratulated the CF and CFI network initiative. The inclusion of CFI network chapter in the draft CFI sub-decree (which is now on hold) is one of the significant changes of policy advocacy in addition to the amending the contractual agreement of CFI with FiA, from 3 years to 10 years. Likewise, CF network is also praised by the FA cantonment for it is helpful for them to communicate with many other CFs in each province.
- 32) *In July 2019, the EDC Director General announced that the proposed Sambor and Stung Treng dams would not be part of the energy mix going forward. An attempt to establish the inter-provincial commission was not a success and therefore the PaFF team decided to drop this initiative due to the similar platform was established by the government in 2019.*
- 33) *Simplification of the process of CFMP development is still in process of discussion. As part of the National REDD+ strategy implementation, the Safeguard Information System (SIS), the Summary of Information (SOI) concepts, and the role of non-state-actor contributing to implementing the SIS were introduced to stakeholders.*
- 34) One of the constraints of this outcome asymmetric power relation among key stakeholders. The illegal cases (from CFI and CF patrolling activities) are not systematically addressed by FiA and FA. The cases to be addressed by FiA and FA were not traceable. This is one of the concerns raised by CF and CFI, and even FiA and FA *per se*, that the latter were not able to assist CF and CFI to handle the cases. Some CF in Kampong Thom, for instance, complained that they kept reporting the cases of land encroachment to FA but they penetrators were released by FA, or if the case transfer to the court, the court release them. FA claimed that it is court decision, not related to FA and it is out of FA authority. In this case, the CF has confirmed that they could not do anything to deal with such situation. This is like the CFI who complained that they have tried their best to protect the resources, but the support from FiA was limited.

#### **6.1.3.3. Facilitating Factors**

- 35) Partnership between the NGO forum and the PAFF ExCom is becoming a more important actor and is a facilitating factor for PAFF for lobbying and influencing but the problems of attribution or contribution remain: Many other actors have been working on the issue to enable policy change, including sub-decree on fishery development, including EU, WB, and IFAD. However, the NGO Forum, which was once considered as a fifth partner of PaFF (by MTR), remains a key actor that mobilise forces and supports dialogue with the FiA and FA for sub-decree and polity changes. SRJS of IUCN was one of the contribution projects that has complemented PaFF' s ability to partake in policy dialogue.

#### **6.1.3.4 Constraining Factors**

- 36) Spending too much time at the national level has undermined the immediate need at the local level. When asked about the policy impact, outcome 3 of the PAFF, many provincial staff of PAFF (consortium members) confirm that it is the role of PAFF's Excom at the capital level. CFI and CF networks were setup, but their roles were more about sharing information rather than to present the voice of the weak CFis and CFs. While are cases, including in Kampong Thom, where CF networks

were successfully able to petition with court to support a CF leader who was being accused of illegal confiscating the perpetrator's land clearing tools. This kind of activity should be promoted. These networks should be highlighted under the policy influence component (outcome 3), to shape local administration (FiA, FA, policemen, district, commune, provincial hall) pertaining to repetitive forest land encroachment and clearing, and illegal fishing. CFs and CFis confirmed that they have protected their resources, but the penetrators are often released by FA, FiA, or provincial court (if the penetrators were sent to courts by FiA and FA). CF and CFi networks need to be more vocal and advocate rather than their status.

- 37) There are also constraining factors in the world of Community forestry. When asked about the top 5 most limiting aspects of policy and policy linked instruments or procedures, the CF agreements as of today, RECOFTC gave the response?
- *The agreement is aligned with forestry law 2002 and sub-decree of CF 2003 which the Forestry Administration Cantonment to sign agreement with CF Management Committee. It is vertical management which directly from ministry of agriculture forest and fisheries (MAFF). But in 2018 government reformed delegated management role and service to sub-national level, some local authorities use this opportunity to interfere the CF management which does not respect to forestry law and sub-decree on CF.*
  - *The dominance issue in CF management is land encroachment when the case cannot resolve thought stakeholder coordination it need to bring the court, in which the CF agreement is less value compare to land title, there are few cases that individual land title fall within the CF areas.*
  - *When prime minister announcement to resolve land conflict in protected areas, some local authorities apply the announcement in CF areas which do not respect the CF agreement but refer to land law and announcement of prime minister but if the CF had certificate of land title it will be safe from the issue.*
  - *It is required to proceed the CF management plan after signed agreement but now most CF signed agreement have no management plan.*
  - *If the government strictly monitor and enforce the conditions in agreement, all CFs will have problem as community cannot fulfil the task in the agreement.*

#### **6.1.3.5 Gender and DRR/CCA mainstreaming**

- 38) Women participation in conservation is limited. But there are cases in which women are empowered to be the provincial leader of CFi as in Kratie. The young lady involved in Koh Samseeb CFi was elected as the leader of the provincial CFi network after working in the sector for 17 years old, and now 28 years old. Apart from this success story, there are women who are elected as CF and CFi credit, and mini-trust-fund treasurers, and many women are of CF credit are known to have made decision in lending for they know well who should be lent.
- 39) Environmental impacts, especially the quality of the forestland and wildlife, and fish population at CF and CF, respectively, are not reported effectively by the programme.

#### **6.2.1 Institutional and organizational set up of PaFF including staffing.**

Program management and implementation is allocated 21% of the budget.

The institutional and organisational set up is outlined in Annex 8.

##### **6.2.1.1 Facilitating factors**

The MTR stated that.

It is also remarkable that WWF, with extremely limited management staff and constraints attached to the institutional set up of PaFF, can manage such a complex programme and coordinate such many diverse activities, while maintaining satisfactory efficiency.

##### **6.2.1.2 Constraining factors**

The MTR found that.

- Though flexibility is built in the design, it cannot be fully expressed because of budgetary constraints and because planning activities in the context of the programmatic approach is a complicated, time-consuming task,

- Management mechanisms tend to slow down strategic decision-making processes. Despite a well-established coordination routine between partners and with SDC, much time is spent in building consensus among the four partners. This is exacerbated by the programmatic approach, which entails design and budgetary adjustments and further complicated by the fact that SDC funding and direct contributions are tightly knitted together. As a result, the position of Programme Manager (a WWF staff) is often reduced to a coordinating role.

The PFE findings include.

30) Direction and management appear to be constrained by the following factors:

- Design: the logical framework is for the programme. It contains nothing about performance progress of the partnership itself. What is its purpose and where does it want to get to? Is it to get money from donors? Is it to become a permanent force for galvanising the federation of community natural resources management groups? Is it a think tank? Who are the potential customers for the PAFF, and should it become a legal entity such as a social enterprise? There is no future vision, so direction is severely limited.
- Flexibility and impact appear to be limited by (1) the lack of authority and gravitas (influence) inherent in the job description of the Project Manager PM and there is no full time Project Director.
- Impact and relevance are limited by the lack of an advisory committee or helpful expert list on relevant science research and innovation.
- The Committee systems and possibly the lack of authority and gravitas of the PM positions appears to have led to limited effective engagement with PDAFF. As FiA and FA are now merged under PDAFF, the former should exploit the advantage from being part of the latter. Even FiA and FA's plans are integrated in the PDAFF's Agricultural Strategic Development Plan (ASDP), the total budget remain the same, and FiA and FA roles (and budget allocation) remain focusing on the conservation. FiA and FA themselves acknowledged that they do not have livelihood capacity. Interviews with PDAFF confirmed that they have an office of community development who oversees agricultural cooperation and community credit. This office should be in the position to support and follow up CFi and CF credits, after PaFF.
- Further to what the MTR suggested, the evaluation team also found that the connection and coordination between SDC-funded-CFis and CFs, and livelihood activities are not well elaborated at the ground level. In Kampong Thom, and like other provinces, for example, where CFs are funded by ForumSyd as a contribution partner of SDC's PAFF, PAFF and SDC's names are not mentioned to these CFs. This has not only caused visibility, but it also presented how the two donors are working on similar thing but separately. In Kratie for example, the livelihood component which was funded by other donors was not presented as part of PAFF. Based on the database of matching fund (contributing fund of PaFF), 64% of these matching funds were classified as link to outcome 1 (rights and tenure, or conservation), and 18% link to outcome 2, and 18% for outcome 3.
- The project has three interlinked outcomes but the partnership of PAFF consortium has been overdependent on FiA and FA whose expertise and authority are focussed on conservation. There is a lack of smooth partnership with PDAFF who has extensive skills in uplifting the livelihoods of the rural communities, from the perspectives of rice cultivation and cattle raising, and CFi and CF credit management. There are on-going large-scale projects such as ASPIRE, World Bank's IWRM, and CHAIN that have funded vegetable growing, chicken raising and related infrastructure, but the consortium partners appear not to have collaborated and exploit these within their contribution fund approach.
- The main expenditure of the project is in the forestry sector and the FE have concluded that land agreements will be even more if a focus in future. A change in lead partner would be logical at this stage. This has nothing to do with the past performance of WWF who have done an excellent job so far as for the partnership.

## **6.2.2 Monitoring, evaluation, learning and reporting.**

### **6.2.2.1 Monitoring and evaluation**

The MTR found

Without a monitoring and evaluation officer, the program manager oversees consolidating the complex data, which is more quantitative using Microsoft Excel rather than a systematic information system management. As such, it is a recording activity other than tracing the impacts, especially how PaFF contribute to poverty reduction, and its impacts on natural resource management.

- 31) The PFE findings on monitoring and evaluation include.
- Monitoring, of PAFF activities, number of entities and financial expenditure is excellent, and WWF is to be commended for its role in this.
  - The M+E systems is not providing an adequate decision support system linked to the quality assessment of outcomes<sup>14</sup> (behavioural change) and outputs (physical things) is not sensitive to customer satisfaction<sup>15</sup> market research on new opportunities, and does not fully support adaptive management linked to the regular testing of critical and operationally useful assumptions.
  - The M+E system is not capturing some of the key impacts observed in the field that are of critical importance to “resilience”. These can be expressed in terms of the 5 capitals of sustainable rural livelihoods: natural capital (population or biomass of a suitable proxy<sup>16</sup>), economic capital (physical and financial assets not income), human capital (health e.g., mortality and morbidity and education status) and social capital (number of useful friends<sup>17</sup>).
  - The M+E system is not capturing attributable effects<sup>18</sup> and evidence linked to advocacy<sup>19</sup>.

## 7 Lessons learnt and case studies from the field.

### 7.1 Outcome 1

- 32) Lessons learned and possible case studies in relation to outcome 1 include:
- A good lesson learnt that derives from a conversation with a commune chief of Thbong Krapeu commune, Santok district of Kampong Thom, has indicated that the CF (namely Prey Thbong Domei) (including a fish breeding pond) was officially registered during the systematic land registration in the commune in 2004. Belong to the community and the commune, this CF is now listed as the asset of the commune. The commune chief claims that this is the vital achievement and ownership certificate that could maintain the size/ boundary of the CF. This **land title is powerful** when it is used to argue or file court case complaining against land encroachers and penetrators. In addition to this success, CF has more than \$10,000 of credit lasting from the emergency good fund (capitalised from the initial fund of about \$6000 supported by the government project in response to disaster mitigation: providing fertilizer and rice seed). The commune did not use the amount to buy rice seed and fertilizers but used the amount as loans to the community members. The credit becomes a core activity of CF and has contributed hugely to community development. The credits also contribute to management and patrol of the community forest and land. This successful case has equated by three important factors: 1) the ability to register the land title of CF; 2) the engagement of commune in monitoring the CF credit scheme and NGOs, and 3); financial support from development partners. The commune chief confirmed that the CF has never been cut from the NGOs and government support: GIZ/GTZ, FA, FiA, PDOE, Sre Khmer, Oxfam, World Food Program, Codex, UNDP, Recoftc. Now and CODEX (of UNDP), RECOFT and FA. While FA remains an important actor, the commune chief also claims that their service remains limited. CF land title is the key legal tool for the commune and CF to argue against the illegal encroachment.

### 7.2 Outcome 2

- 33) Lessons learned and possible case studies in relation to outcome 2 include:
- Livelihood support to support the conservation activities, especially non- NTFP related investment, such as chicken and fish raisings are not feasible. **Fish raising has been a failure since the riparian communities do not like consuming raising fish (catfish)** as they use to natural grown fish from the Mekong. In addition to extensive investment, e.g., building tents, earth, or concrete pond,

<sup>14</sup> Outcomes could be stated in terms of desired behavioural change (e.g., X% of specified group Y adopt practice by a specified date) and have only one quantitative indicator and one indicator of quality (using a scorecard or checklist approach).

<sup>15</sup> Quality can be assessed by the service receiver (government or recipient) at low cost and is more objective and relevant than measurement by the service provider. Customer feedback is a most important pre-requisite of learning.

<sup>16</sup> fundamental to any project dealing with protected areas and species

<sup>17</sup> not currently measured by the partnership

<sup>18</sup> This is where key actors are happy to acknowledge in writing that PAFF made a key or vital contribution

<sup>19</sup> Minute taking with clear agreed action points with dates and clear statements about how delivery can be independently verified

changing water, and feeds, fish raising cannot be sold locally (lack of market as people prefer natural grown fish).

- Social media has been an exemplar of how PaFF created impact beyond the target area, and community. CBET in **Koh Samseb's Facebook communication and dissemination should be drawn as an island of excellence providing lessons learned for the rest of the CBET, CFI and CF communities**. With more than 10k likes on Facebook, Koh Samseb has spread the information about the communities that would lead to awareness raising beyond the three communities in the area.
- Young CF and CFI committees' commitment and capacity: **There are emerging young CFI and CFI committee who have committed to protecting as well as improving their communities' livelihoods**. A young CF leader from CFI Or Chalong (Or Romeas commune, Seam Bok district, Steung Treng province), for instance, have developed CBET (Chour Veng tourism) with minimal support from CEPA's credit and mini-trust fund. The leader has withdrawn the interest payment from LOLC bank to invest in CF credit to accumulate capital (which will also share to CF patrolling) rather than spending the interest payment in patrolling directly.
- Additional burden. A community leader (CFI, CF and CPA) has multiple roles, and thus it creates a burden on the leader and community in general. A leader of CFI in Sre Krasang is also the leader of CFI credit. This is also confirmed by CFI and CF credit study commissioned by RECOFTC that the credits and even mini-trust-fund committees are selected from the existing management committee. Even the design of credits scheme is linked to CF, CFI and CPA's activities, it appears that the design has assigned additional tasks and burden on the management committee. In our focus group discussions in Steung Treng, the same committees were assigned to meet the consultant team even the topic of discussion and interview were different (Credit, CFI/CF management). **Donors, such as EU, have also complained this, that CFI and CF have multiple roles, and questions how these credits will be sustainable if CFI and CF management committee are busy and not paid for the work?**
- Contradictory approach: mini-trust-fund and credit scheme. **Mini-trust-fund has generated income for CF and CFI, but it remains minimal**. Many have claimed that the fund should be invested in CF credit since some of CF have received both. **Income from interest payment under the CF lending scheme is more than the fixed interest rate offered by the bank. 2% per month if invested in CF credit (US\$100 per month), but mini-trust-fund gets around 1% (or less) (about US\$30 per month)** from fixed term deposit from the bank. IUCN claims the mini-trust-fund concept is safer and sustainable even it has not substantially contributed to the CFI and CF management now. This means that CFI and CF credits, though they generated faster income and capital accumulation, is questionable their future endeavour. IUCN has claimed that they have seen many CFI and CF credits failed. Sre Krasang CFI has confirmed this that there such endeavour before, and the group disappeared before CEPA came in in 2019 for this CFI credit initiative.

### 7.3 Outcome 3

- 34) The power of CF and CFI network (Outcome 3) is backed up by evidence: **While many have reported that the roles of CF and CFI network are to coordinate and share information among the CF and CFI management committee. There are cases where the leaders of the network empower and advocate for the CF and CF committees when they are accused by the perpetrators**. In Kampong Thom for example, CF networks were successfully able to petition with court to support a CF leader who was accused of illegally confiscating the perpetrator's land clearing tools. This kind of activity should be promoted. These networks should be highlighted under the policy influence component (outcome 3), to shape local administration (FiA, FA, policemen, district, commune, provincial hall) pertaining to repetitive forest land encroachment and clearing, and illegal fishing. CFs and CFIs confirmed that they have protected their resources, but the penetrators are often released by FA, FiA, or provincial court (if the penetrators were sent to courts by FiA and FA). CF and CFI networks need to be more vocal and advocate rather than their status.

## 8 Conclusions and Recommendations

### 8.1 Conclusions

#### 8.1.1 Relevance and design

As above, policy relevance is high, but the relevance to the poorest in the communities is questionable.

The theory of change may be true, but it is inadequate as a theory of change as it still has a **missing middle** related to the questions of (1) what is PAFFs contribution, (2) why a partnership is better than single entities and (3) why NGOs are more suited to the task than government or community-based organisation?

There are many other deficiencies in design. The logical framework has no useful assumptions and therefore cannot be used as a tool for adaptive management. As pointed out by the MTR many of the indicators are in the wrong place in the logical framework (not SMART), some are, activities and there is repetition. Perhaps a more suitable name for the logical framework would be a muddled box lock frame. This has led to rigidity and an administrative approach. This was also pointed out by the MTR but unfortunately the situation remains at the time of the PFE.

Positive aspects of design include the wide geographical distribution of communities and the high number of citizens involved. This is **especially useful** for any rights-based approach.

PAFF produces newsletters (not featured in the logical framework) and these are **particularly good**.

Overall relevance is therefore **unsatisfactory**.

#### 8.1.1 Impact

Impact is **unsatisfactory**. However, it is probably being underestimated due to design. The indicators for resilience at the impact level are not powerful enough. These include simple and practical measures of environmental improvement. Improved health and social capital (number of friends and advisors).

#### 8.1.2 Sustainability

- 1) Target communities have probably gained new skills (not tested by the programme) and remain motivated by the opportunity to access state resources. However, this motivation continues to be eroded due to lack of adequate funds and adequate support by government. They derive their main income for agriculture. Agroforestry was not part of the design of the programme and remains a missed opportunity.
- 2) Government motivation is compromised by major reorganisation of responsibilities linked to shift of responsibility between ministries and decentralisation issues e.g., provincial officers now report to the provincial governor. It is difficult to see what incentives government officers would obtain in relation to assisting non profitable natural resources management e.g., in degraded forests or fishing areas.

#### 8.1.3 Outcome 1 Rights (satisfactory)

- 3) The extent to which the products (CF, CFi, CPA, CFi Credit, CFi Credit, CFi and CF mini-trust-funds, CBEs, CBETs) of PaFF are sustainable and owned by the communities, FiA, FA and PDAFF, and who will be monitoring and supporting these are key questions for the next phase design. These questions embrace sustainable financial mechanism of these communities, CBEs and CBETs. It is more than the "secure rights to", they need to "own" the natural resources. The ownership question is also applied to local authorities, FiA, FA, and PDAFF. For CFi and CF, the emphasis of next phase is how to ensure that the key players like FiA, FA and PDAFF own and ensure the operation of these communities after PaFF. A better and direct partnership with PDAFF need to be designed. For CBETs, a better relationship with PDoT will be required as some PDoT are still complaining about the quality of partnership.

#### 8.1.4 Outcome 2 Income (unsatisfactory)

- 4) The nature of PaFF is restricted to secure rights over natural resources which is believed to have contribute to income and livelihood enhancement. Like this evaluation, MTR also confirms that livelihood component is weak and does not link well with the poorest. There is a lack of link and balance of investment in this aspect (outcome 2). The next phase of PaFF needs to balance between outcomes (1, 2). While two partners: WWF and RECOFTC appear not to be competent in livelihood support, this support to the community members of CF and CFi can be cultivated from external or contribution projects (in addition to the direct fund of SDC to NTFP-EP).
- 5) Only a small proportion of the livelihood activities are financially sustainable so other options will need to be explored. Government budgets for forest protection and restoration are currently limited but funds

for community fisheries may be increased due to donor budget support e.g., the EU. Natural resources management plans especially forestry are not affordable by the target communities.

### 8.1.5 Outcome 3 Policy (unsatisfactory)

- 6) The key sustainability issues are the duration of any agreement on rights and usufruct for fishery and forestry. This is improving but is still not adequate. The key demand is for community ownership of state land. This is a long-term possibility but without its sustainability is compromised. The long-term stability of rights, further action on this and especially in relation to legislative and advocacy aspects.
- 7) Weaknesses in specific areas (policy support) can be overcome if they are acknowledged by partners and joint internal capacities are reviewed, coordinated and, if needed, temporarily augmented for a clear and pragmatic objective. Difficulties in supporting livelihoods through small scale farming are not easy to address but cannot be ignored. Coordination with other development partners, another problematic area, calls for strategic decisions to reallocate funds where NRM and conservation needs are the highest.

### 8.1.6 Management (highly unsatisfactory)

#### 8.1.6.1 Human resources strategy

- 8) The limitations of the current HR design are now being manifested in several ways. The job description of project manager is not optimal for a project of this size which would normally have a dedicated project director with the gravitas and influence to lead advocacy and steer a complex project. Evidence of this is linked to the weak link with PDAF, the overdependence on-line agencies concerned with conservation and a lack of success in accessing funds linked to the massive expansion in budget and sector support approaches by donors in addition the absence of a full-time post on monitoring evaluation and learning is also unsatisfactory and linked decision support systems is also satisfactory. Management is however currently highly satisfactory at the level of the administration of physical and financial variance and activities. These issues will get worse due to the forthcoming greater challenges of management of a programme in its final phase.

#### 8.1.6.2 Monitoring evaluation and learning

- 9) Although monitoring at the administrative level is highly satisfactory, the current Monitoring Evaluation and learning system is highly unsatisfactory. The systems do not provide an adequate decision support system linked to the quality assessment of all new outcomes<sup>20</sup> (behavioural change) and output quality (physical things) linked to customer satisfaction<sup>21</sup>. Adaptive management linked to the regular testing of critical and operationally useful assumptions is unsatisfactory as evidenced by the quality of lessons learned in the annual narrative reports. In addition, the M+E system is not capturing some of the key impacts observed in the field that are of critical importance to “resilience”. These can be expressed in terms of the “5 capitals”<sup>22</sup> of sustainable rural livelihoods: natural capital (population or biomass of a suitable proxy<sup>23</sup>), economic capital (physical and financial assets not income), human capital (health e.g., mortality and morbidity and education status) and social capital (number of useful friends<sup>24</sup>). The M+E system is not capturing attributable effects<sup>25</sup> and evidence linked to advocacy<sup>26</sup>.

---

<sup>20</sup> Outcomes could be stated in terms of desired behavioural change (e.g., X% of specified group Y adopt practice by a specified date) and have only one quantitative indicator and one indicator of quality (using a scorecard or checklist approach).

<sup>21</sup> Quality can be assessed by the service receiver (government or recipient) at low cost and is more objective and relevant than measurement by the service provider. Customer feedback is a most important pre-requisite of learning.

<sup>22</sup> [Microsoft Word - B7\\_1\\_pdf2.doc \(glopp.ch\)](#)

<sup>23</sup> fundamental to any project dealing with protected areas and species

<sup>24</sup> not currently measured by the partnership

<sup>25</sup> This is where key actors are happy to acknowledge in writing that PAFF made a key or vital contribution

<sup>26</sup> Minute taking with clear agreed action points with dates and clear statements about how delivery can be independently verified

## 8.1 Recommendations

Recommendations are numbered in a way that show the link with the relevant conclusions.

### 8.1.1 Design and Relevance

**Recommendation 1.1:** Produce a clear programme purpose and beneficiaries' statement so that the theory of change can be further development in phase 2 and set the basis for the design of phase 3.

### 8.1.2 Overall sustainability and impact

**Recommendation 2.0.** Locate best practice in the programme areas in terms of financially sustainable and or profitable entities e.g., CBNRM groups and actions of champions outlined in the last two newsletters, replicate them at all scales including the landscape scale.

**Recommendation 3.0** Locate best practice in the programme areas in terms of impact defined as the spread of benefits away from programme areas and themes and replicate them using an understanding of impact pathways. The movement of champions is an especially important impact pathway.

### 8.1.3 Outcome 1 rights

**Recommendation 4.1:** FE acknowledges the achievements of CFi and CF management plans as a form of tenure, but this is not a permanent one. PaFF 3 should build on this achievement and move forward to permanent "ownership" by the CF and FA/PDAFF as a long-term aim. PaFF 3 should focusing on assisting PDAFF and CF to register their forestland for official land title with Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction (MLMUPC). CF committees suggest that the official land title must indicate that the land for community forestry and communal purpose (even the representative of MAFF, DPDAFF is mentioned as the representative owner of the state private land).

**Recommendation 4.2:** CFi should focus on what they have been doing. However, as financial resource is limited for CFi to patrol the entire fishery sanctuary/ boundary, the emphasis of CFi patrolling activity should pay more emphasis on deep pools conservation and protection even patrolling the entire CFi remains an important activity.

**Recommendation 4.3:** Cultivating technology and social media to indirectly influence patrolling action. Other than the information dissemination through Telegram exchange, CFi, CF, and CFi and CF networks should show what they are doing, including reporting illegal cases and documenting evidence. There should Facebook page for each CFi and CF networks for them to circulate news and their activities which may be visible to the other communities across the border. Their experience maybe adopted by other communities (other than that of PaFF's target areas). Training on ethnics and code of conduct of using social media should be provided to the management committees when social media are to introduce.

### 8.1.4 Outcome 2 income

**Recommendation 5.1:** PaFF should focus on sustaining CFi and CF credits, and mini-trust-funds by actively engaging with PDAFF. PDAFF's office of agricultural cooperation and community development should be engaged to support PaFF's CFi and CF credit scheme. In addition to local authorities, PDAFF is competent enough to ensure transparent and sustainable CFi and CF credits, and mini-trust-fund, after PaFF.

**Recommendation 5.2:** Obtain indirect support and capital to enhance livelihoods of CF, CFi and CPA through strengthening partnership with PDAFF (ASPIRE, CHAIN, CAPFISH, IWRM) to complement and broaden the PaFF's livelihoods approaches so that sustainability is improved. Agroforestry would be a good entry point. CF and CFi, including their CBEs, can be part of PDAFF's agriculture cooperative. Integrating part of CF and CF's livelihood activities/ income generation activities with PDAFF's agriculture cooperative is the key entry point of the PaFF.

**Recommendation 5.3:** Diversifying income of CFi, CF and CPA. As we found that income from credits and mini-trust-fund interests are not sufficient for the patrolling activities, CFi and CF need to diversity their income sources. Some have done so such as those areas which are potential for CBETs and CBEs, the rest should seek partner with private sectors: agro-industry companies (which can be part of their management plan). In Preah Vihear for instance, agro-industry companies are seeking to collaborate with CF for tree plantation. This is just an example.

**Recommendation 5.4:** for CFi, collective fishing for commercial purpose should be examined and explored. This would be an additional but vital source of income for the community to remain active and sustainable as support from FiA is limited.

**Recommendation 5.5:** Building on how CBEs, and CBETs, more should be investing in not only building visibility and impacts but also the markets for all community products that locals or foreigners may be interested in. CBETs have been on social media that proliferate the images of PaFF and communities. This social media platform could be a fund-raising platform as they reached out to visitors and stakeholders.

**Recommendation 5.6:** reaching the poor members of CF and CFi. Credit schemes have benefited several CFi and CF committee members, but more investment/ lending is needed for the poor members of CFi and CF. A condition should be set, at least 30% of the borrowers of the credit schemes should be the poor members who actively participate in CFi and CF activities. The demand of credits and the use of these schemes are contributed indirectly to reducing pressure on natural resources (but have not been assessed) as the loan was invested in rice and crop cultivation, and livestock raising.

#### 8.1.5 Outcome 3 policy

**Recommendation 6.1:** Empowering CFi and CF provincial network to dialogue with, and influence local decision and accountability of FiA, FA and PDAFF. CFi and CF networks have been of importance to the communities and FiA and FA. However, the role of network should go beyond the coordination, exchange and sharing information, by in adopting soft advocacy (including lobbying and dialogue approaches) with FiA, FA, District and Provincial Authorities. This can be done through regularly attending the commune, district and provincial forum to lobby and raise issues being faced by CFi and CF.

**Recommendation 6.2:** The most important advocacy activities to be carried out at the national level is to ensure a constant increase in FiA, FA and PDAFF (in overall) budget allocation from the national level. Effort has been made by FiA, with the support of EU Capfish programme, in recruiting young/ university student volunteers (with the possibility of enlisting as FiA officials in the future) to work with CFi. Capfish programme is also funding. FiA's small grant (up to \$1000 per year for about 150 CFi country-wide); PaFF should explore this opportunity and join hand with EU and other donors like IFAD. PaFF should also be able to provide technical assistance to PDAFF is formulating their annual budget and defending their proposal with Ministry of Economy and Finance's (MEF) budget committee. Similar approach should be applied to FA. The decentralisation, including the new initiative (district office of agricultural, NRM and environment), appears not to be feasible supporters of CF and CFi, given their limited capacity and resources. This office is more about coordination rather than possessing financial resources and technical assistance to support the communities.

#### 8.1.6 Direction, management, and MEL

**Recommendation 7.1:** Strengthen human resources to achieve better focus with emphasis on post dealing with direction and not just management and evaluation and learning and not just monitoring in phase 3. This is to be done with existing partners. International technical assistance is vital to improve evaluation and learning and the contract should be of the same value as PAFF3 implementation.

**Recommendation 7.2:** Carry on rotation of lead agency and reorganise to boost strengths on (1) land access and ownership and (2) helping to government to sustain active engagement and support poor communities. In other words, RECOFTC should take on the lead. Partners retain the same roles as PAFF 2.

**Recommendation 8.1:** Dramatically improve MEL in phase 3 and develop the M&E plan to include (1) learning, (2) professional independent evaluation (3) quality improvement using participatory development of checklists and their evolution to scorecards sensitive to customer satisfaction and capturing voice.

**Recommendation 8.2:** Adopt the five capitals approach to DFID sustainable rural livelihoods approach in phase 3 and develop low cost practical and simple methods to assess impact in this way in relation to beneficiaries.

**Recommendation 8.3:** Generate a simple conceptual logical framework with an overall objective, project purpose behavioural results and assumptions as a tool for thinking to be used by those in the partnership concerned with strategic thinking.

#### 8.1.7 Vision for PAFF 3

**Special Recommendation 9** for Phase 3 based on the entire evaluation, the following rather verbose theory of change should be used for discussion purposes. A workshop could be organised using the 25% retained evaluation budget.

*Building on (1) the enormous social capital, rich datasets, and (2) limited positive lessons, exemplars, and champions of PAFF1 and 2, the PAFF 3 will listen and learn from the communities, private sector, other donor funded actions and government about how success can be replicated, spread, and sustained in a manner that will give secure access to land, fish and the profitable long-term use of other natural resources.*

*By mobilising support from local and international technical assistance, PaFF and the target communities become more powerful by (1) acquiring and exerting rights to natural resources and livelihoods, (2) holding the stakeholders and government accountable, (3) helping community resource management organisations to federate, (4) connect communities to experts in restoration agroforestry, internet approaches and e-commerce etc and (5) come up with a vision for its financially self-sufficient role in 2025 as a social enterprise or service provider with a steering committee/board with community champions as members*

# Phase-2 Program Final Evaluation and Phase-3 Proposal Development Partners for Forestry and Fisheries Program (PaFF 2)

Final Report

January 2021



**Prof Steven M Newman FRSA. Team Leader and environment specialist**  
**Dr Sokphea Young. Senior National Consultant**

## BioDiversity International Ltd

[www.biodiversity-int.co.uk](http://www.biodiversity-int.co.uk)

55-56 West St, Faversham, Kent ME13 7JH UK.

Telephone +44 (0)1795 533 487 Email [Steve@biodiversity-int.co.uk](mailto:Steve@biodiversity-int.co.uk)

Company registered in England No. 2855312. Data Protection Act No. X307402

## Contents

Annex One. List of abbreviations.....	3
Annex Two. Terms of Reference.....	5
Annex Three. Workplan, itinerary and deliverables.....	13
Annex Four. List of persons met.....	14
Annex Five Number and type of interviews.....	16
Annex Six. List of focus group discussions.....	17
Annex Seven Documents consulted.....	19
Annex Eight PAFF 2 Organisational set up.....	21
Annex Nine. Detailed analysis of Relevance and Design (from the Inception Report).....	22
Interpreting the Intervention logic.....	22
Initial comments on the programme relevance and design.....	22
Simplified theory of change to guide the evaluation linked to proposal development.....	25
Annex Ten Logical framework with comments linked to baseline and 2019 results.....	27
Annex Eleven SDC evaluation grid.....	28

## Annex One. List of abbreviations

CBE	Community-based Enterprises
CBNE	Community-based NTFP Enterprises
CBNRM	Community-based Natural Resource Management
CBO	Community-based Organisation
CEPA	Culture and Environment Preservation Association
CF	Community Forestry
CFi	Community Fisheries
CFMP	Community Forestry Management Plan
CFN	Community Forestry Network
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ELC	Economic Land Concession
ENRCC	Environment and Natural Resources Code of Cambodia
EU	European Union
ExCom	Executive Committee
FA	Forestry Administration
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization (United Nations)
FiA	Fisheries Administration
IP	Indigenous People
IPG	International Public Good
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IUU	EU rules to combat illegal fishing
MAFF	Ministry of Forestry and Fisheries
MFF	Mekong Flooded Forest
MIS	Management Information Systems
MIME	Ministry of Industry, Mining and Energy
MLMUPC	Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction
MoE	Ministry of Environment
Mol	Ministry of Interior
MoP	Ministry of Planning
MoRD	Ministry of Rural Development
MTR	Mid Term Review
NCFPCC	National Community Forestry Programme Coordination Committee
NCSD	National Council for Sustainable Development
NESAP	National Environmental Strategy and Action Plan
NSDP	National Strategic Development Plan
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NTFP	Non-Timber Forest Product
NTFP-EP	Non-Timber Forest Products Exchange Programme
OPKC	Organization for the Promotion of Kui Culture
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PA	Protected Area
PCFPCC	Provincial Community Forestry Coordination Committee
PCT	Programme Coordination Team
PDaA	Provincial Department of Agriculture
PDaE	Provincial Department of Environment
PDR-SGF	Pastor Delbert Rice Small Grant Fund
PKH	Ponlok Khmer
PSC	Programme Steering Committee
R&D	Research and Development
RCC	Rivers Coalition of Cambodia
RECOFTC	Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (also known as The Centre for People and Forests)
RGC	Royal Government of Cambodia

SDC	Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation
SNA	Sub National Agencies within the Government of Cambodia
SRJS	Shared Resources Joint Solutions
TWGF	Technical Working Group on Fisheries
TWG-FR	Technical Working Group on Forestry Reform
UN	United Nations
USD	United States Dollar
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature

## 1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT:

The Mekong Flooded Forest (MFF) landscape expands in four provinces of Kratie, Stung Treng, Preah Vihear and Kampong Thom and plays a critical role in supporting and sustaining community livelihoods of approximately 140,000 people including indigenous people as they depend on the landscape's rich aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity. In the recent years, the Mekong River and its surrounding lands are under pressures from rapid growth of economic and social development. Such development has caused some environmental impacts, human well-being, and livelihoods. In response to this rapid loss, the Royal Government of Cambodia has formulated strategies to empower local communities to take part of resource management through community-based approaches such as community forestry, community fisheries and community protected areas, with the objective of securing their access rights to lands and livelihoods. At the ground level, the community based NRM groups are facing constraints and require technical support for legalization, development of management plan and the development of sustainable livelihood opportunities. In order to support the implementation of Cambodia's strategic sectors plan, a consortium of four organizations, WWF-Cambodia, the Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC-Cambodia), Non-timber Forest Product Exchange Program (NTFP-EP) and Culture and Environment Preservation Association (CEPA) whose each has its own unique capacity and strength in community based natural resource management, formed and led by NTFP-EP (Phase-1) and WWF-Cambodia (Phase-2) to implement a program called Partners for Forestry and Fisheries (PaFF).

## 2. PROGRAM INFORMATION:

The PaFF program is designed for eight years and implementing in three phases from 2014 to 2023. PaFF Phase-1 (November 2014 – June 2017) was led by NTFP-EP and only implemented in Kratie and Stung Treng provinces. PaFF Phase-2 is for four years (July 2017-June 2021), total budget 6.133M USD (49% from SDC and 51% from IUCN-Netherland-SRJS, CEPF, ForumSyd, Belgium DGD and BMZ through each partner's on-going projects)

The lead consortium for Phase-2 is assumed by WWF-Cambodia and the target area of the program was expanded to two more provinces, Preah Vihear and Kampong Thom (see details of the program information in Annex 1).

The overall objective of PaFF-2 is local and indigenous communities and households increase their incomes and improve their resilience to economic and natural shocks by engaging in sustainable community-based livelihood approaches that protect their ecosystems and reduce pressure on their communal natural resources base. There are three main outcomes include as follows:

- 1) Target communities have secure rights to their natural resources and are exercising them.
- 2) Households in target communities increase their income through sustainable community-based forest and fisheries related enterprises and strategies.
- 3) National and local enabling policy conditions support secure community rights over natural resources and the development of sustainable community-based enterprises.

For beneficiaries, PaFF-2 has committed to achieve both direct and indirect:

- 371 community-based natural resource management groups representing approximately 135,000 people will be engaged in land tenure formalization processes.
- 35 community-based enterprises will be developed and functioning, directly benefiting to 580 households (approx. 1,500 people)
- Policy dialogue on six legislations/policies/laws and capacity building to the relevant authorities on ecosystem services valuation through specific tools and support 16 provincial landscape networks/platforms events for knowledge and information sharing among MFF landscape stakeholders.

In November 2019, the program was conducted an extensive mid-term review (MTR) to understand the program's update and performance against the set expected outcomes as well as the cross-cutting scheme (Governance, Gender Equality and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change by using the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. The MTR was covered the entire program (both SDC and partners 'contribution funding), meaning the works of all the partners involved in PaFF-2 including the assessment of log-frame and monitoring and evaluation tools. The consultant provided 29 recommendations to PaFF team to adjust the implementation in the last period of Phase-2 ranging from an institutional arrangement, adjustment of the program's planning and activities and M&E. The joint-management response between

PaFF and SDC was also developed and agreed; see the MTR report and joint-management response in Annex 2. Due to the approaching of Phase-2 ending and the formulation for the final phase (Phase-3), PaFF is looking for an external consultant to conduct the final evaluation of Phase-2 and the proposal development for Phase-3.

### **3. PURPOSE AND SCOPE:**

The scope of work for this assignment is in two folds: 1) PaFF Phase-2 final program evaluation in overall and 2) Proposal for Phase-3, final phase of the program.

Based on the result of the MTR and the joint-management response, the final program evaluation of Phase-2 is intended to identify the key program achievements and impact, challenges, lessons learned and best practices which will be informed adaptive management and the program design and development of Phase-3. The final program evaluation of Phase-2 is not expected to be extensive and in details as the MTR but rather focusing on top-line evaluation and put more time for designing and formulating a proposal for the PaFF Phase-3, the final phase of the program.

The final program evaluation of PaFF Phase-2 and the Phase-3 program development shall be guided by the following objectives:

#### **A. The Phase-2 final program evaluation:**

- Broadly assess and updated the program achievements and impact, challenges, lessons learned and best practices of each outcome against the agreed program log-frame including its quality on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the existing scope (four target provinces).
- Assess the overall goal/objective of the program and theory of change whether they are met with a provision of concise quality statement including a projection of poverty reduction rate of each target district and province that PaFF contributed.
- Assess for the information to fill in the assessment grid for evaluation and put as an annex of the report.
- Identify of any unintended impacts; and recommendations for avoiding any negative unintended impacts in Phase-3.

#### **B. The development of the final Phase-3 of the program:**

- Review an original proposal of two phases (PaFF-1 & PaFF-2) and document the adjustment, justification, and recommendation to be included in the Phase-3 proposal.
- Phase-3 will be the final phase of SDC`s support to PaFF, therefore, Phase-3 must be developed in a view of sustaining activities beyond June 2023. SDC`s support will end.
- Review the MTR PaFF-2 finding on institutional set up of the PAFF consortium by looking at its functions and propose the appropriate institutional set up for Phase-3 based on scope of work.
- Based on the result of the Phase-2 final program evaluation together with a study report on sustainable forest financing mechanism for CF, a concept note is drafted; the consultant team leads and facilitates the consultation workshop with key relevant stakeholders to validate and finalize the Phase-2 final program evaluation report. They will also collect the views on draft concept notes for Phase-3 as well as to consolidate key stakeholder mapping and analysis for developing Phase-3 proposal.
- Write the proposal of PaFF Phase-3 and develop a PowerPoint presentation of the proposal.

### **4. METHODOLOGY:**

The final program evaluation of PaFF Phase-2 and the Phase-3 program development methodology include qualitative and quantitative methods that will encourage a collaborative, inclusive, reflective process to identify best ways forward in the program. The assignment shall be conducted in a participatory research methodology on the basis that the primary purpose of the assignment is to assess the program implementation and the development of the final phase of the program.

Financial and economic analysis is enquired to use for informing the effectiveness and efficiency. Human rights-based approach and do-no-harm are also asked to use for confirming the good governance and conflict sensitivity in the program implementation and Phase-3 development. Climate change, environment and disaster risk reduction is mandatory for assessing its application in PaFF2 implementation and for analyzing and proposing appropriate application in Phase-3.

The assignment will start with a review of the program documents (see Annex 3) including key reports. The primary data collection is required for the assignment, the consultant shall conduct interview with key individuals within the program including the government officials, relevant NGOs, Development Partners, Private sectors, and target beneficiaries, with special attention paid to capturing the perspectives of men and women, youth, and other vulnerable groups. Interested consultant team or firm is invited to develop a comprehensive proposal to be submitted along with curriculum vitae for consideration. The proposal should clearly indicate the review methods including an estimation of sample and methodology and methods for the proposal development. See Annex 4 for the proposed content outline for the proposal to be submitted to WWF-Cambodia.

#### **5. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE:**

The framework for the final program evaluation report (not more than 12 pages, excluding Executive Summary for 02 pages and annexes) shall be not more than 30 pages in total and structured as in Annex 5. The concept note shall be not more than 05 pages excluding annexes. The proposal document shall not be more than 12 pages excluding annexes and structured as in Annex 6.

The consultant team shall have one international consultant as a team leader and one or team of national consultant. The consultancy service is expected to be carried out 35 working days (25<sup>th</sup> November - 29 January 2021) this will include desk reviews, in-depth interviews, focus group discussion, observations, final program evaluation report writing, Phase-3 concept note and proposal writing, stakeholders' consultation and finalizing the final program evaluation report and the proposal.

The below is detail timeline for key deliverables.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Key Deliverables</b>	<b>Timeline of Deliverables</b>
1	Agree on ToR, sign the contract, and start the service	24 <sup>th</sup> November 2020
2	Conduct desk review (study all provided documents and other secondary information including key stakeholder mapping and analysis, contextual analysis, and financial and economic reflections on achieved outcomes.)	
3	Submit inception report describing the review methodologies including the consultant tasks allocation among the team, tools, and detail work plan.	
4	Conduct field data collection for the final program evaluation for Phase-2 and concept note development for Phase-3	
5	Analyse findings and formulate conclusions about the performance of the current phase with clear recommendations (what and how) as well as elaborate recommendations for the Phase-3 with a draft concept note; the analysis is also included financial and economic reflections on achieved outcomes of Phase-2. This helps to identify project components that should be abandoned or modified and may indicate potential areas for replication or up-scaling.	
6	Submit the draft of the final program evaluation report and concept note	07 <sup>th</sup> January 2021
7	Organize the stakeholder's consultation workshop on the draft final program evaluation report and the concept note for Phase-3	15 <sup>th</sup> January 2021
8	Lead and facilitate PaFF team to develop the Phase-3 proposal and write the proposal including presentation of Phase-3 proposal with concerned donors and government	
9	Consolidate feedbacks from the workshop and meeting, and submit the final program evaluation report for Phase2 and the Phase-3 proposal including a PowerPoint presentation	28 <sup>th</sup> January 2021

**Note:** the consultant needs to strictly comply with the noted timeline above.

## **6. REQUIRED EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATION:**

The consultant team requirements are with following expertise and qualification:

The lead consultant (team leader) – S/he has proven experiences in program design and evaluation (large and complex program/project) which has also included the followings:

- At least seven years' experience in conducting external evaluations with mixed methods evaluation skills and having flexibility in using participatory evaluation methods.
- Extensive experience in program development/design including proposal writing.
- Academic and or professional background/extensive experiences in forestry and fisheries sectors, especially with natural resource governance, livelihood development, community self-financing, etc.
- In-depth knowledge of Cambodia context (culture, institutions, society, and natural resource management including land governance) is a plus.
- Extensive experience in facilitating strategic multi-stakeholder discussions and consensus building.
- Strong ability to inter-relate with different stakeholders in Cambodia, both state and non-state officials including government officials, development agencies and civil society organizations, and private sector.
- Demonstrate practice in managing work settings with attention to gender sensitivity and equity.
- Experience in collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data.
- Demonstrate strong commitment to delivering timely and high-quality results, i.e., credible evaluation and its report that can be used.
- Good communication skills and ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express concisely and clearly ideas and concepts.
- Very good English communication in both speaking and writing.
- Demonstrate strong strategic and analytical skills.

The national consultant (team member/s) - S/he has had the gender lenses with various development projects including the NRM and livelihood improvement, which has also included the followings:

- At least five years' experience in conducting external evaluation with mixed methods.
- Extensive experience in coordination and facilitation
- In-depth knowledge of gender equality in economic development and in NRM sector in Cambodia context through academic and/or professional background.
- Ability to inter-relate with different stakeholders by using participatory and community engagement approaches.
- Proficiency in English writing and communication skills.
- If required, ability to act as translator for lead consultant and logistic arrangement.

## **7. BUDGET AND PAYMENT SCHEDULE:**

The budget for this consultancy service shall be proposed by the consultant including 15% of withholding tax or 10% for VAT. The consultant is requested to submit their best-offered budget for this consultancy service and submit results which consist of appropriate assessment design and budget breakdown. The payment to the successful consultant will be made with the following instalment:

- 10% upon signing the contract.
- 20% upon submission and agreement of the inception report and methodology
- 30% upon acceptance of the first draft of the final evaluation report and Phase-3 concept note.
- 40% upon acceptance of the finalized final evaluation report and Phase-3 proposal including PowerPoint presentation.

## **8. ANNEXES:**

### **Annex 1: Detail PaFF program information:**

#### **PAFF's theory of change:**

The theory of change of PaFF-2 remains as outlined in Phase-1: Working with Government, private sector, civil society, and rural communities, PaFF's contribution to improving stakeholders' implementation capacity, knowledge, and participation in development processes at national and local level will empower rural

households to claim and secure their access to natural resources, as well as strengthen sustainable NRM and thus improve their income and livelihood resilience.

**Intervention Strategies of the PAFF program:**

Capacity development activities will enable communities to engage in tenure formalization process and sustainable natural resources management through training for action, and through the development and implementation of CBNRM plans.

CBNRM groups will be assessed on their potential for livelihood/enterprise development and selected groups will be supported in developing sustainable CBE. Research will be conducted to develop value chains for products with the highest potential.

The capacity of landscape stakeholders (provincial government officials, private sector, local communities) on required NRM-linked topics will be enhanced through support to provincial multi-stakeholder networks and platforms addressing NRM. At the national level, the PaFF will engage with the relevant government institutions to ensure policies reflected the local community's interests.

**PaFF Monitoring & Evaluation:**

The consortium partners have defined the common M&E strategy and framework for the implementation of the PaFF program. The program baseline data was collected at the beginning of Phase-2. Data collection is done continuously and periodically during the implementation. There are two levels of data collection 1) implementation level for activity and output, and 2) Result level for outcome and impact. Mixed tools are used to ensure the effective program M&E. These have been applied continuously through-out the program implementation – e.g., periodic monitoring of indicators, or as specific time-bound exercise such as independent mid-term review, financial audits, and independent final program evaluation.

**Annex 2: the MTR report and joint-management response including PaFF2 project document** (the document will be shared to only appointed consultant)

**Annex 3: List of the program documents for review:** (the document will be shared to only appointed consultant)

- 1) Program documents
- 2) PaFF1 final evaluation report and management response
- 3) Program baseline, M&E strategy, and framework
- 4) Communication and visibilities strategy
- 5) Revised Log-frame and annual milestone
- 6) PCT and ExeCom's ToR, and Program Steering Committee
- 7) Annual Technical Reports and management response
- 8) A study report on CF credit impact to CF management and livelihood
- 9) A study report on sustainable forest financing mechanism for CF in Cambodia (a basis consulting document for Phase-3 concept note)
- 10) Assessment grid for evaluation

**Annex 4: Proposed content outlines for the proposal to be submitted by the consultant:**

- 1) Program Background
- 2) Assignment's Objectives
- 3) Understanding of the ToR
- 4) Methodology of the Phase-2 final program evaluation
  - Study Design
  - Sample Size and Sampling Selection Methods
  - Data Collection Tools
  - Field Work and Data Quality Assurance
  - Limitations
- 5) Methodology of the Phase-3 development and proposal writing.
- 6) Team Composition and Expertise
- 7) Detail Work Plan
- 8) Proposed Budget
- 9) References (short description of 03 similar assignments)

**Annex 5: Proposed content outlines for the final program evaluation report:**

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

1. Executive summary (02 pages)

2. Introduction (0.5 page)
3. Project Summary (Problem statement and intervention) (01 page)
  - 3.1. Problem statement
  - 3.2. The program's intervention in response to the problem including theory of change.
4. Purpose of the final program evaluation (0.5 page)
5. Methodology used for the final program evaluation and limitation (01 page)
6. Findings (05 pages)
  - 6.1. Outcome and findings about the program's achievements and consequences
    - 6.1.1. Outcome 1
      - 6.1.1.1. Introduction – Outcome 1 indicators and Strategy
      - 6.1.1.2. Achievement of outcome (This chapter provides a clear and concise analysis of the effects (outcomes, impact) of the project/program, of its contribution to the reduction of poverty/exclusion/ vulnerability (according to DAC poverty criteria). It also includes considerations on costs of results and their sustainability. *Description of intended and unintended effects: outcomes, if possible, also on impact level (What are the direct and indirect, positive, and negative effects of the project/program at both population and institutional/organizational level? In fragile contexts: What effects can be observed regarding political and social causes of fragility and conflict?*)
      - 6.1.1.3. Facilitating Factors
      - 6.1.1.4. Constraining Factors
      - 6.1.1.5. Governance, Gender and DRR/CCA mainstreaming (*Ex. What are the effects of the project/program about the reduction of inequalities between men and women? Have the women benefited at least equally from the project/program in comparison to the men?*)
    - 6.1.2. Outcome 2
      - 6.1.2.1. Introduction – Outcome 2 indicators
      - 6.1.2.2. Achievement of outcome (This chapter provides a clear and concise analysis of the effects (outcomes, impact) of the project/program, of its contribution to the reduction of poverty/exclusion/ vulnerability (according to DAC poverty criteria). It also includes considerations on costs of results and their sustainability. *Description of intended and unintended effects: outcomes, if possible, also on impact level (What are the direct and indirect, positive, and negative effects of the project/program at both population and institutional/organizational level? In fragile contexts: What effects can be observed regarding political and social causes of fragility and conflict?*)
      - 6.1.2.3. Facilitating Factors
      - 6.1.2.4. Constraining Factors
      - 6.1.2.5. Gender and DRR/CCA mainstreaming (*Ex. What are the effects of the project/program about the reduction of inequalities between men and women? Have the women benefited at least equally from the project/program in comparison to the men?*)
    - 6.1.3. Outcome 3
      - 6.1.3.1. Introduction – Outcome 2 indicators and Strategy
      - 6.1.3.2. Achievement of outcome (This chapter provides a clear and concise analysis of the effects (outcomes, impact) of the project/program, of its contribution to the reduction of poverty/exclusion/ vulnerability (according to DAC poverty criteria). It also includes considerations on costs of results and their

sustainability. *Description of intended and unintended effects: outcomes, if possible, also on impact level (What are the direct and indirect, positive, and negative effects of the project/program at both population and institutional/organizational level? In fragile contexts: What effects can be observed regarding political and social causes of fragility and conflict?*

6.1.3.3. Facilitating Factors

6.1.3.4. Constraining Factors

6.1.3.5. Gender and DRR/CCA mainstreaming (*Ex. What are the effects of the project/program about the reduction of inequalities between men and women? Have the women benefited at least equally from the project/program in comparison to the men?*)

6.2. Findings about the program management and implementation

6.2.1. Institutional and organizational set up of PAFF consortium.

6.2.2. Partnership and Coordination

6.2.3. Monitoring and Evaluation

7. Lessons learned and case studies (02 pages)

*(Lessons learned focuses on relevant aspects that have contributed to success/failure of the project such as thematic approach, main innovation, partnership, communication, harmonization, and alignment. It also focuses on main difficulties faced during the phase and efforts made to overcome them. Case studies focus on where is the project/what has been achieved, about an exit strategy? Where is the project/what has been achieved, about replicability and scaling up?)*

8. Conclusions and Recommendations (02 pages)

9. Annexes (including log-frame with baseline and results, and draft concept note for Phase-3)

## **Annex 6: Proposed content outlines for the Phase-3 concept note and proposal.**

The following structure is not binding but is meant to provide orientation.

### **Table of contents**

#### **Executive summary**

##### **1. Context**

- Key information on the context (political, economic, social, environmental), relevant for the project and linked with the intended changes of the intervention.
- Analysis of the situation, description of the problem(s) to be addressed and needs<sup>1</sup> of the target group<sup>2</sup>, based on relevant and recent assessment, studies, analysis, survey, and baseline.
- Analysis of drivers and restrainers of change<sup>3</sup> (Political Economy Analysis)
- Link to international/national policies / relevant legal and policy framework / Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) / development / humanitarian programs / SDGs, etc.
- Use of further SDC steering instruments such as Conflict Sensitive Project Management (CSPM) or 'Fit for Fragility' to assess the context in a fragile project partner country.

##### **2. Results and lessons learned.**

- In case of a following phase: summary of the results achieved on outcome level (including results on gender and governance)<sup>4</sup> and key outputs based on the end of phase reports and insights from reviews/evaluations.
- Lessons learned and their implications and measures for the new phase.
- Funds deployed up to date.

##### **3. Objectives**

---

<sup>1</sup> Problems and needs of men and women can be very different. The description and analysis should reflect both perspectives.

<sup>2</sup> Target group: refer to beneficiaries on the level of population, as well as on target groups at the level of organisations/systems.

<sup>3</sup> Drivers and restrainers of the intended change by the project/program can be key stakeholders or organisations affected by/involved in an intervention, but also values, interests and abilities, etc.

<sup>4</sup> What are the effects the project/program with regard to the reduction of inequalities between men and women? Have the women benefited at least equally from the project/program in comparison to men?

- A description of the project objectives and the expected results with a clear distinction between the levels of the objectives: outputs, outcomes, and impact to be also presented in the log-frame or similar Results Framework as annex.
- Description of the impact hypothesis or similar<sup>5</sup> that explains and plausibly argues based on the context analysis, how products/services from the project (outputs) will produce effects and changes for the target group.
- Description of the poor and vulnerable target group (disaggregated according to sex, age, ethnicity, religion, etc.) and the expected changes and benefits derived from the intervention.
- Outreach: number of beneficiaries/institutions/organisations and geographical area of the intervention
- Level of the intervention (micro, meso, macro)

#### 4. Implementing strategy

- Description of the intervention approach/methodology/instruments
- Description of the partner organisations, their roles, experiences, added value, capacities, and limitations.
- Form of cooperation and coordination between involved partners
- The intervention strategy should include an explanation on how the project will address the drivers and restrainers of change.
- Measures to ensure the sustainability of benefits/scaling up. End of project vision/exit strategy
- Reflection on the use of country systems, and if not, the reasons to establish and/or use parallel implementing units.

#### 5. Organisation, Management and Administration:

- Initial time frame and tentative yearly breakdown of the phase
- Management of the project:
  - Organisational structure and steering mechanism
  - Roles, tasks, and responsibilities (project team)
- Where applicable: information regarding tendering and contracting of project component.
- Administrative arrangements (accounting, financial management, external audit)

#### 6. Resources

- Human resources, infrastructure, equipment, know how, and financial resources, specifying contributions of other donors and partners.
- Overall budget
- Reflections on cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) and, where possible, cost-benefit analysis (CBA)

#### 7. Risk Analysis

- Assessment of main risks<sup>6</sup> for the project and/or risks resulting from the intervention; measures for mitigation.
- Indication on how the risks will be monitored and managed.

#### 8. Monitoring and Evaluation

- M&E plan
- Result-oriented reporting system (focus on outcome monitoring with reference to log-frame and budget)
- If not yet done, information regarding timing for baseline studies and responsibilities.
- Planned (internal/external) review(s)/evaluation.

#### The following information is usually provided as annexes to the proposal or ProDoc:

- a) Log-frame in line with the requirements of SDC Guidance Log-frame or equivalent type of Results Framework, incl. measurable and verifiable key indicators for outputs, outcomes, and impact, as well as costs with target values and baseline
- b) Detailed budget
- c) Terms of reference of key project/program staff and experts
- d) List of abbreviations
- e) Institutional set-up

<sup>5</sup> e. g. intervention logic/model, theory of change

<sup>6</sup> Scope of risk assessment should be discussed between partners and SDC project management. SDC tools for risk assessment are available.

### Annex Three. Workplan, itinerary and deliverables

No.	Key Deliverables and activities	Timeline of Activity or Deliverables
1	Agree on ToR, sign the contract, and start the service	24 <sup>th</sup> November 2020
2	Conduct desk review (study all provided documents and other secondary information including key stakeholder mapping and analysis, contextual analysis, and financial and economic reflections on achieved outcomes.)	1 <sup>st</sup> December 2020 to 4 <sup>th</sup> December 2020
3	Submit <b>inception report</b> describing the review methodologies including the consultant tasks allocation among the team, tools, and detail work plan.	21 <sup>st</sup> December 2020
4	Conduct field data collection for the final program evaluation for Phase-2 and concept note development for Phase-3	6 <sup>th</sup> December to 8 <sup>th</sup> January 2021
5	Analysis and report writing.	4 <sup>th</sup> December to 8 <sup>th</sup> January 2021
	Submit the <b>first draft of the final program evaluation report and concept note</b> (without field work data)	7 <sup>th</sup> January 2021
6	Submit the <b>second draft of the final program evaluation report and concept note</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> January 2021
7	Organize and deliver the stakeholders consultation and <b>validation workshop</b> on the draft final program evaluation report and the concept note for Phase-3	21 <sup>st</sup> January 2021
8	Revision of contract by dropping the clause to write and develop the Phase-3 proposal including presentation of Phase-3 proposal with concerned donors and government	25 <sup>th</sup> January 2021
9	Consolidate feedbacks from the validation workshop and meetings, and submit the <b>final program evaluation report</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> January 2021

Annex Four. List of persons met.

No	Name	Organisation	Date met	Mode of meeting
1	Mr. Vannarith Nop	NTFP-EP	17-Dec-20	Virtual
2	Ms. Sokunthea Ly	WWF-Cambodia	17-Dec-20	Virtual
3	Mr. Seng Teak	WWF-Cambodia	17-Dec-20	Virtual
4	Ms. Rasmey Luy	CEPA Phnom Penh	17-Dec-20	Virtual
5	Mr. Vannak Un	CEPA Phnom Penh	17-Dec-20	Virtual
6	Mr. Ly Vuthy	FiA	17-Dec-20	Virtual
7	Mr. Phalluy Vy	CEPA province	17-Dec-20	Virtual
8	Mr. Piseth Chheang	CEPA province	17-Dec-20	Virtual
9	Mr. Tommy Phat	CEPA province	17-Dec-20	Virtual
10	Mr. Vanna Chea	CEPA province	17-Dec-20	Virtual
11	Mr. Din Dim	WWF province-Kratie	18-Dec-20	Virtual
12	Mr. Peakdey Sorn	IUCN Cambodia	18-Dec-20	Virtual
13	Ms. Kalyan Hou	RECOFTC	18-Dec-20	Virtual
14	Mr. Heng Da	RECOFTC	18-Dec-20	Virtual
15	Ms. Saramany Doung		18-Dec-20	Virtual
16	Mr. Marcuk Bürli		18-Dec-20	Virtual
17	Mrs Kev Vanna	Chief of Communtiy Forestry Network of Kampong Thom	21-Dec-2020	Virtual
18	Mr. Teang Sengki	Chief of Thbong Krapeu commune (Kampong Thom)	21-Dec-2020	Virtual
19	Mr. Mr. Cheng Seng	FA Cantonment of Preah Vihear	22-Dec-2020	In person
20	Mr Kea Sochea	Leader of CF network of Preah Vihear	22-Dec-2020	In person
21	Mr. Poeung Tryda	Director of PDAFF Preah Vihear	22-Dec-2020	In person
22	Mr. Eve Chi Chea	Deputy Commune Chief of Roveng, Preah Vihea	22-Dec-2020	In person
23	Mr. Khan Salon	Deputy Direct PDAFF	23-Dec-2020	In person
24	Mr. Kao Vutha	Deputy Forestry Administration of Kampong Thom	23-Dec-2020	In person
25	Mr. Bun Sothy	Direct of Forestry Administration of Preah Vihear	23-Dec-2020	In person
26	Mr. Mao Vichet	Deputy Director PDAFF	28-Dec-2020	In person
27	Mr. Ben Bunaravuth	Head of Unit of Irrawaddy dolphin of FiA (Kratie)	28-Dec-2020	In person
28	Mr. Nuon Pov Ratana	Director of FA of Kratie	28-Dec-2020	In person
29	Ms. Houg Rany	Chief of CFi network of Kratie	28-Dec-2020	Virtual
30	Mr. Porn Sambo	Dept of Tourism of Kratie	28-Dec-2020	In person
31	Mr. Koeu Bopha	Chief of O' Krieng commune	29-Dec-2020	In person
32	Mr. Khut Samol	Leader of Koh 30 CBET of Kratie	29-Dec-2020	In person
33	Mr. Vorn Trai	Honey CBE of Prasat Tek Kmao CF, Kratie	29-Dec-2020	In person
34	Mr. Cheam Ourdong	Deputy of FA Cantonment of Steung Treng	29-Dec-2020	In person

No	Name	Organisation	Date met	Mode of meeting
35	Mr. Ry Reaksmeay	Deputy of FA Cantonment of Steung Treng	29-Dec-2020	In person
36	Mr. Hun Samoeun	FA Triage	29-Dec-2020	In person
37	Mr. Tum Niro	Director or FiA of Steung Treng	29-Dec-2020	In person
38	Mr. Orn Porseang	Director of Dept of Tourism of Steung Treng	29-Dec-2020	In person
39	Mr. Leang Seng	Director of PDAFF of Steung Treng	29-Dec-2020	In person
40	Mr. Sorn Sary	Governor of Talaborivat District, Steung Treng	29-Dec-2020	In person
41	Mr. Sek Mao	Commune Chief of O Svay, Steung Treng	30-Dec-2020	In person
42	Mr. Neam Vichet	Leader of CFI credit and CFI of Sre Krasang	30-Dec-2020	In person
43	Mrs. Heng Chana	Treasurer of CFI credit of Sre Krasang	30-Dec-2020	In person
44	Ms. Den Vokda	Member of Eco-tourism of Borey Osvay	30-Dec-2020	In person
45	Mr. Pen Ratana	Independent consultant	6-Jan-2020	Virtual
46	Mr. Aymeric Roussel	European Union Delegation	08-Jan-2021	Virtual

## Annex Five Number and type of interviews

### Key informant interviews

Functional classes	Global	Capital	Provinces	District	Commune/Communities	Total
PAFF consortium patterns		8	7			13
Local Administration (Mol)				1	4	5
FiA		1	4			5
FA			7			4
PDAFF			4			4
CFi			2 (network)		2 (credit; trust fund)	4
CF			2 (network)			2
CBET/CBE					2	2
Tourism			2			2
<b>Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>46</b>

### Focus group discussions.

Communities	ST	KTR	PV	KTP	Total		
					Groups	Male	Female
CFi	5	5	0		10	36	14
CF	5	9	5	8	27	52	24
CF credit		3			3	3	13
CFi credit	1				1		11
CBE	3	2	3		8	15	7
CBET	1	1		1	3	44	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>73</b>
						<b>223</b>	

Annex Six. List of focus group discussions

Date	Location	Community categories	Participations
21 Dec 2020			
Kampong Thom	Forestry Cantonment	Prey Kbal Bei (4) Prey Cheung Pum (4) Trapeang Sandan (4)	3 CFs 5 Females 7 Males
		Tapang Jruk CF, Preah Sophea CF, Prey Sombor CF, Tapang Prey CF	44 CFs 5 females
22 Dec 2020			
Preah Vihear	Forestry Cantonment	Preah Introng (2) Chambok Hoor (2) Trapeang Tontum (2) Phnom Pich Borey (2) Chrob Phnom Dombok (2)	5 CFs 10 Males
		Tapang Torterm CF (2), Pich Borey CF Credit (2), Chom Bok Hors CF/CBET (2), Preah Oen Trung CBE (2)	1 CF 1 CF 1 CBET 1 CBE 8 females
	Cheb District	Sankea Traing Prossing Group (4) Chheab Lech Traing Prossing Group (4) Dongplet Honey Group (4)	3 CBEs 3 Females 9 Males
23 Dec 2020			
Kampong Thom	Trapeang Prey CF	Trapeang Prey (3) Trapeang Chrok (3) Prey Banteay (2) Prey Sambo (3) Preah Sophea (2)	5 CFs 13 Males
28 Dec 2020			
Kratie	Forestry Cantonment	Sre Thom (2) Sre Ronam (4) Kantuot (2) Anchanh (5) O' tanung (3)	5 CFs 16 Males
	Sorsor 100 Pagoda	Kampong Damrey (2) Kampong Pnov (2) Ampil Teuk (2) Prek Krieng (2) Kampong Kreung (2)	5 CFis 10 Males
		PI domrey CFI credit (2), Kompong kbueng CFI Credit (2) Preakkreang CFI Credit (2) kompong pnov CFI Credit (2) Om peltuk CFI Credit	5 CFI credits 9 Females
	WWF's office	O'Kak (2F, 2M) Veal Kanseng (2F,2M) O Preah (4F,2M)	3 CFs 8 Females 6 Males
29 Dec 2020			

Date	Location	Community categories	Participations	
Kratie	O'Krieng Pagoda	Honey group in Prasat Tekmaov (2) CF Credit (3) CBET (Kah 30) (2)	1 CF credit, 1CBE, 1CBET	7 Males
		Kbal Domrey, Koh Samseb CBET, Phnom Bak CBE, Or Kreang CF Credit (2), khsach Lav CF Credit.	2 CBEs 1 CBETs 2 CF credits	7 Female
Steung Treng	CEPA's office	Koh Preah (4) Koh Chreung (3) Ochralang (1) Phum Thmey (4) Sre Krosang (3)	5 CFis	14 Males
		Srea Krosang CF (2), Koh Chreng CF Or cholung CF (2)	3 CFs	5 Females
30 Dec 2020				
Steung Treng	PDAFF's office	O'Svay Chheuteal Prek Phnom Romiet Chum Pich Orussey Kandal	5 CFs	12 Males
		Burey Orsvay CF Credit Orussey kandal CF (3) Phnom lmeat CF Credit Chham Pich CF Credit (2)	1 CF 3 CF credits	7 Females
	NTFP-EP's office	Honey group (1F, 4M) Kah Han (CBET) (1 F, 2M)	1 CBE, 1 CBET	2 Females 6 Males
	CEPA's Office	Srea Krosang CFI Credit (5), Or Chulung CFI Credit (6)	2 CFI credits	7 Females

### Annex Seven Documents consulted

- PFinal report: mid-term review of Partnership Programme to support Forestry and Fishery Phase II by Pascale Debord
- SDC and PaFF joint management responses to recommendations of MTR 2019
- 2016 Socio-Economic Baseline Survey (SEBS): The Partners for Forestry and Fisheries – Cambodia Programme (PAFF) In Cambodia’s Stung Treng and Kratie – September 2016 – So Dane - NTFP EP
- Contracts between SDC and WWF and annexes, including the budget, the project description, the Grant agreements between WWF and RECOFTC, CEPA and NTFP-EP 2016
- PAFF Newsletter 2020\_May 2020: Community livelihoods improvement and natural resources management go hand in hand.
- PAFF Newsletter 2019\_February 2019: Protecting fish and forests for the communities and future generation.
- PAFF: Communication and Visibility Strategy - July 2017 – June 2021 – CEPA, NTFP-EP, RECOFTC, WWF
- Minutes of ExeCom meetings (3 Oct 2017 – 6 April 2018 – 27 July 2018 – 6 Nov 2018 – 12 Feb 2019 – 3 May 2019)
- Baseline Survey SRJS – 2018 – NTFP-EP
- CEPA: CBNRM Mini-Trust Fund Establishment and Management Technical/Voluntary Guidance, 2020
- WWF: VALUE CHAIN ASSESSMENT ON KHMER BREED Chickens Production in Mekong Flooded Forest Kratie Province by Sak Sambath, 2018
- CBNRM Database Revised Updated as of June 2020 (excel spread sheet)
- Database CFs & CFis & CBEs updated 2019 (excel spread sheet)
- PAFF: Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and Framework July 2017-June 2021
- PAFF2/outcome 2 road map: Jan 2019-June 2021
- NTFPEP: Business plan fish sauce last-final (Khmer)
- NTFPEP: Business plan Honey \_Krala Peas village (Khmer)
- NTFPEP: Business plan Honey \_Kroam village (Khmer)
- NTFPE: Final fish business plan of Ksach Leave Samkey Sambo (Khmer)
- NTFPEP: Final Honey Business of Tonsong Tleak (Khmer)
- NTFPEP: Final Honey Business plan of Sompong (Khmer)
- NTFPEP: Honey Business of Veal Kansaeng (final) (Khmer)
- NTFPEP: Thmey Pa' Ork BP-Final-Virai 15 June-17 (Khmer)
- NTFPEP: Baseline survey report: Shared resources joint solutions (SRJS) program
- WWF: Strategic intervention on chicken production enterprise for MFF, drafted by Livelihoods Team in MFF.
- PaFF Program Advisory Committee\_ TOR

- Terms of Reference of Natural Resource Management Coordination Forum (NCF)
- Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on the formulation and functions of PaFF Executive Committee (The Excom)
- WWF: Final PaFF Revised log-frame and milestone 2020\_ 13 July 20 (Excel spread sheet)
- WWF: PaFF2 Logframe Revised 10-01-2019\_Before MTR.
- PAFF Phase 2 Programme Document (2017-2021), WWF, RECOFTC, CEPA, NTFP-EP
- WWF: 5-Year Ecotourism Strategic Plan for Kratie's Mekong Flooded Forests (MFF) Landscape "Hog Deer and Bird Nest Conservation Areas of MFF Landscape" by Neth Baromey and Rith Sam Ol
- WWF: Report for Socio-Economic Status of Community People of MFF in Sambour District, Kratie, Cambodia, 2018
- WWF: report on end line socio-economic study in the Mekong flooded forest landscape in Sambor district of Kratie province, Cambodia. By Sok Serey, 2020.
- NTFPE: Traing Chopsticks value chain analysis, Preah Vihear Cambodia. By Tanya Conlu, 2019
- RECOFT: Report Community Forest Credit Scheme Study (2020-11-05) by Edward Valencia Maningo
- Annual report 2017: Partnership programme to support forestry and fishery communities in Stung Treng, Kratie, Kampong Thom and Preach Vihear provinces, Cambodia (January-December 2017)
- Annual report 2018: Partnership programme to support forestry and fishery communities in Stung Treng, Kratie, Kampong Thom and Preach Vihear provinces, Cambodia (January-December 2018)
- Annual report 2019: Partnership programme to support forestry and fishery communities in Stung Treng, Kratie, Kampong Thom and Preach Vihear provinces, Cambodia (January-December 2019)
- IUCN: SRJS MTR Cambodia: Learning report, October 2018.
- Programme Structure\_revised (ppt)
- PaFF milestone 2020\_updated 04 Jan 2021\_clean (excel spreadsheet)
- Minute of the ExeCom Meeting- 04-05-2020
- Minute of the ExeCom Meeting- 19-06-2020
- PAFF: DDR and CCA Capacity Assessment Report March 2019
- Ou Tanoeng CF Management Plan (Khmer)
- Fishery Community Management Plan Anlong Veal Prolong Chet: Duration 3 years (2018-2020)

## Annex Eight PAFF 2 Organisational set up.

*PaFF is implemented by four competent organisations—Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF), RECOFTC (The Center for People and Forests), the Non-Timber Forests Products Exchange Programme (NTPF-EP) and the Culture and Environment Preservation Association (CEPA). These organisations have significant relevant and complementary capacities, experience, and networks. Their organisational competencies particularly in the fields of community forestry, community fisheries, conservation and landscape management, livelihood and community natural resource-based enterprise and natural resources governance are synergised in the programme towards achieving three major related outcomes.*

WWF has taken the main role of direction, programme management and programme administration and is responsible for reporting to the donor SDC.

PAFF is facilitated by:

- 1 An Executive Committee (**EXCOM**) recently consisting of **directors of partner organisations**, WWF Finance Manager; 8) Ms. Ly Sokunthea, PaFF Program Manager (PM). **Its primary role is linked to progress and financial reporting.**
- 2 Program Advisory Committee (PAC) – which ensures that the PaFF Program is well aligned with Government’s policies and provides strategic orientation. PAC advises and validates the PaFF annual work plan and budget plan. Given the changing responsibilities in NRM within RGC, the PAC should be a primary mechanism for ensuring policy engagement, development, and alignment with priorities of the RGC. PAC members comprise of representatives from organizations below. Director of Department of Community Livelihood, Ministry of Environment (MOE) Director of Department of Forests and Community Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) Director of Department of Community Fisheries Development, MAFF Representative from IUCN Country Director of WWF-Cambodia, the Chairperson of ExeCom Country Coordinator of NTPF-EP Country Program Coordinator of RECOFTC Executive Director of CEPA. **Its primary role is to optimise alignment with government policy and organisational development.**
- 3 Programme Coordination Team PaFF Program Manager will be responsible for overall coordination of the program and is a lead of PCT. PaFF Program Manager will have the responsibility to report on overall program progress to the ExeCom and PAC according to agreed reporting period/s and prepares the necessary documents for those meeting. The main roles and responsibilities of the PCT are: a) Define and agree on roles, responsibilities and communication among partners b) Define and agree on program approach, delivery strategies c) Ensure quality delivery of program activities d) Discuss and jointly resolve programmatic challenges e) Communicate and consolidate field/provincial developments f) Synthesize field to national program progress and lessons g) Identify partnership and capacity needs and gaps in the program h) **Develop** Annual plans, **M&E**, and reporting i) **Identify adjustments and course-corrections for the program** j) Coordinate any events as requested by the donors (i.e. program evaluation, audits etc.). **Its primary role is coordination. It has no guidance on best practice in direction or how good direction will be measured.**
- 4 The Natural Resources Management Forum (NCF). It has the capacity to Identify and map focal areas and priorities of forum participants. • Provide an opportunity for relevant stakeholders (Development Partners (DPs), CSOs, the government institutions) who work in the Mekong landscape of Cambodia to share their work (best practice, challenges, and lesson learnt) and learn from others about their respective work. • Explore, and identify new initiative for collaboration and synergy creation (joint discussion and solution) with potential integration and cost sharing. • Identify and leverage potential funding to support coordinated efforts. • Ensure that the programs/projects are aligned with the government priorities **through steering of the representatives from the government institutions. The minutes 17/5/19 show exchange of information but no action points or steering.**

There is no project director. There is however a programme manager. There is no job description for PM in the proposal document. The Programme Manager reports on programme progress to the ExeCom and donors according to agreed reporting periods and similarly prepares the financial and operational plans and reports. will oversee M&E overall. (S)he is supported by WWF’s in-house M&E team who have time dedicated to PaFF. Partner PaFF Coordinators from each Partner will ensure that their internal M&E systems and staff are aligned to support PaFF M&E as agreed and coordinated with the WWF lead staff.

## Annex Nine. Detailed analysis of Relevance and Design (from the Inception Report)

### Interpreting the Intervention logic

The intervention logic (underpinning project design) to be used in the FE is linked to the document supplied with the file name of "Revised Logical Framework\_ 13 July 2020".

The overall goal of the intervention is stated (with my numbers) as

***Rural and indigenous communities and households (1) increase their incomes and (2) improve their resilience to economic and natural shocks by engaging in sustainable community-based livelihood approaches that protect their ecosystems and reduce pressure on their communal natural resource base.***

The geographical area of operation is not given but it can be inferred that actors other than those engaged in PAFF2 could contribute to achieving this.

Only item (1) has an Objectively Verifiable Indicator (OVI) that could be verified by management. OVI 3 is stated as

***Increase, measured as a percentage, in annual HH income of selected households participating in CBEs and individual enterprises.***

The outcomes that contribute to the overall goal are

**Outcome 1:** Target communities have secure rights to their natural resources and are exercising them.

**Outcome 2:** Households in target communities increase their income through sustainable community-based forest and fisheries related enterprises and strategies.

**Outcome 3:** National and local enabling policy conditions support secure community rights over natural resources and the development of sustainable community-based enterprises.

Outcome 2 is a subset of OVI 3 pertaining mainly to only forest and fisheries related enterprises and strategies. There are other livelihood activities however including cow and chicken linked enterprises: A key question could be; how many CBEs that PAFF/SDC support can be self-financing and sustain their businesses?

The overall percentage budget for the components based on the excel file: Copy of PaFF2\_Consolidated Financial Report \_ (Jan-Sep 2020) is indicated in brackets below. The summary table linked to the calculations is given in Annex 3 and uses total budget figures (SDC and other)

The three outcomes could be simplified as three components.

1. Rights (63% budget)
2. Income (9% budget)
3. Policy (19% budget)

The most expensive outputs leading to the outcomes are.

Rights (tenure formalisation process 57% of the component budget). It should be noted that the process includes formalization (agreement), CFMP development, & CFMP implementation (+CF credit).

1. Income (staff costs 37% of the component budget)
2. Policy (Landscape forums 66% of the component budget)

### Initial comments on the programme relevance and design

The evaluation objectives linked to relevance and design posed in the ToR can be summarised as

**Assess the relevance of the planned overall goal and outcomes.**

Since 2004 and coinciding with every parliamentary election, successive Royal Governments of Cambodia have set out their socioeconomic platform within the framework given by Rectangular Strategy (RS), centred on the themes of Growth, Employment, Equity and Efficiency. The National Strategic Development

Plan 2019-2023 aspires to raise income, improve governance, and has specific ideas on protected area management and community based natural resources management including:

- 1) Improving the effectiveness of the protected area management system through strengthening the management capacity of the organization and through good governance.
- 2) Demarcating, identifying management areas, registering protected areas as the state public property, while having a clear plan for protected areas management.
- 3) Increasing law enforcement efficiency and reducing threats with modern equipment and training on law enforcement and related skills as needed in each area.
- 4) Encouraging the delegation of the management function of protected areas to Sub National Agencies (SNA)s
- 5) Determining land rights in protected areas and resolving land conflicts in protected areas, including in the areas of economic land concession projects.
- 6) Creating new protected areas.
- 7) Developing strategies to increase forest cover through reforestation and promoting conservation and restoration of genetic resources, plants, forests, and wildlife in protected areas. National Strategic Development Plan 2019-2023 Chapter IV: Key Policy Priorities and Actions 2019-2023 213
- 8) Improving the effectiveness of REDD+ programs by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and degradation, conserving carbon stocks, sustainable forest management, and increasing forest carbon inventory.
- 9) Developing creative solution in conservation and development, as well as creating opportunities for sustainable ecotourism and financing mechanisms

For local community development, ecotourism development, and heritage area management, focal areas include.

- 1) Continuing to review and update community protected areas and management plans.
- 2) Studying forest communities in newly established protected areas to further develop community protected areas.
- 3) Cooperating with SNAs and relevant ministries and agencies related to the establishment of community protected areas networks at national, regional, and protected areas committee levels.
- 4) Expanding employment opportunities for local communities by providing direct and beneficial opportunities for employment generation and encouraging the integration of activities in community management plans into each commune investment plan.
- 5) Selecting and implementing the concept of "co-management and community participation" in several protected area communities located in the eastern part of the Mekong River and north and south parts of the Tonle Sap.
- 6) Mobilizing support and resources for establishing and expanding production, contributing to improving the livelihoods of protected areas communities in the Mekong River region and north and south parts of the Tonle Sap.
- 7) Preparing ecotourism and conserving natural resources.
- 8) Local communities' benefit from participating in the management of protected areas through ecotourism arrangements.
- 9) Ecotourism and cultural tourism have proven to be successful ways for the protection and preservation of protected areas as well as simultaneously maintaining the sustainability and well-being of local communities.
- 10) Strengthening the cooperation and partnerships with relevant ministries and agencies, especially with tourism and ecotourism companies, and ecotourism development projects and ecotourism services to be improved and increase the number of tourists visiting the protected areas.
- 11) Strengthening the cultural heritage management in collaboration with culturally responsible institutions, concerned units and development partners. National Strategic Development Plan 2019-2023 Chapter IV: Key Policy Priorities and Actions 2019-2023 214?
- 12) Enhancing the capacity of the organizations and disseminate information and education on the value of comprehensive natural-cultural heritage to the public.

For the forestry sector the project is relevant to current policy including the following elements:

1. To manage sustainably the forest resource and wildlife though strengthening the enforcement of Law on Forest, by promoting forest replantation, increasing research and development on forests and wildlife, and building the capacity of forest communities to have a better living condition with the following key priority activities:
2. Forest management and development.

3. Enhancing the research and development on forests and wildlife.
4. Zoo management and wildlife protection.
5. Enforcing the Law on Forest.
6. Enforcing institutional management and supporting services.

The evaluation questions linked to relevance and design in the BioDiversity International Ltd proposal were focussed on positive aspects and areas for further improvement. This can now be endorsed as the extensive MTR covered deficiencies and problems. In the context of proposal development, it is also important to identify missed opportunities. There may also be important future opportunities for PAFF3 linked to NASDP and PASDP.

**On this basis the project goal and outcomes remain relevant**

The relevance questions posed in the BioDiversity International Ltd technical proposal was How far has the project design addressed the problem context in target communities/landscapes and how far the context is relevant in the current scenario? Based on government policy, (1) determining land **rights**, (2) facilitating rural livelihoods (**income**) and (3) Developing strategies (**policy**) to increase forest cover through reforestation and promoting conservation and restoration of genetic resources, plants, forests, and wildlife in protected areas. *National Strategic Development Plan 2019-2023 Chapter IV: Key Policy Priorities and Actions 2019-2023 213*, **the project goal and outcomes remain relevant but there appears to be a missed opportunity as of today to have restoration and restoration linked forestry or fishery income opportunities as a possible component. Moreover, to what extent did the PAFF contribute to improving these policies when referring to its outcome 3.**

Details on the mechanics and profitability of this will be addressed as part of PAFF 3 considerations. The evaluation grid has questions shown overleaf with initial findings.

Grid question	initial findings
1. The extent to which the objectives of the intervention respond to the needs and priorities of the target group.	Needs and priorities of the target group have not been found in the documents supplied. However, some of the needs and priorities of the target groups could be drawn from the 2016 Socio-Economic Baseline Survey. The document was shared and named "PaFF Baseline Socio-economic survey"
2. The extent to which the objectives of the intervention respond to the needs and priorities of indirectly affected stakeholders (not included in target group, e.g., government, in the country of the intervention.	Government stakeholders dealt with above
3. The extent to which core design elements of the intervention (such as the theory of change, structure of the project components, choice of services and intervention partners) adequately reflect the needs and priorities of the target group.	Needs and priorities of the target group have not been found in the documents supplied

**Design questions posed in the BioDiversity International Ltd technical proposal included:**

- What is the quality of clarity, realism and coherence and how could this be improved in future?

**Clarity**

Initial analysis shows that there are missed opportunities to improve clarity on

- 1) where pressure is coming from in terms of environmental degradation, e.g., poor people local or non-local, powerful people national or foreign, action of government national or other countries.
- 2) the point at which target groups do not need any more help with rights to natural resources.
- 3) specific policy instruments and delivery mechanisms that need reform.
- 4) why tenure formalisation documents and landscape forum proceedings are the most expensive outputs.
- 5) why there are no assumptions in the logical framework only risks.
- 6) why short-term funding from a donor such as SDC is more appropriate than using the interest from endowments.
- 7) why the intervention design is heavy on administration/delivery of contribution projects but light on learning from them.
- 8) why violation rates linked to protected area and natural resources management laws are not recorded.

- 9) why quality of outcomes/outputs is not assessed.
- 10) why physical measures of forest or aquatic ecosystem function or biodiversity are not part of the monitoring system.

### Realism

Initial analysis shows that there are missed opportunities to improve realism in

- 1) NGOs facilitating entrepreneurial success (not simply a technical matter)
- 2) Cambodian citizens protecting the environment from foreign interests e.g., effects on the Mekong due to actions by another Mekong Countries.

### Coherence

Coherence means logic. In other words, is it logical that to get X you need to produce A and B first?

Initial analysis shows that there are missed opportunities to improve coherence linked to the following provocative propositions or logical alternatives.

- 1) It is not a failure of policy and related instruments that leads to environmental destruction it is a lack of effective enforcement.
- 2) Target community resilience can be measured in terms of resistance to loss of life, health, or wealth (assets and income). Increased income may not be enough to reduce mortality in the phase of climate change and loss of ecosystem services linked disasters (now far more likely than when the programme was designed)

The evaluation grid has questions shown below and the initial findings are.

Grid question	Initial findings
Internal coherence: the extent to which the intervention is compatible with other interventions of Swiss development cooperation in the same country and thematic field (consistency, complementarity, and synergies).	Needs and priorities of SDC have not been found in the documents supplied

- How SMART are the indicators?

SMART is an acronym meaning Specific, Measurable, Attainable (verifiable) at reasonable cost, Relevant and Timebound. It can be applied to the indicators or the intervention logic in a logical framework. For logical framework OVIs Specific means specific to the level of intervention Logic. The term resilience in the Overall goal needs an indicator that measures resilience in the face of a shock e.g., survival rate after a grade X cyclone. Conserving habitat OVIs are at the level of an outcome not at the impact level. The programme logical framework does not have any measurable indicators for quality of outcomes. The logical framework covering effects of indirect and direct assistance cannot be run at a low cost. On the positive side most of the logical framework OVIs are relevant and timebound (have targets)

The MTR has indicated several problems and many of these may remain. These include.

- 1) The hierarchy of indicators is not always coherent and there are redundancies.
- 2) The contribution of PaFF II to gender equity (CF credit schemes, women in leadership roles, women empowerment) and DRR (systematically mainstreamed in programme activities) is real but there is no indicator to capture concrete outcome benefits stemming from efforts in these cross-cutting areas.
- 3) Reporting on indirect support has more negative than positive consequences (lack of transparency and accountability, no clear overview of the benefits of direct support, no control over indirect targets; challenging collection of robust data on indirect support).

Missed opportunities in relation to SMART OVIs are linked to the following questions.

- 1) How could we measure the quality of protection of key biodiversity entities or ecosystem services?
- 2) How could we measure the quality of resilience?
- 3) How could we measure the quality of livelihoods?
- 4) How could we measure the quality of policy?
- 5) How could we measure the quality of papers related to tenure/ownership?

BioDiversity International Ltd has developed a scorecard approach for measuring quality that also serves as a useful learning tool.

[Simplified theory of change to guide the evaluation linked to proposal development.](#)

A first attempt at this (for discussion purposes) is as follows.

Level of intervention logic	Formulation	Commentor innovative suggestion

Overall Objective	At least X% of target biodiverse communities in Cambodia feel that they are adequately equipped to protect a named biodiversity/ecosystem services asset by date Y	Many actors contribute to this
Project purpose	At least X% of PAFF 2 communities feel that they are adequately equipped to protect a named biodiversity/ecosystem services asset by date Y	This is the responsibility of PAFF partners and any study of the spread of benefits to areas outside PAFF beneficiaries will lead to valuable insights on “global impact pathways”
Outcome 1	At least X% of PAFF 2 communities have secure tenure allowing protection and the securing of loans by date Y	Quality M+E linked to the use of scorecards
Outcome 2	At least X% of PAFF 2 communities have adequate savings/income/assets allowing protection and the securing of loans by date Y	Quality M+E linked to the use of scorecards
Outcome 3	Partners have at least X verifiable and attributable procedural or policy reform suggestions that have been implemented by date Y	Quality M+E linked to the use of scorecards
Outcome 4	Donors/private sector/public private partnerships agree to pay at least \$X for the specified M&E data collection (direct and non-direct) critical lessons learned and donor coordination outputs from the partnership for at least the next 50 years	Quality M+E linked to the use of scorecards

Annex Ten Logical framework with comments linked to baseline and 2019 results.



Annex\_Logical  
framework annex

## Tool 7: Assessment Grid for the DAC Criteria

**Assessment Grid for project/programme evaluations of the SDC interventions** Version: 30.06.2020 **Note:** this assessment grid is used for evaluations of SDC financed projects and programmes (hereinafter jointly referred to as an 'intervention'). It is based on the OECD Development Assistance Committee evaluation criteria.<sup>7</sup> In mid-term evaluations, the assessment requires analysing the likelihood of achieving impact and sustainability. All applicable sub-criteria should be scored, and a short explanation should be provided.

Please add the corresponding number (0-4) representing your rating of the sub-criteria in the column 'score':

- 0 = not assessed
- 1 = highly satisfactory
- 2 = satisfactory
- 3 = unsatisfactory
- 4 = highly unsatisfactory

---

<sup>7</sup> For information on the 2019 revisions of the evaluation framework see: Better Criteria for Better Evaluations: Revised Evaluation Criteria. Definitions and Principles for Use, OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 2019.

Key aspects based on DAC Criteria	Score (put only integers: 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4)	Justification (please provide a short explanation for your score or why a criterion was not assessed)
<b>Relevance</b>		
<b>Note:</b> the assessment here captures the relevance of objectives and design at the time of evaluation. In the evaluation report, both relevance at the design stage as well as relevance at the time of evaluation should be discussed.		
1. The extent to which the objectives of the intervention respond to the needs and priorities of the target group.	3	Evaluation limited by a lack of definition of the target communities which is a variable name and not a clear target group (beneficiaries' statement) such as citizens below the poverty line. The key objectives (outcomes) are (1) Target communities have secure rights to their natural resources and are exercising (2) Households in target communities increase their income through sustainable community-based forest and fisheries related enterprises and strategies and (3) National and local enabling policy conditions support secure community rights over natural resources and the development of sustainable community-based enterprises. All of these remain relevant however land law and land ownership agroforestry are now of pivotal relevance for outcome (2). The programme is not very relevant to the poorest in the communities. They suffer from lack of proper food and this is manifested by a high incidence of child stunting.
2. The extent to which the objectives of the intervention respond to the needs and priorities of indirectly affected stakeholders (not included in target group, e.g., government, civil society, etc.) in the country of the intervention.	2	All the outcomes are of central relevance to government policy and practice in terms of the fisheries and forest sector. Objective 1 is of central relevance to Civil Society
3. The extent to which core design elements of the intervention (such as the theory of change, structure of the project components, choice of services and intervention partners) adequately reflect the needs and priorities of the target group.	4	The theory of change is <i>Working with Government, private sector, civil society, and rural communities, PaFF's contribution to improving stakeholders' implementation capacity, knowledge, and participation in development</i>

		<p><i>processes at national and local level will empower rural households to claim and secure their access to natural resources, as well as strengthen sustainable NRM and thus improve their income and livelihood resilience. This urgently needs to be changed in the light of lack of emphasis on some key areas. This was also questioned by a validation workshop participant that what does the project want to change? It is not clearly defined and conceptualised.</i></p> <p>In terms of design there are some serious deficiencies including (1) no clear end point description for the programme or the partnership. In addition, (2) No outcome with indicators in relation to the creation of a powerful partnership and (3) lack of indicators of behavioural change that would lead the programme to learn about possible motivation constraints to be overcome and incentives to be facilitated.</p> <p>The logical framework (PaFF2) is constructed in a way that does not empower adaptive management or the facilitation of direction. It is not fit for purpose. There is a severe lack of indicators related to quality of outcomes</p>
<p><b>Coherence</b></p> <p>4. Internal coherence: the extent to which the intervention is compatible with other interventions of Swiss development cooperation in the same country and thematic field (consistency, complementarity, and synergies).</p> <p>5. External coherence: the extent to which the intervention is compatible with interventions of other actors in the country and thematic field (complementarity and synergies).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Not in ToR</p> <p>This programme is focused on action by NGO government joint working and will be highly compatible with sector support approaches in fisheries funded by the EC and World Bank</p>
<p><b>Effectiveness</b></p> <p>6. The extent to which approaches/strategies during implementation are adequate to achieve the intended results.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The production of natural resources management plans is a key part of the project approach and strategy. It is hoped that these will empower rural households to claim and secure their access to natural resources, as well as strengthen</p>

		<p><i>sustainable NRM and thus improve their income and livelihood resilience.</i></p> <p>At present the plans are too expensive, not profitable for anyone, and too complicated for target communities to use. In addition, they do not capture the voice and plans of the people adequately, or the opportunities now offered by the internet and digital media for linking with powerful advisors and allies, monitoring the natural resources (webcams), and generating funds by asking for donations and selling community produced commodities and service.</p> <p>The income from the livelihood assistance is not enough to help people protect the resource and carry out many resource management aspirations. There is a need for a change in strategic focus towards credit and better synergy with government. The level of evaluation and learning within the partnership is not adequate for a programme of this size and nature.</p> <p>The synergy between outcomes of the programme is weak. A vital financial resource is invested in outcome 1, but a few in outcome 2 (livelihoods). In most cases, CFI and CF are not supported by outcome 2. Meanwhile, outcome 3 has focused more on the national policies whereas the local issues (illegal encroachment, fishing, and logging) that need immediate solution are not dealt with. However, some of the policy briefs are excellent.</p>
7. The extent to which the intervention achieved or is expected to achieve its intended objectives (outputs and outcomes).	2	Outcomes 1 and 3 will all be achieved but outcome 2 will not achieve the effectiveness expected
8. The extent to which the intervention achieved or is expected to achieve its intended results related to transversal themes.	2	The project is sensitive and is supportive towards issues linked to gender, environment, DRR and human rights
<b>Efficiency</b>		

9. The extent to which the intervention delivers the results (outputs, outcomes) cost-effectively.	3	Some are awfully expensive given the results especially the cost of income uplift per unit project expenditure. The project spent a significant amount of the budget to uplift a selected number of households, especially the committee members. As in outcome 1, while the project obtained agreements from FiA and FA and developed management plans to secure rights over the resources, in practice the resources are still threatened by the illegal land encroachment, and illegal logging and fishing.
10. The extent to which the intervention delivers the results (outputs, outcome) in a timely manner (within the intended timeframe or reasonably adjusted timeframe).	3	All outcomes are on track to reach the end of project targets, but we now have COVID which is (2020) and will (2021) slow down implementation and burn rate.
11. The extent to which management, monitoring and steering mechanisms support efficient implementation.	3	Monitoring of financial variance and physical outputs is excellent. Evaluation is extremely poor. This is linked to a lack of appropriate investment, appropriate human resources, and design issues linked to quality assessment of outcomes and outputs by the target communities and the government. Learning is also extremely poor linked to a lack of assumption testing and adequate recording systems for auspicious mistakes.
<b>Impact</b>		
12. The extent to which the intervention generated or is expected to generate 'higher-level effects' as defined in the design document of the intervention.  <b>Note:</b> when assessing this criterion, the primary focus is the intended 'higher-level effects'. If <i>significant</i> unintended negative or positive effects can be discerned, they must be specified in the justification column, especially if they influence the score.	3	Impact is probably being underestimated due to design. The indicators for resilience at the impact level are not powerful enough. These include simple and practical measures of environmental improvement and quality. Improved health and social capital (number of friends and advisors).  In relation to the four impact indicators: (1) area under formal agreements has increased and this is good. (2) Secure rights stated in outcome 1 has not been secured since a majority of CF and CFI are struggling to enforce their rights over the resources. Their resources have been threatened by perpetrators. (3) the numbers of household and individuals undertaking sustainable livelihood is an activity not an indicator,

		<p>(4) Increase in annual household income is good and has risen from \$36 to as much as \$228 in some selected households (community-based ecotourism). However, the number of households involved is not significant and sustaining the income in the face of COVID and other factors may be difficult.</p> <p>(5) Hectares of terrestrial and aquatic habitat conserved and managed has no evidence of achievement as indicators for the term conserved are absent.</p> <p>In summary impact is unsatisfactory due to inadequate income uplift, and insufficient environmental or rights improvement by the programme</p>
<b>Sustainability</b>		
<p>13. The extent to which partners are capable and motivated (technical capacity, ownership) to continue activities contributing to achieving the outcomes.</p>	3	<p>Target communities have probably gained new skills (not tested by the programme) and remain motivated by the opportunity to access state resources. However, this motivation continues to be eroded due to lack of adequate funds and adequate support by government. They derive their main income for agriculture. Agroforestry was not part of the design of the programme and remains a missed opportunity.</p> <p>Government motivation is compromised by major reorganisation of responsibilities linked to shift of responsibility between ministries and decentralisation issues e.g., provincial officers now report to the provincial governor. It is difficult to see what incentives government officers would obtain in relation to assisting non profitable natural resources management e.g., in degraded forests or fishing areas.</p> <p>After more than four years, the programme (PaFF2) appears not have modelled the sustainability for the target communities. BCE, CFI and CF credits, and mini-trust-fund schemes have just introduced, but they communities appear not to have acquired confident capacity to pursue the interest after PaFF2.</p>

<p>14. The extent to which partners have the financial resources to continue activities contributing to achieving the outcomes.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Only a small proportion of the livelihood activities are financially sustainable so other options will need to be explored. Contribution fund (projects) from the consortium partners focuses more on outcome 1 whereas the foundation of outcome 1, which is livelihoods (outcome 2), is minimally contributed. There is an imbalance investment in each outcome/component. Government budgets for forest protection and restoration are currently limited but funds for community fisheries may be increased due to donor budget support e.g., the EU. Natural resources management plans especially forestry are not affordable by the target communities</p>
<p>15. The extent to which contextual factors (e.g., legislation, politics, economic situation, social demands) is conducive to continuing activities leading to outcomes.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The key sustainability issues are the duration of any agreement on rights and usufruct for fishery and forestry. This is improving but is still not adequate. The programme has supported FiA and FA for several years, but, in the end, the FiA and FA are still claiming that they do not have enough resources (capacity and finance) to maintain the products produced by PaFF.</p> <p>The key demand is for community ownership of state land. This is a long-term possibility but without its sustainability is compromised.</p> <p>Long term stability of rights, further action on this and especially in relation to legislative and advocacy aspects</p> <p>The target areas of the programme are facing the influx of the domestic immigrants who put a significant pressure on the rights and resources of the communities (CFI and CF). COVID-19 has increased not only poverty rate but also unsustainable natural resource extraction rate (clearing land for farming).</p>

Title of the intervention: Phase-2 Program Final Evaluation and Phase-3 Proposal Development Partners for Forestry and Fisheries Program (PaFF 2)  
Assessor(s): Prof Steven M Newman and Dr Sokphea Young  
Date: 28/1/21

## **Management response to the PaFF 2 Final Evaluation Report and PaFF Management Response for the Final Evaluation Recommendation**

### **Management Response**

The Management Response (MR) states the position of the SDC on the recommendations of the PaFF2 Final Evaluation Report and PaFF team`s management response for the final evaluation recommendation. The MR provides a solid basis for strategic decision-making. The relevant stakeholders will be consulted.

### **Assessment of the evaluation**

The evaluation was conducted by a team of independent experts (Prof Steven M Newman, Team Leader and Dr Sokphea Young, Senior National Consultant) from BioDiversity International Ltd, UK in accordance with international standards. The evaluation process was under the management of PaFF team with close involvement of SDC`s responsible NPO. The main objectives according to the ToRs was to identify the key program achievements and impact, challenges, lessons learned and best practices which will inform for adaptive management of phase 2 and the program design and development of phase3 (final phase). The final program evaluation of PaFF2 was not expected to be extensive in details as the MTR carried out end of 2019, but rather focus on designing and formulating a proposal for the PaFF3. These objectives were only partially met by the evaluators. SDC appreciates some of the comprehensiveness of the evaluation report and the sound analysis of key elements of SDC`s contribution to the PaFF2.

Some of report`s analysis and resulting recommendations are considered to be useful for strengthening the strategic orientation of the final phase of PaFF which is planned to be as a joint contribution project with SIDA.

### **Main findings**

The evaluation presents 39 findings in relation to the standard OECD DAC evaluation entities. It states that PAFF is unique in Cambodia and if (1) PAFF 2 design problems identified by this evaluation team are sorted out; (2) the management team is augmented by a new director post, and technical assistance; and (3) it is equipped to turn from being a “mother” to many initiatives and organisations to letting her “children” thrive by enabling them to learn from their own mistakes, it should be supported until 2023 so that it can build on the following positive and possibly unique attributes and achievements:

1. A catalogue of data and auspicious mistakes related to the development of community based natural resources management.
2. An incredible amount of social capital in terms of friends, community champions and advisors
3. The ability to produce good communication materials such as newsletters that appreciate the work of its champions.
4. Community natural resources management groups that are at a stage where they could be made more powerful by federation and self-governance.

The final evaluation concluded the PaFF has achieved the agreed outputs. Policy relevance is high, but the relevance to the poorest in the communities is questionable. The wide geographical distribution of communities and high number of citizens involve is useful for rights-

based approach. There should be more effort to show the impact due to its limitation on M&E design. Some missed opportunities for improvements were high-lighted in particular for theory of change, impact indicators and log-frame, sustainability, effectiveness and efficiency, management, and MEL. Therefore, the final phase of PaFF should strengthen the MEL and carefully design with stronger impact indicator, sustainability, and more effective management structure.

Out of the 20 recommendations, 6 are 'fully agreed' (green), 12 are 'partially agreed' (orange) and 2 are not agreed ('disagree' - red) – see table below. SDC agrees to seize this opportunity to improve its results by taking specific measures in line with the recommendation.

1.	<b>Recommendation 1:</b> Produce a clear programme purpose and beneficiaries' statement so that the theory of change can be further development in phase 2 and set the basis for the design of phase 3.	Orange
2.	<b>Recommendation 2:</b> Locate best practice in the programme areas in terms of financially sustainable and or profitable entities e.g., CBNRM groups and actions of champions outlined in the last two newsletters, replicate them at all scales including the landscape scale.	Green
3.	<b>Recommendation 3:</b> Locate best practice in the programme areas in terms of impact defined as the spread of benefits away from programme areas and themes and replicate them using an understanding of impact pathways. The movement of champions is an especially important impact pathway.	Green
4.	<b>Recommendation 4.1:</b> FE acknowledges the achievements of CFi and CF management plans as a form of tenure, but this is not a permanent one. PaFF 3 should build on this achievement and move forward to permanent "ownership" by the CF and FA/PDAFF as a long-term aim.	Orange
5.	<b>Recommendation 4.2:</b> CFi should focus on what they have been doing. However, as financial resource is limited for CFi to patrol the entire fishery sanctuary/ boundary, the emphasis of CFi patrolling activity should pay more emphasis on deep pools conservation and protection even patrolling the entire CFi remains an important activity.	Orange
6.	<b>Recommendation 4.3:</b> Cultivating technology and social media to indirectly influence patrolling action. Other than the information dissemination through Telegram exchange, CFi, CF, and CFi and CF networks should show what they are doing, including reporting illegal cases and documenting evidence. There should Facebook page for each CFi and CF networks for them to circulate news and their activities which may be visible to the other communities across the border.	Green
7.	<b>Recommendation 5.1:</b> PaFF should focus on sustaining CFi and CF credits, and mini-trust-funds by actively engaging with PDAFF. PDAFF's office of agricultural cooperation and community development should be engaged to support PaFF's CFi and CF credit scheme.	Orange
8.	<b>Recommendation 5.2:</b> Obtain indirect support and capital to enhance livelihoods of CF, CFi and CPA through strengthening partnership with PDAFF (ASPIRE, CHAIN, CAPFISH, IWRM) to complement and broaden the PaFF's livelihoods approaches so that sustainability is improved. Agroforestry would be a good entry point.	Orange
9.	<b>Recommendation 5.3:</b> Diversifying income of CFi, CF and CPA. As we found that income from credits and mini-trust-fund interests are not sufficient for the patrolling activities, CFi and CF need to diversity their income sources. Some have done so such as those areas which are potential for CBETs and CBEs, the rest should seek partner with private sectors: agro-industry companies (which can be part of their management plan).	Green
10.	<b>Recommendation 5.4:</b> for CFi, collective fishing for commercial purpose should be examined and explored. This would be an additional but vital source of income for the community to remain active and sustainable as support from FiA is limited.	Orange
11.	<b>Recommendation 5.5:</b> Building on how CBEs, and CBETs, more should be investing in not only building visibility and impacts but also the markets for all community products that locals or foreigners may be interested in.	Orange

12. <b>Recommendation 5.6:</b> reaching the poor members of CF and CFi. Credit schemes have benefited several CFi and CF committee members, but more investment/ lending is needed for the poor members of CFi and CF. A condition should be set, at least 30% of the borrowers of the credit schemes should be the poor members who actively participate in CFi and CF activities.	Yellow	
13. <b>Recommendation 6.1:</b> Empowering CFi and CF provincial network to dialogue with, and influence local decision and accountability of FiA, FA and PDAFF.	Green	
14. <b>Recommendation 6.2:</b> The most important advocacy activities to be carried out at the national level is to ensure a constant increase in FiA, FA and PDAFF (in overall) budget allocation from the national level.	Red	
15. <b>Recommendation 7.1:</b> Strengthen human resources to achieve better focus with emphasis on post dealing with direction and not just management and evaluation and learning and not just monitoring in phase 3. This is to be done with existing partners. International technical assistance is vital to improve evaluation and learning and the contract should be of the same value as PAFF3 implementation.	Green	
16. <b>Recommendation 7.2:</b> Carry on rotation of lead agency and reorganise to boost strengths on (1) land access and ownership and (2) helping to government to sustain active engagement and support poor communities. In other words, RECOFTC should take on the lead. Partners retain the same roles as PAFF 2.	Yellow	
17. <b>Recommendation 8.1:</b> Dramatically improve MEL in phase 3 and develop the M&E plan to include (1) learning, (2) professional independent evaluation (3) quality improvement using participatory development of checklists and their evolution to scorecards sensitive to customer satisfaction and capturing voice.	Yellow	
18. <b>Recommendation 8.2:</b> Adopt the five capitals approach to DFID sustainable rural livelihoods approach in phase 3 and develop low cost practical and simple methods to assess impact in this way in relation to beneficiaries.	Yellow	
19. <b>Recommendation 8.3:</b> Generate a simple conceptual logical framework with an overall objective, project purpose behavioural results and assumptions as a tool for thinking to be used by those in the partnership concerned with strategic thinking.	Yellow	
20. <b>Special Recommendation 9</b> for Phase 3 based on the entire evaluation. The theory of change stated at the end of the report should be used for discussion purposes. A workshop could be organised using the 25% retained evaluation budget.	Red	
Fully agree	Partially agree	Disagree

**Overview of recommendations, management response and measures from SDC  
In addition to the PaFF Management Response:**

No.	PaFF-2 Final Evaluation Recommendations	PaFF Management Response	SDC Response
1	Design and Relevance  Recommendation 1.1: Produce a clear programme purpose and beneficiaries' statement so that the theory of change can be further developed in phase 2 and set the basis for the design of phase 3.	Partly agree.  Direct beneficiaries in PaFF2 have been clearly defined in the log frame; however, the indirect beneficiaries have been hard to track them due to limited access to data from non-PaFF partners.	Partially agree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.  SDC's guidance note for Theory of Change will be used as a tool for reviewing the PaFF3 project proposal. So it will be shared with PaFF team for reference. Moreover, "target populations" will be the common term for project's beneficiaries defined from each

		We will make an adjustment of the theory of change the clear beneficiaries' statement in the phase-3 design. We think, the recommendation to adjust the ToC in current Phase-2 would be difficult because time remains little left for the phase-2.	target group of the SDC's supported project, including PaFF3.
2	<p>Overall sustainability and impact</p> <p>Recommendation 2.0: Locate best practice in the programme areas in terms of financially sustainable and or profitable entities e.g., CBNRM groups and actions of champions outlined in the last two newsletters, replicate them at all scales including the landscape scale.</p>	Agree. The financial sustainability will be the core strategy of phase-3 development. PaFF will continue to promote CBNRM group champions through the newsletters and PaFF Facebook page.	<p>Fully agree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>Sustainable Financing Mechanism for community will be the core focus of SDC for the support to PaFF3. Furthermore, the good governance or ownership of the sector to those CBNRM groups will be also the important component of the project.</p>
3	<p>Recommendation 3.0: Locate best practice in the programme areas in terms of impact defined as the spread of benefits away from programme areas and themes and replicate them using an understanding of impact pathways. The movement of champions is an especially important impact pathway.</p>	Agree. The best practices in the programme areas in terms of impact defined will be incorporated into the PaFF-3 project designed and development.	Fully agree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.
4	<p>Outcome 1 rights</p> <p>Recommendation 4.1: FE acknowledges the achievements of CFi and CF management plans as a form of tenure, but this is not a permanent one. PaFF 3 should build on this achievement and move forward to permanent "ownership" by the CF and FA/PDAFF as a long-term aim.</p> <p>PaFF 3 should focus on assisting PDAFF and CF to register their forestland for an official</p>	Agree. This will strengthen the rights of communities to protect CF areas from land encroachment, but it is risky to achieve as key stakeholders of CF land titling are FA/PDAFF and PDLMUPC where communities seem to have no role beside verification boundary in the field, so it is depending on the commitment of FA/PDAFF and PDLMUPC. There are steps	<p>Partially agree with the recommendation and partially agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>CF agreement is the key legal binding to inform the tenure rights. Exercising the rights to benefit from the CF area is based on the management plan developed, approved and implemented.</p> <p>As responded by the PaFF Management Response, CF land registration is put as the obligation of</p>

	land title with the Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction (MLMUPC). CF committees suggest that the official land title must indicate that the land for community forestry and communal purpose (even the representative of MAFF, DPDAFF is mentioned as the representative owner of the public state land).	and process of land conflict resolution before issuing a land title, so it is difficult to budget the support of land conflict resolution and deliver output during the program period.	the FA of PDAFF/MAFF and technical and budget allocation from the MLMUPC and its line provincial departments.  In contrary to that, PaFF3 should assure the tenure rights of CF with the official land title through a facilitating role to ensure the set target in the PASDP implemented through key platforms and policy dialogue rather than a core focus of PaFF3.
5	Recommendation 4.2: CFi should focus on what they have been doing. However, as the financial resource is limited for CFi to patrol the entire fishery sanctuary/ boundary, the emphasis of CFi patrolling activity should pay more emphasis on deep pools conservation and protection even patrolling the entire CFi remains an important activity.	Partly agree. The focus of deep pools conservation within CFi areas will continue to implement in the PaFF-3 and the importance of deep pools protection have been highlighted in the CFi management plans; however, the conservation and patrol activities for the entire CFi area remains critically important.	Partially agree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.  The phase 3 of PaFF shall have well indicated on the logic of sustainable financing mechanism to support the management plan implementation of the CBNRM. EU budget support with fund transfer to CFi should be discussed clearly for the readiness of support to the patrolling activities and CFi development. PaFF3 added value to the CFi is on sustainable financing and policy influencing through revised law on Fisheries, CFi sub-decree, and CFi Networks.
6	Recommendation 4.3: Cultivating technology and social media to indirectly influence patrolling action. Other than the information dissemination through Telegram exchange, CFi, CF, and CFi and CF networks should show what they are doing, including reporting illegal cases and documenting evidence. There should Facebook page for each CFi and CF networks for them to circulate news and their activities which may be visible to the other communities across the border. Their experience may be	Partly agree. Using technology to increase networking, reaching out to outsiders for CFs/CFis and marketing of CBE products is a good idea but trainings on communication ethics and code of conduct about social media need to be provided.  However, using technology and social media (Telegram or Facebook) to report about the illegal activities and cases happening in CFs/CFis should be	Fully agree with the recommendation and partially agree with the PaFF Management Response.  Using technology and social media to increase visibility of CF, CFi, networks, and CBE across the border. It should be part of MEL at community level.  Training on ethics and code of conduct of using social media should be a topic for capacity building to management committee of CBNRM groups for PaFF3.  And as response by PaFF team, the SMART software and tools

	<p>adopted by other communities (other than that of PaFF's target areas). Training on ethics and code of conduct of using social media should be provided to the management committees when social media are to introduce.</p>	<p>avoided due to sensitivity and high risks leading up to potential court cases. Moreover, internet access and coverage of CFs/CFis and some villages, is limited and some places are impossible. .</p> <p>Addressing the illegal cases should be done through the existing platforms which involve the relevant stakeholders. The SMART software and tools should be introduced in PaFF-3 for the community patrolling teams.</p>	<p>should be equipped to each community as part of Community's MEL.</p> <p>Telegram is widely used by government from National to sub-national levels. PaFF's targeted communities had experienced receiving prompt support from the FA and local authorities for some cases that they had reported through Telegram in addition to other mechanisms have practiced in PaFF2.</p>
7	<p>Outcome 2 income</p> <p>Recommendation 5.1: PaFF should focus on sustaining CFI and CF credits, and mini-trust-funds by actively engaging with PDAFF. PDAFF's office of agricultural cooperation and community development should be engaged to support PaFF's CFI and CF credit scheme. In addition to local authorities, PDAFF is competent enough to ensure transparent and sustainable CFI and CF credits, and mini-trust-fund, after PaFF.</p>	<p>Partly agree. We need to check the policy under Agriculture Cooperative; it may have different objective and management structure from CF/CFi on credit schemes management.</p>	<p>Partially agree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>The management oversight of Credit Scheme and Mini-trust fund should include the participation of the sectoral office from the Forestry Administration under PDAFF and local authorities. The recommendation from the study on sustainable forest financing mechanism for CF should be considered for PaFF3.</p>
8	<p>Recommendation 5.2: Obtain indirect support and capital to enhance livelihoods of CF, CFI and CPA through strengthening partnership with PDAFF (ASPIRE, CHAIN, CAPFISH, IWRM) to complement and broaden the PaFF's livelihoods approaches so that sustainability is improved. Agroforestry would be a good entry point. CF and CFI, including their CBEs, can be part of PDAFF's agriculture cooperative. Integrating part of CF and CF's livelihood activities/ income generation activities with PDAFF's</p>	<p>Partly agree. Agroforestry has potential to have more engagement with PDAFF as well as seeking support from other on-going projects in the areas.</p> <p>CF/CFi could not be integrated with PDAFF agricultural cooperative (AC) because each entity has its own objective and different from each other even though they are both under MAFF, for example, CF/CFi have its own objective on management and</p>	<p>Partially agree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>Rather than maintaining its own livelihood activities PAFF3 should link to other on-going development projects as was also recommended by the MTR of PaFF2 and the findings of the final evaluation. SDC advocates to adapt the focus of PAFF3 to supporting sustainable financing mechanisms which are crucial for functioning CBNRM groups and for them to provide benefits to the livelihoods of its members. The PaFF3</p>

	agriculture cooperative is the key entry point of the PaFF.	conservation of the natural resource despite there is the operation of the CBE and credit schemes, it's operated in the framework of CF/CFis objective where AC is more concentrated on business operation and income generation.	MEL will be defined clearly to capture the changes of community's livelihood improvement and NRM.
9	Recommendation 5.3: Diversifying income of CFi, CF and CPA. As we found that income from credits and mini-trust-fund interests are not sufficient for the patrolling activities, CFi and CF need to diversify their income sources. Some have done so such as those areas which are potential for CBETs and CBEs, the rest should seek a partner with private sectors: agro-industry companies (which can be part of their management plan). In Preah Vihear for instance, agro-industry companies are seeking to collaborate with CF for tree plantation. This is just an example.	Agree. PaFF-3 will explore the involvement of the private companies with the selected target of CFs/CFis through CBEs and agro-forestry activities. The potential partnership between CFs/CFis could be formed if possible (diligence of the companies need to be conducted).	<p>Fully agree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>But PaFF3 will engage with a limitation through CBE.</p> <p>As mentioned above for some reasons of adaptation, SDC advocates to adapt the focus of PAFF3 to supporting sustainable financing mechanisms which are crucial for functioning CBNRM groups and for them to provide benefits to the livelihoods of its members. The PaFF3 MEL will be defined clearly to capture the changes of community's livelihood improvement and NRM.</p> <p>Collaboration between CF and agro-industry companies on tree plantation as well as timber harvesting will also a possible approach. This should be carefully defined in the PaFF3 link to the on-going pilot project of CF plantation and timber harvesting.</p>
10	Recommendation 5.4: for CFi, collective fishing for commercial purpose should be examined and explored. This would be an additional but vital source of income for the community to remain active and sustainable as support from FiA is limited.	Agree. PaFF-3 will implement collective fishing for commercial purpose. The process will require a lot of regulations and monitoring system to put in place with close engagement from the stakeholders especially the FiA cantonments and CFi members to ensure the ac-	<p>Partially agree with the recommendation and partially agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>Examination and exploration of collective fishing for commercial purpose is a good proposal for PaFF3 as PaFF team have been working on policy influencing to</p>

		<p>countability and transparency of the processes and benefit-sharing.</p>	<p>have it in the revised law on Fisheries and CFI Sub decree amendment.</p> <p>Per the current context and speed of finalization and endorsement of the revised law on Fisheries, the PaFF3 should put as the continue policy influencing and readiness for CFIIMP with clear plan and target for commercial fishing for collective purpose.</p>
11	<p>Recommendation 5.5: Building on how CBEs, and CBETs, more should be investing in not only building visibility and impacts but also the markets for all community products that locals or foreigners may be interested in. CBETs have been on social media that proliferate the images of PaFF and communities. This social media platform could be a fund-raising platform as they reached out to visitors and stakeholders.</p>	<p>Disagree. It's not feasible in the Cambodia context. it will require legal documentation and official recognition from the relevant government.</p> <p>The CBEs component will be scaling down in PaFF-3 and the focus will be on using the best performance CBEs to disseminate the best practices among other groups, market linkage for selected products (honey, CBET and Traing chopstick) and enabling policies at the national level.</p>	<p>Partially agree with the recommendation and partially agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>As mentioned above for some reasons of adaptation, SDC advocates to adapt the focus of PAFF3 to supporting sustainable financing mechanisms which are crucial for functioning CBNRM groups and for them to provide benefits to the livelihoods of its members. The PaFF3 MEL will be defined clearly to capture the changes of community's livelihood improvement and NRM.</p> <p>CBE and CBET will be consolidated in PaFF2 by end of June 2021. Their operation and function will be followed up to inform the impact pathway when they will be under the management of CBNRM groups. Those CBE and CBETs will be able to access the credit from credit groups.</p>
12	<p>Recommendation 5.6: reaching the poor members of CF and CFI. Credit schemes have benefited several CFI and CF committee members, but more investment/ lending is needed for the poor members of CFI and CF. A condition should be set, at least 30% of the borrowers of the credit schemes should be the poor members who actively participate in CFI</p>	<p>Disagree. The program could not interfere with the selection of CF credit members. PaFF empowers CF/CFI credit management committee to manage and make decisions on whom should be members of the groups.</p>	<p>Partially agree with the recommendation and partially agree with the PaFF Management response.</p> <p>As responded by the PaFF Management, the program could not interfere with the selection of CF credit member.</p> <p>However, the recommendation from the Final Evaluation should</p>

	and CF activities. The demand for credits and the use of these schemes are contributed indirectly to reducing pressure on natural resources (but have not been assessed) as the loan was invested in rice and crop cultivation, and livestock raising.		be considered for some adaptation to remind the selection process of credit members and updated the membership in PaFF3 to have at least 30% of the members are from the poor and who actively participate in the CF or CFi. Moreover, the monitoring tool should be in place for MEL at community level to measure the impact of credit scheme to community members and NRM.
13	<p>Outcome 3 policy</p> <p>Recommendation 6.1: Empowering CFi and CF provincial network to dialogue with, and influence local decision and accountability of FiA, FA and PDAFF. CFi and CF networks have been of importance to the communities and FiA and FA. However, the role of network should go beyond the coordination, exchange and sharing of information, by adopting soft advocacy (including lobbying and dialogue approaches) with FiA, FA, District and Provincial Authorities. This can be done through regularly attending the commune, district and provincial forum to lobby and raise issues being faced by CFi and CF.</p>	Agree.	<p>Fully agree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>This has been done well in PaFF2. Furthermore, PaFF3 development should also focus on the facilitation of having the support from each CF and CFi as well as budget allocation from FA, FiA and local authorities for functioning the network of CF and CFi. This will also need to consider the operational plan of the network and budgeting.</p>
14	<p>Recommendation 6.2: The most important advocacy activities to be carried out at the national level is to ensure a constant increase in FiA, FA and PDAFF (in overall) budget allocation from the national level. Effort has been made by FiA, with the support of EU Capfish programme, in recruiting young/ university student volunteers (with the possibility of enlisting as FiA officials in the future) to work with CFi. Capfish programme is also</p>	<p>Disagree. This is out of control of PaFF team to ensure a constant increase of the national budget for the fisheries and forestry sector. We could lobby the government to increase more budgets to support communities through technical working groups, however, there is no need to provide technical assistant to PDAFF to formulate their annual</p>	<p>Disagree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>PaFF3 should less focus on Fisheries. EU mandated FAO under EU CapFish program for technical assistance and capacity building to Fisheries at all levels including the PASDP development and budgeting for each province.</p> <p>The value added of PaFF2 and also for PaFF3 is to ensure the intervention of PaFF well aligned and integrated in the PASDP and</p>

	<p>funding. FiA's small grant (up to \$1000 per year for about 150 CFi country-wide); PaFF should explore this opportunity and join hand with EU and other donors like IFAD. PaFF should also be able to provide technical assistance to PDAFF is formulating their annual budget and defending their proposal with Ministry of Economy and Finance's (MEF) budget committee. Similar approach should be applied to FA. The decentralization, including the new initiative (district office of agricultural, NRM and environment), appears not to be feasible supporters of CF and CFi, given their limited capacity and resources. This office is more about coordination rather than possessing financial resources and technical assistance to support the communities.</p>	<p>budget, they're fully competent.</p>	<p>FiA central (to avoid duplication) and lobbying for a joint monitoring mechanism between NGOs and FiAC based on the set target in the PASDP.</p>
15	<p>Direction, management, and MEL</p> <p>Recommendation 7.1: Strengthen human resources to achieve better focus with emphasis on post dealing with direction and not just management and evaluation and learning and not just monitoring in phase 3. This is to be done with existing partners. International technical assistance is vital to improve evaluation and learning and the contract should be of the same value as PAFF3 implementation.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>Fully agree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>PaFF3 should focus on international expertise from people who are based in Cambodia.</p>
16	<p>Recommendation 7.2: Carry on rotation of lead agency and reorganise to boost strengths on (1) land access and ownership and (2) helping to government to sustain active engagement</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>Partially agree with the recommendation and partially agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>As mentioned above for some reasons of adaptation, SDC advocates to adapt the focus of PAFF3</p>

	and support poor communities. In other words, RECOFTC should take on the lead. Partners retain the same roles as PAFF 2.		<p>to supporting sustainable financing mechanisms which are crucial for functioning CBNRM groups and for them to provide benefits to the livelihoods of its members. The PaFF3 MEL should be defined clearly to capture the changes of community's livelihood improvement and NRM.</p> <p>The partnership of PaFF NGOs for PaFF3 will remain as PaFF2, but some adjustment is required based on scope of work in PaFF3. The rotation of lead agency will be the consensus of PaFF ExeCom based on scope of work and joint funding opportunity from SDC with other donors (as expected from SIDA).</p>
17	Recommendation 8.1: Dramatically improve MEL in phase 3 and develop the M&E plan to include (1) learning, (2) professional independent evaluation (3) quality improvement using participatory development of checklists and their evolution to scorecards sensitive to customer satisfaction and capturing voice.	Agree. The quality improvement tools will be defined by the selected external evaluation company.	<p>Partially agree with the recommendation and partially agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>PaFF3 should have a proper MEL system and plan. Its elements will be supported by the in-country experts (national or international firms). The MEL will help assessing the accumulated result of PaFF since phase1 until end of phase3. The impact and sustainability will also generate from it. The contribution of PaFF for poverty reduction and CCA-M/forest cover changed in the target provinces will be consulted with MEL experts.</p>
18	Recommendation 8.2: Adopt the five capitals approach to DFID sustainable rural livelihoods approach in phase 3 and develop low cost practical and simple methods to assess impact in this way in relation to beneficiaries.	Partly agree as we concern that the capacity of the program interventions may not be fully contributed to the improvement of the five assets. This will be raised and consulted with the selected external evaluation company on the integrating of DFID	<p>Partially agree with the recommendation and partially agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>M&amp;E cannot be fully delegated to an external evaluation company; the PaFF partners have to define the MEL system for PaFF3. The integration of the 5-assets framework should be considered in the development of PaFF3. Reasons</p>

		framework and measuring the impact.	<p>should be given if it is considered not feasible.</p> <p>Moreover, Human rights based approach, DRR, CCA-M, and good governance in the NRM have been set as the basis of PaFF design as an 8-year programme.</p> <p>As mentioned above for some reasons of adaptation, SDC advocates to adapt the focus of PAFF3 to supporting sustainable financing mechanisms which are crucial for functioning CBNRM groups and for them to provide benefits to the livelihoods of its members. The PaFF3 MEL should be defined clearly to capture the changes of community`s livelihood improvement and NRM, for example, through the 5-assets approach.</p>
19	<p>Recommendation 8.3: Generate a simple conceptual logical framework with an overall objective, project purpose behavioral results and assumptions as a tool for thinking to be used by those in the partnership concerned with strategic thinking.</p>	<p>Partly agree. PaFF-3 log-frame will include behavioral change indicators and assumptions.</p>	<p>Partially agree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p> <p>A logical frame work is mandatory tool for monitoring for SDC. So clear information of expected results, indicator and target including baseline are required. SDC will use the guidance note for logical framework to assess the quality. It was shared to PaFF team during the PaFF3 development process.</p>
20	<p>Special Recommendation 9 for Phase 3 based on the entire evaluation, the following rather verbose theory of change should be used for discussion purposes. A workshop could be organized using the 25% retained evaluation budget.</p>	<p>Disagree. PaFF has formed the design team for PaFF-3 due to low performance of the final evaluation consultant and the contract of the final evaluation consultant was finished by 28<sup>th</sup> January 2021.</p> <p>The remaining budget is used to hire the national consultant to support PaFF-3 design team.</p>	<p>Disagree with the recommendation and fully agree with the PaFF Management Response.</p>

Annex: List of Acronym

CBE	Community Based Enterprise
CBET	Community-Based Eco-tourism
CF	Community Forestry
CFi	Community Fisheries
CFIMC	Community Fisheries Management Committee
CFiMP	Community Fisheries Management Plan
CFIN	Community Fisheries Network
CFMC	Community Forestry Management Committee
CFMP	Community Forestry Management Plan
CPA	Community Protected Area
FA	Forestry Administration
FAC	Forestry Administration Cantonment
FiA	Fisheries Administration
FiAC	Fisheries Administration Cantonment
FE	Final Evaluation
PaFF	Partnership for Forestry and Fishery project
PDAFF	Provincial Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
PDLMUPC	Provincial Department of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction
MLMUPC	Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning