

DECEMBER 27, 2018



## TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT *FOR UNDP/GEF PROJECT*

### ***GENERATING, ACCESSING AND USING INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE RELATED TO THE THREE RIO CONVENTIONS***



**GEF Project ID:** 5292

**UNDP/GEF ID:** 5222

**Agency's Project ID:** 00092117

**Evaluation Period:** Oct.- Dec. 2018

**Date of Evaluation Report:** 10 December 2018

**Country and Region:** Cambodia, Asia and the Pacific

**GEF Operational Program:** CD-2, CD-4

**Executing Partner:** GSSD/MOE

**GEF Agency:** UNDP

Terminal Evaluation Independent Consultant: Dr. Amal Aldababseh  
adababseh@estidama-jo.com

**Acknowledgments:**

*The Terminal Evaluation Consultant (TEC) would mainly like to acknowledge the support of the UNDP Cambodia and the GSSD/Ministry of Environment Project Management Unit during this evaluation. The TEC is particularly indebted to the Programme Analyst, UNDP Cambodia, and Project Coordinator at GSSD/MOE for their help in planning the focus of the review and organizing the mission.*

*The TEC would like to share the sincerest gratitude to all partners and stakeholders of the Project who gave of their time, and experience during the terminal evaluation and sharing their experiences and insights on this project. Without their valuable input, the work could not have been accomplished.*

*The TEC wishes to thank the representatives of the piloting site staff and the primary school deputy principal in the Siam Reap Province who gave of their time during the field visit and proved to be helpful, and informative, and all of whom were supportive of the project and its delivery.*

*We would like also to thank the concerned Ministries of the Government of Cambodia for the efforts made by them to ensure a smooth and successful evaluation.*

## ii. Table of Contents

---

<b>1.</b>	<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Project Summary Table.....	5
1.2	Project Description .....	5
1.3	Evaluation Rating Table .....	6
1.4	Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations, and Lessons learned.....	7
<b>2.</b>	<b>Acronyms and abbreviations.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>12</b>
1.1	Purpose of the Evaluation.....	12
1.2	Scope and Methodology .....	12
1.3	Structure of the Evaluation Report.....	14
<b>2.</b>	<b>Project Description and Development Context.....</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1	Project start and duration.....	15
2.2	Problems that the project sought to address .....	15
2.3	Immediate and development objectives of the project .....	16
2.4	Baseline Indicators Established.....	17
2.5	Main Stakeholders .....	17
2.6	Expected Results .....	18
<b>3.</b>	<b>Findings .....</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1	Project Design/ Formulation.....	19
3.1.1	Analysis of the LFA/Results Framework (Project logic/ Strategy, Indicators) .....	19
3.1.2	Assumptions and Risks .....	20
3.1.3	Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design.	21
3.1.4	Planned stakeholder participation .....	21
3.1.5	Replication approach.....	22
3.1.6	UNDP comparative advantage .....	23
3.1.7	Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector	23
3.1.8	Management arrangement .....	24
3.2	Project Implementation.....	27
3.2.1	Adaptive Management.....	27
3.2.2	Partnership arrangements .....	28
3.2.3	Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.....	29
3.2.4	Project Finance .....	31
3.2.5	Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*) .....	27
3.2.6	UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation/execution coordination, and operational issues (*) .....	29
3.3	Project Results .....	31

3.3.1 Overall Results (attainment of objectives) (*).....	31
3.3.2 Relevance (*) .....	36
3.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency (*) .....	36
3.3.4 Country Ownership .....	37
3.3.5 Mainstreaming .....	38
3.3.6 Sustainability (*) .....	38
3.3.7 Impact.....	40
<b>4. Conclusions, Recommendations &amp; Lessons .....</b>	<b>41</b>
4.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project .....	41
4.2 Actions to follow up or reinforce the initial benefits from the project .....	42
4.3 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives .....	42
4.4 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success .....	43
<b>5. Annexes .....</b>	<b>44</b>
Annex 1. ToR.....	45
Annex 2. List of documents reviewed.....	52
Annex 3: Itinerary .....	53
Annex 4. List of persons interviewed.....	56
Annex 5. Evaluative Question Matrix .....	57
Annex 6. The questionnaire used for the interviews.....	63
Annex 7: List of Project’s Key Events .....	65
Annex 8: Changes on the Log-frame proposed during the Project’ Inception Workshop.....	67
Annex 9: Progress evaluation for the complete Log-frame.....	69
Annex 10: Updated Capacity Scorecards.....	89
Annex 11: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form .....	93
Annex 12: Evaluation Report Clearance Form.....	94

**List of Tables:**

Table 1: Rating Project Performance .....	6
Table 2: Overview of the Terminal Evaluation of the Project's Log-frame .....	20
Table 3: The list of experts who were involved in the Project in Cambodia .....	26
Table 4: Project Budget and Expenditures (US\$).....	32
Table 5: Co-financing of Project Partner (US\$).....	32
Table 6: Matrix for rating the Achievement of Outcomes .....	32

## 1. Executive Summary

### 1.1 Project Summary Table

Project Title: Generating, Accessing and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions		
GEF Project ID:	5292	
UNDP ID	00092117	
UNDP GEF Project ID (PIMS #):	5222	
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Project ID:	KHM 00083830	
Country(ies):	Cambodia	
Region:	Asia and the Pacific	
Focal Area:	Multi-focal	
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	CD-2, CD-4	
Trust Fund (GEF)	GEFTF	
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner	UNDP, Implementing Partner: GSSD/MoE	
Project Financing	at CEO endorsement	at TE – Nov. 2018 (US\$)
[1] GEF financing:	990,000	966,457
[2] UNDP contribution:	1,150,000	971,499
[3] Government:	150,000	109,450
[4] Other partners:	-	-
[5] Total co-financing [2+3+4]:	1,300,000	1,080,949
PROJECT TOTAL COST [1+5]	2,290,000	2,047,406
Project Document Signature Date	14 January 2015	
Closing date	Proposed 21 Dec. 2017	Actual 31 Dec. 2018

### 1.2 Project Description

The Generating, Accessing and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions Project implementation is through the United Nations Development Programme in Cambodia and project execution is through National Government Execution, namely the GSSD/Ministry of Environment (MoE).

The **goal** of the Project was to *improve the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia through the development of national capacities to better coordinate and generate better information related to the implementation of these Conventions*. The proposed project was supposed to develop the crosscutting capacity to respond to the needs of the three conventions; particularly the reporting requirements. During the project implementation, the coordination and information generation capacities of the focal points established by the government were supposed to be enhanced.

The project's **objective** was to *improve access to environmental information related to the Rio Conventions through the harmonization of existing environmental management information systems and improving coordination of the implementation of these conventions in Cambodia*. The harmonization of these existing systems was translated into better access to information related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia. As a result, the project was designed to lead to both direct and indirect global benefits.

To achieve the project's goal and objective, the project has **two components** (mentioned in the logical framework as the project's outcomes), and **seven outputs**. The project's components/outcomes are *improved access and generation of information related to the*

three Rio Conventions, and improved use of information and knowledge related to the Rio Conventions.

The project was designed to be innovative by setting up a network of enhanced information exchange, dialogue, and cooperation between the state agencies and other civil society stakeholders. With the greatly improved information generated and accessible, the proposed set up was supposed to provide the basis for better monitoring the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia and be input into planning and design of other development activities across the country.

### 1.3 Evaluation Rating Table

Although the Project has faced a long delay during its inception phase, the Project has still had several significant achievements. Overall project's rating is provided in Table 1.

**Table 1: Rating Project Performance<sup>1</sup>**

Criteria	Rating
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation:</b> Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	
<b>Overall quality of M&amp;E</b>	<b>S</b>
M&E design at project startup	<b>S</b>
M&E Plan Implementation	<b>S</b>
<b>IA &amp; EA Execution:</b> Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	
Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	<b>S</b>
Implementing Agency Execution	<b>S</b>
Executing Agency Execution	<b>S</b>
<b>Outcomes:</b> Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	
<b>Overall Quality of Project Outcomes</b>	<b>MS</b>
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	<b>R</b>
Effectiveness	<b>MS</b>
Efficiency	<b>MS</b>
<b>Sustainability:</b> Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).	
Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	<b>ML</b>
Financial resources	<b>ML</b>
Socio-economic	<b>L</b>
Institutional framework and governance	<b>ML</b>
Environmental	<b>L</b>
<b>Impact:</b> Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)	
Environmental Status Improvement	<b>S</b>
Environmental Stress Reduction (rate 3 pt. scale)	<b>3</b>
Progress towards stress/status change (rate 3 pt. scale)	<b>2</b>
<b>Overall Project Results</b>	<b>MS</b>

<sup>1</sup> The rating for the main evaluation criteria is narratively highlighted in the report; other rating is not. Rating explanations: HS- Highly Satisfactory; S- Satisfactory; MS- Moderately Satisfactory; MU – Moderately Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory; HU – Highly Unsatisfactory; UA – Unable to Assess; N/A – Not Applicable Sustainability ratings: L – Likely; ML – Moderately Likely; MU – Moderately Unlikely; U – Unlikely. Impact ratings: Significant (S); Minimal (M); Negligible (N).

## 1.4 Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations, and Lessons learned

### *Summary of Conclusions*

The project has had a considerable effect on improving access to environmental information to the Rio Conventions through the harmonization of existing environmental management information systems and improving coordination of the implementation of these conventions in Cambodia. It achieved major milestones that are crucial to the realization of its objectives, it has achieved key targets including, developing inventory of existing information/information management, conducting SWOT analysis on effectiveness and efficiency of existing environmental information management system in Cambodia; defining institutions and bodies that generate data and information concerning the Rio Conventions in Cambodia and conducting SWOT analysis and recommendations on the best action for the project to follow; reviewing of capacity building tools; analyzing capacity building for the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia and conducting SWOT analyses, and designing and launching of existing websites related to the Rio Conventions in Cambodia. The Project proved to be successful in leveraging co-financing from the government mainly through the Orchid Piloting site in Phnom Kulen National Park / Siem Reap Province.

The project was able to complete many of the planned activities within four years (acknowledging that during the first year there was no work, so the one-year extension with no cost requested to finalize the remaining project's activities is considered logic).

Like other projects under the GEF CCCD multi-focal area, the Project is considered complex, multi-sectoral and involve multi-stakeholders. In addition, the delay the project faces during the inception phase is also like other CCCD projects due to the difficulties to mobilize the right team to manage and lead the project activities. Due to these reasons, the project overall rating is **Moderately Satisfactory**.

The Project is very much acknowledged by the Government of Cambodia. It is considered relevant to the national context and to the UNDP programmatic direction. Many positive results have been already achieved, yet, there remains a need to continue consolidating results and promoting lessons learned from the Project experiences. There are some very positive indications for potential sustainability, but that would need confirmed funding for follow-up activities. Without a confirmed financial government commitment prospects for sustainability are uncertain, and overall sustainability is considered **moderately likely**.

### *Recommendations:*

**Recommendation 1:** As nine major Project's products will be finalized by early December 2018 (a month before the project official closure) and will be discussed and endorsed at a national workshop during the third week of December, an urgent and clear plan of action needs to be developed to ensure the utilization of these products after 2018 to ensure Project's outcomes sustainability. These products include *the 5-years capacity development plan, the strategy to bring the synergy among the Rio conventions in its implantation, the Roadmap, and action plan to implement partnership and communication strategy, as well as the guidebook to produce a joint report for the Rio Conventions (UNDP, GSSD/MOE, and MAFF)*

**Recommendation 2:** The Project has managed to produce a set of valued public awareness products on the Rio Conventions and is currently in the process to finalize the CEPA (Communication, Education, Public Awareness) package on the synergy among the Rio Conventions. It is recommended to develop a dissemination plan for those public awareness and outreach tools as part of the DBD, DCC, and CCD future work, to ensure that future initiatives would build on the Project activities and results and will incorporate the project's products in its work. **(UNDP, GSSD/MOE and MAFF).**

**Recommendation 3:** Despite the fact the TE was unable to review several Project's products as they are not finalized yet, it is recommended that the remaining project training and piloting activities be completed as soon as possible, including piloting the testing of the economic valuation tools in Siem Reap Province that incorporating environmental economic valuations for ecosystem services, which aimed to demonstrate measurable indicators of delivering global environment benefits. (**UNDP, and GSSD/MoE**).

**Recommendation 4:** The work to improve access to data and enhance national capacities for Rio conventions implementing has just begun through this Project. It still at the early stages hence other UNDP and Government of Cambodia initiatives and projects should continue working on the upgrading of the national capacity, the infrastructure, and project's deliverables produced to ensure that the Country will achieve the Project's Objective (**GSSD/MOE, UNDP, development partners, and donor agencies**).

### **Lessons Learned**

**Lesson learned 1:** The Project was able to deliver significant achievements despite the challenging circumstances it faced at the inception phase including its small size in relation to the planned deliverables and being the first project to follow the national implementation modality. The Project was able to make good progress in establishing a strong foundation on which future and further work on accessing environmental data in Cambodia can be carried out. It can be noted that this was achieved by the dedication, flexibility, and determination with which the GSSD/MoE, PMU, UNDP Cambodia, UNDP/GEF, and other key stakeholders have implemented the project activities. Thus, this Project demonstrated that even in challenging project implementation contexts, with dedication and flexibility, important results can be achieved.

**Lesson learned 2:** When technical capacity is considered as a challenging situation at the national level, it is very critical to define a clear project management structure that embeds the services of international technical advisors at various levels of project implementation. In Cambodia, this Project required the involvement of technical advisors to support the PMU in project implementation. However, that was not well-articulated in the Project Document, hence, it was not fully discussed during the Project Inception Phase. Furthermore, the Project has faced several problems in mobilizing the needed technical advisors on time. As a result, the involvement of external international specialists was late which has caused further delay in project implementation. The presence of a technical advisor from the early beginning of the project implementation is crucial to ensure the successful implementation of the project's activities. The UNDP/GEF team may develop a list of qualified technical advisors, who can be easily mobilized by country officers to support CCCD projects implementation.

**Lesson learned 3:** Based on the review of the technical deliverables produced by the Project, the effectiveness of relatively small amounts of assistance mobilized by the GEF initially was highly effective in supporting the national efforts and shows that even in a complex situation, the institutional capacity can be sustained with this initial stimulation. The successful implementation of the Project depends on the fund's availability, strong political support, and the mobilization of technical expertise needed. Hence, an exit strategy is very crucial to ensure the integration of the Project's deliverables in governments work plan and strategies to ensure projects' results sustainability.

**Lesson learned 4:** Timely support to the PMU is needed from the UNDP/GEF and UNDP Country Offices to ensure the development of the needed adaptive management measures to be undertaken during the project inception phase. This could have helped the Project to avoid delay and support the project to utilize whatever opportunities arising that would lead to improved cost-efficiency, and/or offers solutions to a problem. Although this Project is very relevant to Cambodia and was entirely based on its NCSA Project, different operational issues

resulted in slowing down the project implementation and have caused uncertainty with respect to the project's sustainability. The UNDP/GEF technical support is very crucial during the inception phase to ensure that operational risks are clearly analyzed at the project inception stage as well as regularly during project implementation with concrete mitigation measures to be identified as part of the adaptive management.

**Lesson learned 5:** A key to ensuring successful implementation of the project's activities and the sustainability of its key deliverables is to ensure the country ownership. Hosting the PMU within the government premises is a very effective mean of fully engaging with government and local stakeholders. The project was hosted at the GSSD/MoE premises. The project was able to get the needed political, technical, financial, and logistical support. It has enhanced the ability of the PMU to coordinate and collaborate with other initiatives implemented in the fields of climate change, land degradation, and biodiversity conservation.

## 2. Acronyms and abbreviations

---

<b>ADB</b>	Asian Development Bank
<b>APR</b>	Annual Progress Report
<b>AWP</b>	Annual Work Plan
<b>CCCD</b>	Cross-Cutting Capacity Development
<b>CDRs</b>	Combined delivery reports
<b>CDTA</b>	Capacity Development Technical Advisor
<b>CEPA</b>	Communication, Education and Public Awareness
<b>CHM</b>	Clearing-House Mechanism
<b>CO</b>	Country Office
<b>COP</b>	Conference of Parties
<b>CPAP</b>	Country Programme Action Plan
<b>DBD</b>	Department of Biodiversity
<b>EA</b>	Executing Agency
<b>EMIS</b>	Environmental Management Information System
<b>IMS</b>	Information Management System
<b>IR</b>	Inception Report
<b>GEF</b>	Global Environment Facility
<b>GEF CEO</b>	Global Environment Facility Chief Executive Officer
<b>GDANCP</b>	General Department of Administration for Nature Conservation and Protection
<b>GIZ</b>	German Corporation for International Cooperation
<b>GSSD</b>	General Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development
<b>GOC</b>	Government of Cambodia
<b>HACT</b>	Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers
<b>LFA</b>	Logical Framework
<b>M&amp;E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>MDGs</b>	Millennium Development Goals
<b>MEAs</b>	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
<b>MAFF</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries
<b>MLMUPC</b>	Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction
<b>MME</b>	Ministry of Mines and Energy
<b>MoE</b>	Ministry of Environment
<b>MOU</b>	Memorandum of Understanding
<b>MOWA</b>	Ministry of Women Affairs
<b>MOWRAM</b>	Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology
<b>MOEYS</b>	Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport
<b>MoH</b>	Ministry of Health
<b>MoT</b>	Ministry of Tourism
<b>MTR</b>	Mid-term Review
<b>MPWT</b>	Ministry of Public Works and Transportation
<b>MRD</b>	Ministry of Rural Development
<b>NAP</b>	National Adaptation Plan
<b>NAPA</b>	National Adaptation Programme of Action
<b>NBC</b>	National Biodiversity Committee
<b>NCSA</b>	National Capacity Self-Assessment
<b>NCSDD</b>	National Council for Sustainable Development
<b>NIM</b>	National Implementation Modality
<b>NPD</b>	National Project Director
<b>PAC</b>	Project Appraisal Committee

<b>PB</b>	Project Board
<b>PC</b>	Project Coordinator
<b>PIR</b>	Project Implementation Report
<b>PMU</b>	Project Management Unit
<b>RTA</b>	Regional Technical Advisor
<b>RUPP</b>	Royal University of Phnom Penh
<b>SDGs</b>	Sustainable Development Goals
<b>SGP</b>	Small Grants Programme
<b>TE</b>	Terminal Evaluation
<b>TWG</b>	Technical Working Group
<b>UNCBD</b>	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
<b>UNCCD</b>	United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification
<b>UNFCCC</b>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
<b>UNDAF</b>	United Nations Development Assistant Framework
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNDP CO</b>	United Nations Development Programme- Country Office
<b>UNDP-GEF</b>	United Nations Development Programme- Global Environment Facility

## 1. Introduction

---

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) is an integral component of the UNDP-supported GEF-financed project cycle management. This report for the TE of the UNDP/GEF Project “**Generating, Accessing and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions**” (hereafter called “Project”) covers the main items that should be included in TE report according to the UNDP/GEF terminal evaluation guide<sup>2</sup>. The TE was carried out in three phases: a desk review; 2) a mission to Cambodia to meet with the implementing and executing agencies; and 3) drafting and finalizing the TE report and share with the concerned stakeholders for review and feedback.

### 1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

As a full-size UNDP-supported and GEF-financed project, the Project is required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation, as per the UNDP and the GEF evaluation policies and procedures.

This TE is envisioned to provide evidence-based credible, useful, and reliable information. The TE produces a set of recommendations and a list of lessons to help guide future design and implementation of GEF-funded UNDP activities and contributes to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefits.

This TE is based on a performance assessment approach guided by the principles of results-based management. The evaluation reviews the implementation experience and achievement of the project results against the Project Document endorsed by the GEF CEO, including any changes made during the inception phase, and tracks impact per the project’s outcome as listed in the Project’s Logical Framework. The contribution of this project is evaluated with reference to the achievement of the project outcomes and the overall objective.

This report concerns the TE of the project “**Generating, Accessing and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions**” to assess project results achieved since its actual commencement.

### 1.2 Scope and Methodology

#### **Scope:**

This TE has been conducted according to the guidance, rules, and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The evaluation used the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined, and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting TE of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects.

The TE is founded on evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful as requested by the UNDP/GEF. It has also followed a participatory and consultative approach and focused on ensuring close and continuous engagement with key government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, the UNDP GEF team, and key project beneficiaries and stakeholders. To ensure that all stakeholders and the project’s beneficiaries were involved in the TE, a site visit to the province was carried out and several meetings were taking place with representatives of local communities, provinces, and government stakeholders. It builds on the findings and lessons learned during the Mid Term Review (MTR) (August 2017) and was carried out in strict adherence to the Terms of Reference received (**Annex 1**).

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

The TE considered:

- **Project Management** including project preparation and implementation: the evaluation considered the project's development from PIF formulation and follow this through to the present. The objective of this step is to examine how the project was designed and subsequently developed when critical changes were made. As projects don't occur in a vacuum, the project development, decisions, and assumptions should be considered against the prevailing situation, at the time they were taken, in order to understand the context of why such decisions were made.
- **Log-Frame (LFA) and Project Strategy:** Particular attention was placed upon the project's log frame to examine the rationale behind the project's design and consider how the strategy – the various outcomes – contributed to the project's strategy for achieving the objective and overall GEF goal. The TE examined also indicators to see if these are the best measures of the progress of work and the effectiveness of the various activities in achieving the objective.
- **Adaptive Management Framework:** the TE examined the overall project strategy, objective, outcomes, outputs, and activities and consider whether and the original strategy represented the best scenario at that time and to examine the project's adaptive management framework, that is, how the project responded to new information, changes in variables, etc. The TE examined also the risks and assumptions that the project had based its strategy upon and assess their validity and the way in which the project, has responded and managed these risks.
- **Project Performance:** the evaluation reviewed the project's performance over its lifetime. This considered what has been the impact of the project and how has it contributed to the GEF objectives. Therefore, the TE assessed the effectiveness of the individual activities (monitoring performance); the effectiveness of the various activities in achieving the Outcome (monitoring the impact), and; the effectiveness of the various Outcomes on achieving the Objective (monitoring the change).

### **Overall Approach to the Final Evaluation**

The TE has several audiences and needs to provide a basic evaluation service for these different players (GSSD/MoE, UNDP, GoC, GEF, etc.). The TE provides an opportunity for external evaluators to ask the difficult questions of the project's stakeholders and challenge the decisions, activities, and assumptions of those involved in the project. However, very little is achieved by adopting a combative approach to project evaluation. Rather, the TE worked alongside the project management team, GSSD/MoE, UNDP CO and other partners to look critically at the projects progress against the stated objective, outputs, and indicators contained in the log-frame and identify the strengths and any weaknesses that may exist and map out any future interventions.

Therefore, the evaluation provided feedback at all points of the evaluation; explained the findings of the evaluation of the project team prior to the presentation; provided a final feedback presentation and the final TE report. Hence, the TE includes:

- 1. Inception Phase:** this initial stage of the TE involved desk reviews of project-related documentation (project document, annual reports, quarterly progress reports, project implementation report, project files, project technical deliverables, mid-term review report and the response to management response) that the evaluator considered useful for an evidence-based evaluation assessment (list of documents reviewed, **Annex 2**). The documents were mainly provided by the Project Management Unit (PMU).

As part of the this phase, an Inception Report (IR) was prepared and submitted to PMU

for approval on the 6<sup>th</sup> of November 2018; it included a preliminary itinerary for the field mission (**Annex 3**), a tentative list of interviewees was included, based on the project document, to provide a good sample of the achievements and influences of the project (**Annex 4**), and an evaluation matrix was developed, submitted during this phase, and used during the field mission to Cambodia to guide the interviews with the project's stakeholders (**Annex 5**).

- 2. Evaluation Mission to Cambodia (14-22 November 2018) Phase:** An Evaluation mission in Cambodia took place from 4-22 November 2018. The mission included three major activities: (i) **meetings with and interviewing key project stakeholders** to brief on the purpose and methodology of the TE, and to get the needed updates on the project's activities. Findings were crosschecked during different interviews and with available evidence. During the mission and the site visit, number of interviews were set using a pre-prepared set of questions (**Annex 6**); (ii) **a visit to the project's piloting sites in Siam Reap Province** and meet with local staff at the province level, and (iii) **gather the needed data, documents, and project's technical deliverables**.
- 3. Terminal Evaluation Report Preparation Phase:** following the field mission to Cambodia, all information/data collected were carefully reviewed and analyzed in accordance with the UNDP Project Evaluation Methodology. Accountable information and stakeholders' opinions with associated sources and assumptions given, were used to draft the TE report that was submitted to UNDP and PMU for review and feedback.

According to the UNDP/GEF Evaluation guide, UNDP Cambodia Country Office bears the responsibility to circulate the report to key project's partners for review. A list of consolidated comments/observations on the TE draft report to address in the final version of the TE report is shared with the TE consultant. An "**audit trail**" is submitted along with the TE final report to indicate all the comments received, and the way they were/were not addressed in the final TE Report.

### **1.3 Structure of the Evaluation Report**

The structure of this TE Report follows the Evaluation Report outline as documented in the TOR for the assignment as well as the GEF and UNDP Terminal Evaluation Guide. The maximum total number of the TE report pages is 40 excluding the annexes.

## 2. Project Description and Development Context

---

### 2.1 Project start and duration

The Project was planned to start in **January 2015** for a period of 3 years with a planned closure date of **December 2017**. The Project received the GEF CEO delegation of authority on **23<sup>rd</sup> September 2014**. The Project Appraisal Committee meeting (PAC) took place on **13<sup>th</sup> October 2014**. All parties signed the Project Document by the **14<sup>th</sup> January 2015**. A Harmonized Approached Cash Transfers (HACT) assessment was conducted by an international independent assessor in **June 2015**, based on which The Government of Cambodia agreed with UNDP to follow the full NIM implementation modality. The discussion to agree on the NIM modality, the project governance and structure, and the recruitment of the team consumed around 10 months. The project officially started in **October 2015** upon the recruitment of the Project Management Unit (PMU) staff (**14 October 2015**). However, as this project is the first project that follows the NIM modality, the actual commencement took another 8 months by launching the project at the national level through the Inception Workshop (IW) which was organized on the **27<sup>th</sup> May 2016**. The first budget revision was submitted and discussed during the IW. The project was officially extended and was approved by the UNDP GEF in January 2018, with no cost, till December 2018 to allow the completion of the remaining activities.

As of **September 2018<sup>3</sup>**, by the end of the third quarter of Annual Work Plan (AWP) 4, the budget execution (actual expenditure plus the encumbrance) was **US\$ 966,457 (98%)**. In-kind contributions from GSSD/MoE amounted to **US\$ 109,450 by November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2018** or **73%** of the initially planned co-financing (**US\$ 150,000**) following the actual project implementation status. The UNDP cash co-financing amounted to **US\$221,499** or about **(147.67%)**, and the in-kind UNDP contribution amounted to **US\$ 750,000 (75%)**. The TE consultant observes that the government co-financing is underestimated by the PMU as the government contribution to the piloting site alone is immense including the land allocated for the piloting and the contribution of the regional park rangers (5 rangers work on the site on a full-time base). The high co-financing from the Government to the piloting site shows the high-level interest in, and commitments to the project.

### 2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

Cambodia ratified the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD) on February 9, 1995, and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) on December 18, 1995, and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought (UNCCD) on August 18, 1997. Furthermore, Cambodia ratified other important protocols under the Rio Conventions in later years, namely: the Cartagena Protocol on Biological Safety to protect biodiversity from the potential risks posed by genetically modified organisms that are the product of biotechnology; The Kyoto Protocol; Cambodia acceded to the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress on remedial measures arising from damages caused by the transboundary movement of living modified organisms on August 30, 2013; and Cambodia signed the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization on February 1, 2012.

In 2005, Cambodia mobilized a GEF grant to conduct its National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) exercise, which was concluded in 2006. The goal of the project was to develop and strengthen national capacities for sustainable management and use of natural resources and

---

<sup>3</sup> Financial data provided by the project covered the expenditure up until September 2018.

of the environment, for the benefit of the Cambodian poor. Its objective was to identify country level priorities and needs for capacity development, to address global environmental management requirements, particularly the thematic concerns of the three UN conventions. The project investigated existing capacities and capacity needs in Cambodia, to address domestic environmental issues and concerns that are also concerns of the three Rio Conventions: UNFCCC, UNCDB, and UNCCD, which Cambodia is a party to.

The Project is closely aligned with and consistent with Cambodia's United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The UNDAF 2011-2015 is anchored in and aligned with the Government's Rectangular Strategy Phase II and the National Strategic Development Plan (2009-2013). The UNDAF is based on the findings from the Common Country Assessment published in 2009. The project was designed to contribute to UNDAF's priority 1— *Economic Growth and Sustainable Development* and to a lesser degree to priority 4— *Governance*.

The project document identified Cambodia's efforts in assessing its own capacities and capacity development needs to address the requirements of the three conventions through the NCSA. The Country has focused on issues and concerns within its jurisdiction to address Cambodia's obligations under the three conventions. It was a national assessment of Cambodian capacities undertaken by the government of Cambodia and done by Cambodians.

The NCSA assessment was cross-cutting across the three Rio Conventions and was conducted at 3 levels: i) systemic capacity or creation of an "enabling environment"; ii) institutional (or organizational) capacity, and iii) individual capacity. The NCSA assessment identified sets of thematic challenges that need to be addressed in order to enhance the local capacities to implement and report on the Rio Conventions.

In addition to these thematic challenges, the cross-cutting analysis identified five cross-cutting capacity issues: the capacity to develop and execute strategies to engage different sectors on addressing environmental issues in all levels of government in the country; the capacity to stabilize population fluxes in all areas of the country; the capacity to develop clear procedures, systems, and tools on forming environmental policies and on selecting natural resources management strategies; the capacity to stimulate the build-up of local capital and investments to support environmental initiatives and resource regeneration in the country; and the capacity to procure support to build up the preceding capacities.

Thus, the project responded to these specific crosscutting capacity development needs, and it was considered strategic in that it was designed to respond to a targeted set of underlying barriers to environmental management towards the goal of meeting and sustaining global environmental outcomes.

Explicitly, the project document addressed capacity constraints as the common barriers to the management of all environmental areas in Cambodia at national and subnational levels. The improved access and generation of information were supposed to help in filling the data and information gaps required to guide planning and implementation of activities that yield global environmental benefits as exemplified in low-emission and climate resiliency at the same time sets out to meet the objectives under all three Rio Conventions through improved decision making.

### **2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project**

The Project Document lists the project's goal as being<sup>4</sup>:

---

<sup>4</sup> Project Document, Sub-Section C.2.a.2, Page 31

*to improve the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia through the development of national capacities to better coordinate and generate better information related to the implementation of these Conventions.*

The project document outlined the main Objective of the project as:

*“improve access to environmental information related to the Rio Conventions through the harmonization of existing environmental management information systems and improving coordination of the implementation of these conventions in Cambodia”.*

The achievement of the goal and objective were organized around TWO organized components:

- I. Improved access and generation of information related to the three Rio Conventions;
- II. Improved use of information and knowledge related to the Rio Conventions.

## **2.4 Baseline Indicators Established**

In the baseline scenario, there were the following indicators<sup>5</sup>:

1. Key environmental management information systems are harmonized with open-access and covering areas related to the Rio Conventions.
2. Quality of monitoring reports and communications to measure implementation progress of the Rio Conventions.
3. Capacity development scorecard rating
4. A system and a data architecture to harmonize key environmental information systems
5. A developed clearinghouse mechanism in place at GSSD/MOE and covering all environmental areas related to the Rio Conventions.
6. Stakeholders engagement in Rio Conventions related dialogues
7. An operational inter-sectorial coordination mechanism that builds on existing coordination instruments.
8. Model to implement environmental economic valuation in Cambodia.
9. Use of environmental economic valuation in environmental decision-making.
10. Negotiation capacity of Cambodia at COPs.
11. Quality, quantity, and timeliness of reports submitted to conventions.

## **2.5 Main Stakeholders**

The Project Document provided a long list of the stakeholders to be involved in the project implementation<sup>6</sup>. Those are:

- **At the National Level:**
  - Department of International Conventions and Biodiversity (ICBD) of the GSSD/Ministry of Environment (MOE) in charge of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD);
  - Department of Climate Change of GSSD/Ministry of Environment (MOE) in charge of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC);
  - Department of International Cooperation of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries in charge of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD);
  - Ministry of Women's Affairs (MOWA);
  - The Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology (MoWRAM);

---

<sup>5</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project Document.

<sup>6</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project Document, Pages 40-41.

- The Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction (MLMUPC);
  - The National Committee for Disaster Management (NCDM);
  - The Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME);
  - The Ministry of Public Works and Transportation (MPWT);
  - The Ministry of Rural Development (MRD);
  - The Ministry of Health (MoH);
  - The Ministry of Tourism (MoT);
  - The Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC);
  - Donors and Development Partners like UNDP, ADB, USAID, ...
- **Province level stakeholders:**
    - Local & International NGOs;
    - GEF UNDP Small Grant Programme (SGP) grantees; and
    - The selected Province for the piloting exercise according to output 2.1 *“Innovative tools piloted for decision-making using the economic valuation of the use of natural resources”*: a pilot may take place in one Province.

Project relations with the key stakeholders are fully discussed under section 3.1.4, Page 21.

## **2.6 Expected Results**

This project was designed to address the critical need to provide better environmental knowledge in Cambodia. At the time of development, the project was considered a timely response to address this priority, particularly when considering the emerging issues due to global climate change. The provision of better environmental knowledge was expected to be useful for stakeholders to identify responses to threats including negative impacts of global climate change on the local environment, which is the basis of livelihoods, human health, and economy in Cambodia. It was also designed to contribute to the broader institutional strengthening initiative of GSSD/MOE, currently underway.

One of the emphases of the project was to develop the capacity of GDANCP (changed to GSSD<sup>7</sup> during project implementation) to provide more accurate and timely comprehensive information on the state of the environment in Cambodia. It was expected that results will be automatically institutionalized along with the implementation of the project; therefore, contributing to the long-term sustainability of the project’s achievements. It included the decision-making process to meet Rio Conventions objectives, which was targeted to be improved by having better access to more complete and relevant information.

---

<sup>7</sup> GSSD: General Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development

### 3. Findings

---

#### 3.1 Project Design/ Formulation

The project design is considered highly relevant to the Government of Cambodia's global environmental obligations, development plans and strategy, to UNDAF and UNDP Country Programme, and to the GEF objectives. The Project Document included specific outcomes, outputs, listed activities under each output and defined targets and indicators.

The Project Document failed to include the required level of details concerning the project log-frame (LFA). Although it included the project's components and outputs, it failed -in many cases- to make a proper link to the local context. The Project Document was successful in addressing five main cross-cutting capacity issues and defining the way to deliver sustainable impact by addressing the critical need to provide better environmental knowledge in Cambodia, building cross-cutting capacities to respond to the needs of the three conventions, and in defining the reporting requirements and developing the needed capacity to coordinate and generate needed information. Furthermore, on-going public awareness on linkages of the global environment to national socio-economic development priorities designed and partially implemented in some provinces and at the national level in Cambodia. These activities contributed to improving the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia through the development of individual and institutional capacities to better coordinate and generate data and information related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions.

The Project is operating in a policy framework that includes, among others: "*Cambodia Rectangular Strategy-Phase III (2013-2018)*", the "*Cambodia Climate Change Strategic Plan 2014-2023*"; the "*National Policy on Green Growth*"; the "*National Strategic Plan on Green Growth 2013-2030*"; and the "*National Protected Area System Strategic Management Framework (2014)*".

##### 3.1.1 **Analysis of the LFA/Results Framework (Project logic/ Strategy, Indicators)**

###### **LFA:**

According to the project's inception report, the LFA has been reviewed, some outputs and indicators were amended, and one output was added to the second outcome. However, the PMU and UNDP CO kept using the old LFA in their quarterly, annual progress, and annual implementation reports where output 2.4 was not in place and hence no reporting was done concerning this output.

Essentially the LFA followed the GEF format but it did not include targets at the outcome level. This resulted in some weaknesses in the LFA in defining targets and indicators at the outcomes level at the TE. Therefore, the LFA has led to some confusion concerning the project's strategy. Table 2 provides an overview of the TE assessment of the project's LFA and how "SMART" the achievements are compared to the defined end-of-project targets.

###### **Strategy:**

The Project Document established a rational strategy to address challenges to access environmental information related to the Rio Conventions in Cambodia. Although the strategy was a not well-rounded plan, it generally addressed the apparent challenges, risks, and issues but did not coherently set the basis for a plan of action. However, it seems likely to have made considerable progress towards achieving the project's Objective. Furthermore, the strategy survived through to the inception phase and as it was further enhanced in the updated log-frame matrix and effectively remain the strategy for the project, as there have been revisions to the log-frame. The targets achievement per the end of the project as formulated during project development-are generally realistic, with a few exceptions.

**Table 2: Overview of the Terminal Evaluation of the Project's Log-frame**

Criteria	TE comments
<b>Specific</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LFA relates to the project components and outputs and defines corresponding indicators per component/output.</li> <li>- Indicators are generally specific and target oriented.</li> <li>- The LFA refers to specific future events and results to be achieved mainly in relation to the capacity development outputs.</li> </ul>
<b>Measurable</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most of the indicators are linked to measurable targets. However, no quantifiable targets are listed for some outcomes and outputs. For example, outcome 1/output 1.2, output 1.3, and outcome 2/output 2.2, and output 2.4.</li> <li>- Indicators are not well-written, and this might have led to greater confusion during the project implementation. i.e. output 2.3: <i>the capacity of existing institutions and individuals to advance Cambodian national interests on biodiversity, climate change and desertification/land degradation and drought matters and their interlinkages in regional and global networks and forums strengthened</i>. The target proposed for the end of the project is <i>Negotiations at 2-3 COP meetings and in other regional and global forums with positions papers for Cambodia</i>. This target is neither specific nor measurable, i.e. which COP we are talking about, what progress in negotiation skills is needed, how to measure that, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>Achievable</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most of the indicators could be achieved with the allocated budget and timeframe. However, some of the indicators are impossible to be achieved during the proposed timeframe. One example is Output 2.1, it has two indicators, as follows: (i) <i>a strategy is developed on how to implement environmental economic valuation, impact assessments and scenarios and projections as policy instruments in Cambodia, and (ii) 3-4 policies, programmes or plans are developed using environmental economic valuation, impact assessments and scenarios and projections, respectively</i>. Taking into consideration the local capacity, this could be considered as an outcome, not an output. In order to develop a strategy on how to implement environmental economic valuation, a clear methodology or a tool or a guide needs to be developed by the project to conduct environmental economic valuation.</li> </ul>
<b>Relevant</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All indicators are relevant and address national development priorities and UNDP Cambodia UNDAF priority areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Time-bound</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most of the indicators are not linked to a specific date. Furthermore, the project faced more than 22 months delay before its inception phase. Yet, it got a 12 months extension, but the project work plan was not updated to reflect this delay. Furthermore, the one-year extension granted to the project after the MTR.</li> </ul>

### 3.1.2 Assumptions and Risks

The review of the risks to the Project, during the Project formulation phase, indicated that *“these risks are manageable through the project’s learn-by-doing approach<sup>8</sup>”* mainly that *“the Project is a direct response to national priorities identified through the NCSA process; as a result, there is a strong national ownership and willingness to succeed, hence low risks that key stakeholders will not participate in the project and lack of political will”<sup>9</sup>*. Furthermore, the project was designed to be hosted at the GSSD/MOE, which was expected to contribute to managing any operational risks which would also contribute to a better prospect for long-term sustainability of Project results.

The Project was designed to respond to the capacity constraints and barriers defined in the NCSA assessment. The Project identified **nine risks** during the formulation stage<sup>10</sup> and

<sup>8</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project Document, Section C.3.c Risks and Assumptions. Page 38-39.

<sup>9</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project Document, Section C.3.c Risks and Assumptions. Page 38-39.

<sup>10</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project Document, Section C.3.c Risks and Assumptions. Page 38-39.

included risks and assumptions per each outcome and output. Two risks were identified as medium level risks while seven were considered low-level risks. The risks included political, technical, operational, and financial risks.

Risks and issues logs have been updated quarterly by UNDP CO, with a clear set of mitigation measures identified per risk/issue. However, TE consultant considers the management of the project's risks needs some improvement, as they need more substance and concrete mitigation measures.

### **3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design.**

After a careful review of the Project Document, no clear signs for incorporating lessons learned from other relevant projects into this Project design. However, government officials indicated that they have learned several lessons from the implementation of the Project, as the first project to be fully implemented following the NIM modality, which they would like to utilize and benefit from in the design of other GEF and UN projects. To share some (a) learning-by-doing is very crucial for the sustainability of all initiatives and to ensure the national and government ownership even if the capacity is limited. The Government's officials have faced many complex issues in implementing this project, yet, they consider it as a better way of learning, and sustainable method to enhance capacity, (b) a chief technical advisor should be hired from the early beginning of the project and to be stationed in the country so that the team learns more and gets the needed technical support on time, and (c) innovative ways to be developed to provide support to government's staff who are participating in the Project implementation.

### **3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation**

To ensure the Project efficient and effective implementation, the main Project's stakeholders and the direct beneficiaries – the government institutions – should be fully engaged and supportive of the project's intervention. The project has managed to develop some of the critical partnerships with stakeholders at the national mainly with the Ministries of Environment (hosts the UNFCCC and UNCBD focal points) and Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (hosts UNCCD focal point), where relationships appear to be pleasant and there is considerable support. However, considering the strategic scope of this Project to build national capacities in data gathering, accessing, sharing, and reporting, the TE would have expected to see more evidence of partnerships with organizations involved in different field in relation to the Rio Conventions, such as the academic sectors, private sectors, and national and international non-governmental organizations and development partners.

The involvement of the key stakeholders has been limited to attending various training workshops, meetings, and public awareness events. A complete list of these events organized and supported by the project is presented in **Annex 7**. However, the Project did not utilize these events to build a national database for concerned stakeholders or experts how have directly participated in project activities.

However, to ensure the institutional sustainability of the project's results, the involvement of key national stakeholders must be substantial to achieve full buy-in of the project results. This could be achieved as a result of one important factor, with the PMU hosted within the GSSD/MOE, meant that the project team was primarily operating from the immediate preview of the key GSSD/MOE staff responsible for two of the three Rio Conventions. UNDP and the PMU worked consistently through the project implementation to ensure government partner stakeholder ownership. The GSSD/MoE has remained supportive of the project overall through implementation mainly through the National Project Director (NPD), as well as MAFF, through its UNFCCC focal point.

The Project Document required the project to set up a multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral Steering Committee and a Technical Support Team in order “to guide and oversee the implementation of the project”<sup>11</sup>. At least two main types of organizations were listed as members of the two groups in the project document (key public and civil society sectors), however, only government agency representatives from two main ministries were involved in the project implementation. It should be noted that the absence of other stakeholders’ representatives in the project steering/technical committee has limited the work of the PMU due to the workload.

The project also established good cooperation with on-going national projects implemented or at the level of development by the Department of Biodiversity (DBD) because all projects related to biodiversity thematic area including this Project are being hosted within the same directorate (same office space). The involvement of the DBD in the Project activities is contributing to their awareness about the project outcomes and thus are an important element to achieve sustainability of project results.

A memorandum of understanding (MOU) was signed on November 2017 between the GSSD/MOE and the Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP) on cooperation in the field of sustainable development. The MOU aimed to “strengthen and further develop co-operation between the two Parties in the field of sustainable development, including but not limited to climate change, biodiversity, green economy and science, and technology”.<sup>12</sup> Although the MOU was not solely signed for the Project, yet, it was developed with the support of the Project, and will facilitate “access to available resources for research, education and policy in sustainable development related fields via the NCS website, including through data sharing between both Parties and access to other relevant data, and access to information on research funding opportunities and on visiting scholars/lecturers exchange programs”.<sup>13</sup>

No evidence of any cooperation between the Project and international and national NGOs could be noticed. However, the piloting site is part of a regional park. During the TE mission, the consultant had the chance to meet with the officers responsible for the national park who are involved in commissioning different components and it was easy to recognize how much they are committed to supporting the project.

The general conclusion, the project management has achieved some modest appropriate partnerships with relevant stakeholders mainly the involvement of the Ministry of Women Affairs in the Project Board. However, the project management has failed to engage other key stakeholders listed in the project document.

### **3.1.5 Replication approach**

The Project’s results such as the developed capacity, enhanced public awareness, and the developed guidelines and tools would ensure the sustainability of global environmental benefits and outcomes’ replicability of the key principles. The implemented approach for replicability included the following main elements:

The project was designed to address *national priorities that were identified through the NCSA process*. The project would support Cambodia in having access to more accurate and timely environmental information as well as a better coordination mechanism for the implementation of the Rio Conventions. The capacity developed by this Project will equip government’s teams with the needed skills, tools and knowledge to develop and implement other key environmental initiatives.

---

<sup>11</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project Document, Section C.1, Table 1, Page 27

<sup>12</sup> MOU between GSSD/MOU. Page 1.

<sup>13</sup> MOU between GSSD/MOU. Paragraph III. Forms of Cooperation. Page 2

This project served as a catalyst of a longer-term approach to Rio Conventions implementation by improving the generation and access to timely environmental knowledge and by strengthening the coordination of activities related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions. The learning-by-doing approach applied by the project helped in building the needed local capacities, ensured the institutionalization of the project's work at national level, and the proper application of the developed plans, strategies, and tools through a pilot project. Consequently, the replication value is reasonably high.

The implementation of the advance public awareness and training programmes in the piloting sites, in cooperation with national organizations and other projects like the projects implemented by the DBD, provided learn-by-doing opportunities and helped in building the capacity at national and provincial levels. The Research and Development including the development of a piloting site with the technical support of the RUPP and the financial and political support of the DBD would enhance learning-by-doing and facilitate piloting in other regions.

The project is currently busy translating different project's deliverables to the Khmer language, ensuring that the body of knowledge developed with the support of the project will be available to other stakeholders in Cambodia. Thus, it should contribute to piloting site sustainability and to up-scaling and replicating it.

### **3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage**

UNDP, the GEF Implementing Agency, for this Project was selected based on its experience and expertise in supporting capacity developments efforts in Cambodia, the regional, and the global level. Furthermore, the comparative advantage lies in its experience in integrating policy in national processes, policies, and frameworks, and the lessons learned and best practices that it could bring to bear from their experience in other countries.

The Government of Cambodia and UNDP CO have worked jointly on implementing the NCSA project and its follow up initiatives. This Project is complex due to its multi-sectoral, and multi-stakeholders nature, hence, UNDP's ability to provide the needed technical expertise in designing and implementing activities, its in-country presence, its key role with regards to advocacy, "*advocating a sustainable development agenda with Government and other partners*<sup>14</sup>," and its experiences *in developing environmental indicators and monitoring and evaluation tools*<sup>15</sup> - which is extremely necessary in implementing these kind of complex initiatives impacts on the ground - all these comparative advantages helped UNDP to be in a prime position to provide Cambodia with the needed support.

### **3.1.7 Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector**

The Project positively collaborated with several national initiatives and projects funded by international donors and development partners. Those include UNDP/GEF, Asian Development Bank (ADB), UN Environment/GEF, GIZ, and the Government of Cambodia. In addition, the project was hosted at the DBD at the Ministry of Environment. The DBD is managing several biodiversity-related projects and this has facilitated the work of the Project by sharing lessons learned, sharing financial and technical resources, and providing the needed logistical and technical support. Also, the Project was implemented under the UNDP Environment Unit which is currently responsible for implementing six other ongoing

---

<sup>14</sup> 5222 CCCD GEF Project Identification Form (PIF). Page 12.

<sup>15</sup> 5222 CCCD UNDP/GEF Project Document, Page 53.

initiatives. The Project's team members were collaborating with their colleagues from other projects.

Overall, the Project had limited cooperation with key ongoing initiatives. This cooperation could have been stronger and should have been expanded to benefit from other projects' work and experiences. For example, UNDP through its Small Grants Programme (SGP) is funding several small-scale initiatives through community-based organizations close to the Orchid piloting site in Siem Reap Province. It was observed that none of the SGP grantees were involved in this Project's capacity development or public awareness activities. The MTR made a clear recommendation in this regard *"the communication and public awareness material for Rios convention project must be developed and widely distributed among partners and network. For communities, the NGO engaged can also work with GSSD/MoE and the project to develop a guide of the three Rio Conventions for schools and public"*<sup>16</sup>, which was completely disregarded.

### 3.1.8 Management arrangement

The Project is being implemented under the NIM. The DBD/GSSD/MoE is the designated Executing Agency (EA) and main beneficiary. UNDP is the Senior Supplier and the GEF Implementing Agency responsible for transparent practices and appropriate conduct. UNDP has the Project Assurance role, which supports the Project Board Executive by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. All project's activities are developed in close cooperation with the MAFF as it hosts the focal point for the UNCCD. The Executive is represented by a senior official of GSSD/MoE, as an individual representing the project ownership to chair the group. The Senior Beneficiaries are the Departments of Biodiversity Conservation (DBC) and the Department of Climate Change, GSSD/MoE, and the Department of International Cooperation, MAFF.

The **NIM modality** was based on the HACT assessment and agreed with the Government of Cambodia. However, the selection of this Project to be the first national project ever that fully implements the NIM modality was a brave decision due to the complex nature of the project, and the limited experiences at the national level (for the UNDP CO and the Government) on how to implement a project under the NIM modality. The management arrangements were developed in the Project Document, presented and agreed during the inception workshop. However, no changes were proposed during the inception phase, and hence, the Project has followed the proposed structure despite the 22 months delay in the project implementation.

A **Project Board (PB)** was to provide strategic decisions and management guidance to implement the project. The PB reports to the National Council for Sustainable Development (NCSD). The PB is made up of representatives of relevant ministries and government departments (the three Rio Conventions focal points and a representative from the Ministry of Women's Affairs), and UNDP, and chaired by the GSSD/MOE Secretary-General. A **National Project Director (NPD)** was nominated by the Government of Cambodia to follow up on the Project activity, who is the Deputy Secretary General, GSSD/MOE. The project was monitored by the PB. The Project Document stated that the project board should meet at least (2) times per year. Based on the approved annual work plan (AWP), the PB reviews and approves project quarterly plans when required and authorizes any major deviation from agreed quarterly plans. The NPD is supervising operational management and guidance for execution and implementation within the constraints laid down by the Project Board and subcontracts specific components of the project to specialized government agencies. The NPD is actively responsible for financial management and disbursements with accountability to GSSD/MoE and UNDP.

---

<sup>16</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project's MTR Report. Section 7. Recommendation. Pag 41.

It was observed that the PB is functioning well. To date, the PB has met five times, but meeting notes show discussion has been preoccupied with startup and operational issues. PB should be functioning as a high-level decision-making body and helps the PMU in taking a strategic decision. However, the meeting minutes and the discussion with the Project stakeholders' reviews that the meetings focused on operational and financial day-to-day issues face the project. The MTR emphasized on this specific issue and recommend that "... the project director with the support of UNDP and PC can oversee the planning of excellent *board meetings with technical presentations to share information on project work to influence policy and learning from the ongoing technological advancements in the project.*"<sup>17</sup>

The Project Document also stated the need to establish a **Project Steering Committee** with a sub-group of it formulates a Technical Team. This team was expected to be formed from technical experts representing other sectors and departments and would support the NDP and the PMU *by providing technical support to the technical implementation of deliverables especially indicators, CHM and training plans*<sup>18</sup>. It was intended to provide comment on the key outputs produced by the project to make sure it has the quality expected. However, during the first Project board meeting, it was agreed that this Technical Group is not going to be established as there is a high-level committee responsible for providing the needed technical support, assess deliverables technical quality, and promote learning by doing a platform.<sup>19</sup> This is considered as a good adaptive management practice that would help the project to tap on existing resources and already established mechanism, which would relieve the Board from operational and detailed discussions on implementation and or project products. Nevertheless, the use of this committee was not as expected and needed as members of the Committee are mainly from the biodiversity field and that have not helped the PMU in providing the needed technical support to review the project's deliverables, proposed intersectoral agreement and make recommendations to GSSD/MoE on different technical issues pertaining to the Project.

The **Project Management Unit (PMU)** is located at GSSD/MoE. It is managed by a full-time National Project Coordinator (PC), who is supported by Project Finance Officer, Knowledge Management Officer, Administrator, and Project Assistant. The PC oversees and manages the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of, and with the approval from the NPD. The PMU team cooperate very well to deliver the Project's results, and with the team of experts and the DBD team. The UNDP Programme Analyst responsible for the Project is vigorously practicing the project assurance role.

A **Capacity Development Technical Advisor (CDTA)** position was proposed in the Project Document. This CDTA was intended to join the PMU from the early beginning of project implementation to provide relevant expertise and capacity building support to the PMU and the NPD. The assumption that recruiting a CDTA would help in bringing together delivery of the key deliverables and oversees the capacity development strategy. However, the Project faced a big challenge in mobilizing the needed CDTA. The Project hired several CDTAs, who were unable to deliver – for many reasons beyond the project's capacity- which has contributed to a further delay in the project implementation. The forth CTA hired mid-2018, was able to support the PMU but with considerable delay in submitting the project's deliverables. Hence, the limited time left for project implementation makes it very difficult for the PMU to finalize all project's deliverables.

The project management arrangement can be summarized as follows:

- The Project Implementation Agency is UNDP.

---

<sup>17</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project Mid-Term Review Report. Page 32.

<sup>18</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project Document, Section C.1. Page 25-27

<sup>19</sup> 5222 Project First Board Meeting

- The Project is following the NIM modality; the first project at the national level to follow the NIM modality.
- The executing agency is GSSD/ MOE in cooperation with MAFF.
- The GSSD/MOE appointed its Deputy Secretary-General as the National Project Director.
- A Project Coordinator (PC) is responsible for daily management and actual implementation and monitoring of the project and is accountable to the UNDP Analyst and the Project Director.
- A team of project support staff was an assignment to support the Project Coordinator (project assistance, a project finance officer, a project knowledge officer and an administrator).
- The project team has its project office in the premises of the DBD/ GSSD/MOE.
- The overall responsibility for the project is with a Project Board where GSSD/MOE, MOA, MOWA, and UNDP are represented.

A group of 14 experts (9 national and 5 international experts) and a national consultancy firm were mobilized to ensure proper implementation of the project activities and delivery of the expected outputs in line with the Project LFA (Table 3). However, and as stated above, the Project faced several problems in mobilizing international experts, those are:

- The process to select consultants is unnecessarily lengthy.
- Difficulties in attracting high-level and knowledgeable consultants.
- International knowledgeable consultants were very busy and seem uncommitted to the project.

**Table 3: The list of experts who were involved in the Project in Cambodia**

No.	Technical Area	Sex	Level	Contract period
1.	Chief Technical Specialist	M	International	January-June 2016
2.	Assistant to Chief Technical Specialist	M	Local	January-June 2016
3.	MEA Specialist	M	Local	November 2016-May 2017
4.	Capacity Development Advisor	M	International	Jan-August 2018
5.	IMS and IT specialist	M	Local	October 2017-September 2018
6.	MEA's Report Quality Assurer	F	Local	September-December 2017
7.	Gender Specialist	F	Local	February-September 2018
8.	3-Rio related Information/Data Reviewer	F	Local	February-September 2018
9.	Communication and Partnership Specialist	F	Local	February-October 2018
10.	Chief Technical Specialist	M	International	November-April 2018
11.	Plant/Orchid Taxonomist	M	Local	September-November 2018
12.	3 Rio Synergistic Material Developer	M	Local	October-December 2018
13.	Mid-Term Reviewer	F	International	May-June 2017
14.	Terminal Evaluation Consultant	F	International	October – December 2018
	Synergy Video Spot Developer	Firm	Local	Later November-December 2018

## 3.2 Project Implementation

The Project implementation arrangement and its adaptive management have been reviewed and assessed. The following aspects of project implementation have been assessed<sup>20</sup>: Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation); Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country); Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management; Project finance; Monitoring and evaluation; design at entry and implementation\*, and UNDP and Implementation Partner Implementation/ execution coordination, and operational issues\*.

Achievements of project implementation and adaptive management have been rated in terms of the criteria above at a six-level scale as follows<sup>21</sup>: Highly satisfactory (HS) - the project has no shortcomings; Satisfactory (S) - minor shortcomings; Moderately satisfactory (MS)- moderate shortcomings; Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)-significant shortcomings; Unsatisfactory (U)- major shortcomings; and Highly unsatisfactory (HU) - severe shortcomings.

The following paragraphs provide a complete review and justifications for the rating of the results. The rating and a description of that rating are summarized in the TE Ratings & Achievements table 1, Page 6.

### ***Inception Phase:***

The inception phase is considered as an opportunity to unite the project management team, to define the current and near-future status of the project, to discuss and review the project strategy with stakeholders, to put in place the necessary logistics, to develop the first Annual Work Plan (AWP) and to review and refine the Project Logical Framework (LFA)<sup>22</sup>. The major output of the inception phase should be the Inception Report (IR)<sup>23</sup> and the first AWP, which, on an agreement with the Project Board, will form a necessary flexible basis for implementation.

The Inception Phase is an important point in the critical path of the project when changes can be made to the LFA and that any changes to the project documentation should be accompanied by a rationale or justification explaining how they enhance the project strategy for achieving the project's *Objective*, or even changing the *Objective* if necessary. The IW discussed the LFA and have proposed making the needed modifications to the LFA and the TE, however, these were not correctly reflected in the IR, therefore, the TE considers that the Inception Phase and corresponding Report represent a considerable weakness in the project cycle.

The project IR was, to a large extent, an extended copy of the project document. It stated the changes in the project document without providing a correct background story on the project's delay, and the changes in the project LFA. Changes in the project documents are listed in **Annex 8**. While these faults might have been detected by the project assurance or by UNDP/GEF, these are not also impossible to be detected by the PMU and the executing agency as the LFA is a requirement for many donors and development partners.

### **3.2.1 Adaptive Management**

Adaptive management means that the PMU with the support of the PB should constantly keep referring to the Project's goal and objectives and critically assessing how the activities are

---

<sup>20</sup> These are the seven main areas to assess based on UNDP/GEF Evaluation Guide.

<sup>21</sup> 5222 TOR for Terminal Evaluation.

<sup>22</sup> Under the existing Result-Based Management System used by UNDP/GEF an LFA is a requirement.

<sup>23</sup> Under the Result-Based Management System a LFM, whether there have been revisions or not, should be included in the Inception Report and should be considered a contractual document upon which future evaluations will take place.

contributing to the outputs and how those outputs are leading to the objective. Although the project started one year later than the planned date and had witnessed another major delay for more than six months due to the difficulties in hiring the project team, the international consultants, and the national consultant, the TE did not observe any major adaptive management measures.

The Project Document was signed by all parties on **14 January 2015**, whereas the first PB took place on **7 March 2016** (one year later), and the IW took place on **27 May 2016**. The project faced three major difficulties in the first period; (1) being the first UNDP Project to follow a full NIM modality made it a challenge not only for the executing agency but for the UNDP as well, (2) major delay in the inception phase due to the inability to assign a qualified project team and difficulties to agree on next steps to start the actual implementation, and (3) difficulties in mobilizing international experts to support the project. The PMU has prepared the first annual work plans (AWP) which were presented and approved in the IW, based on which the activities and outputs are related to proposed project components and outcomes. However, the project faced other delays afterward and the implementation of most of the project's activities was not in line with the initial plan.

The TE consultant could observe only two adaptatively management measures taken by the Project, some of these measures were discussed and agreed upon during different Project Board meetings:

- Utilize the existed technical group to provide technical support to the project instead of establishing a new one.
- Seek international technical support to steer the project implementing by conducting a mid-term review although it was not planned nor mandatory for this size of UNDP/GEF projects.

Although other adaptive measures should have been introduced mainly after the long delay in project implementation, the Project was able to have some progress and has achieved a number of the intended results as stated in the MTR report "*... there has been evidence of promising learning by doing with improved GSSD/MoE and MAFF collaboration on project implementation, including early work on scoping and generation of information related to the three Rio Conventions. A project team is in place and the Project Board is functioning*".

### **3.2.2 Partnership arrangements**

The Project has been successful in arranging partnerships with the main stakeholders (GSSD/MOE and MAFF) for the implementation of the project. The project was hosted at the GSSD/MOE, this has helped the project to be very close to other projects and initiatives led by the DBD/GSSD/GSSD/MOE. As a result, the Project was able to closely monitor the implementation of other initiatives developed/ supported by key international donors (including the UN Environment, UNDP/GEF Projects, and GIZ and ADB). However, as stated in the MTR, the project should establish key partnerships to facilitate its implementation and extend its work to cover all beneficiaries. For example, for the piloting, the MTR recommended that "*Begin conceptual work on the CHM Pilot Education work at the municipality level. To implement the pilot, the project management should enter into an implementing partnership agreement with a municipality to develop and pilot test a CHM Three Rios training package for NGOs to disseminate and carry forward the learning about the CHM and Three Rios through its network of communities. This pilot work with GSSD/MOE and project should result also in a guide of the Three Rio Conventions for schools and public.*"<sup>24</sup> However, this did not take place.

---

<sup>24</sup> 5222 Project MTR Report. Section 7. Recommendation. Page 43.

The Project Document made it very clear that the project should cooperate with a wide range of stakeholders and has provided a comprehensive list of government agencies, non-governmental organizations, international development partners, donors, local and national non-governmental organizations and community-based organizations, and academia. Yet, the project did not manage to build the needed partnership with any of these key partners.

The project implementation report (PIR) 2017/2018 stated that *“the project national partner also makes linkage with the current ongoing project, Strengthen National Biodiversity and Forest Carbon Conservation through Landscape based collaborative management of Cambodia’s Protected Areas System as Demonstrated in the Eastern Plains Landscape (CAMPAS) in expanding the scope of implementation in regard to the Information Management System to ensure its better function based on the knowledge generated under the 3 Rio conventions project. It is worth noting that CAMPAS is a 5-year project under the grant of GEF and Co-Finance from the Royal Government of Cambodia”*<sup>25</sup>. Nevertheless, the TE consultant did not meet with the CAMPAS project team and hence is unable to confirm what has been stated in the PIR.

The overall conclusion is that project management has failed to achieve the minimum required partnership level with the relevant ***national stakeholders***. The participation of stakeholders was limited throughout the whole project to GSSD/MoE and MAFF.

### **3.2.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management**

The M&E framework of the Project is a perfect example of the missing adaptive management framework that should have been applied to address a management challenge. The PMU did not have any sufficiently developed adaptive management framework and did not fully understand the project’s strategy. However, the PMU had an honest desire to get on with the job and get some of the project’s activities in place.

The monitoring role of the UNDP was satisfactory as the Project Assurance has been active in assisting in the preparation of the project quarterly and annual progress reports, implementation reports, as well as in preparing for the Board Review, development of the project AWP, Budget Reviewing and follow up on the international consultants’ works and quality of the deliverables. However, it was observed that there have been several critical weaknesses in the monitoring of the project cycle. Even though it has been demonstrated that there were several justifying circumstances, it is expected that UNDP to take the initiative in addressing these issues at some point in the project cycle. Instead, the lack of proper adaptive management has led to the implementation of some of the project’s activities, while other strategic ones were not achieved, which are necessary to achieve the project Objective.

The project was signed on the 14<sup>th</sup> of January 2015 by all parties. A HACT assessment was conducted by an international consultant in June 2015, upon which the stakeholders decided to follow the NIM implementation modality. The PMU staff members were on board on the 14<sup>th</sup> of October 2015, however, the project Inception workshop (IW) was held on the 27<sup>th</sup> of May 2016, almost eight months after the recruitment of the PM. The inception report was submitted a month after the IW, on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2016, however, it did not reflect on the discussion that took place during the IW. It included a very brief summary on the changes requested on the project’s log-frame, did not capture any adaptive management measurements even though the project was almost 22 months behind the original schedule, and chaptered briefly the changes to the project’s output. Furthermore, the IR was an extended copy of the original Project Document. It should be noted that the deficiency in the

---

<sup>25</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project PIR 2017/2018.

inception phase, IW, and IR should have been detected by the UNDP CO and the UNDP/GEF Unit as these monitoring tools are part of all UNDP supported projects.

Furthermore, the project has no clear M&E plan, although it was evident that the Project regularly used feedback from QPRs and PBs to address appropriately any new challenges and thereby ensure the achievement of established targets. Risks and issues are quarterly updated. However, the LFA and the Inception Report were not used properly as bases for adaptive management.

The annually, quarterly and day-to-day M&E instruments such as the annual, quarterly and project implementation reports were reviewed by UNDP CO and UNDP/GEF. As a result, these reporting tools were discussed and acted upon at the Project Board meetings. The PB was active as up until the TE mission it had already 5 meetings. The TE considers that the UNDP project assurance role has been reasonably applied to this project mainly with the participation of the UNDP Country Director in the PBs meetings.

It is noted that the Project did not go under major changes as a result of the MTR, however, the Project through the PMU and with the support of the PB was able to demonstrate a set of adaptive management in response to the Recommendations of MTR:

- Evaluation Recommendation 1: *GSSD/MoE formally links project implementation to the GSSD/MoE/MAFF processes related to information and knowledge management.* In response, a project work plan and approach to move toward common information system considered the fact that each of the conventions is currently at the different levels of capacity. The work plan was produced and endorsed during the project board meeting in Q1 2018.
- Evaluation Recommendation 2: *GEF/UNDP/GSSD-MoE reschedule project in line with the late implementation start, i.e. Oct. 2016. The Project, therefore, needs to be extended for 1.5 years (31 December 2018).* In response, a project extension request was submitted to the UNDP GEF for official approval. The project was officially extended to the 31<sup>st</sup> of December 2018.
- *Evaluation Recommendation 3: PMU develops an infographic vision statement to articulate the expected outcomes in a short guide to communicating the overall expected outcomes and road map with two components to all stakeholders. The project implementation strategy is limited in the area related to technical oversight and guidance on interpretation of the results and is missing important inclusions of stakeholders and institutional linkages for sustainability and uptake of IMS and CHM toward results between output one and output two in addition to the events already organized such as IDB.* In response to this, a Roadmap and implementation strategy and institutional linkage were reflected in the Project work plan developed and endorsed during the project board meeting in the first quarter of 2018.
- *Evaluation Recommendation 4: UNDP immediately hires a qualified (chief) Technical Specialist (CTS) to support technical implementation, develop an implementation roadmap in line with this MTE report, set up the suggested implementation platforms and oversee processes linking work between the two outputs and outcome. The CTS should engage in all project results in monitoring and oversight.* In response, a technical specialist was hired and was on board in November 2017. However, the consultant was unable to deliver until April 2018. A new CTS was hired in June, who is currently helping the PMU in finalizing all project deliverables.

- *Evaluation Recommendation 5: PMU continue to encourage the knowledge management learning officer and recruit partnership, gender mainstreaming strategy consultants and IT expert/team to support the Project Director and GSSD, Coordinator for developing and advancing the Three Rios Partnership/networking strategy and operationalizing project GSSD/MoE social/networking, cross-sectoral and public learning agenda and development of partnership engagement and gender mainstreaming strategies, and website(s).* In response, the Project hired a group of national and international consultants to support the Project Director and Coordinator in delivering the project's outputs.
- *Evaluation Recommendation 6: The project/knowledge management learning officer become focal point for the strategic project communication, i.e. newsletter and broader uptake of the CHM through making linkages to the future CHM pilot project, dissemination of learning guides and working with partners for the CHM training of trainers, environmental education in general and project activities.* In response, an agreement was reached, and the concept was produced regarding the CHM for the RIO conventions. Each of the Rio Conventions teams agreed to be part of the CHM and to share the information on the two common thematic areas under RIO Conventions including (i) Sustainable land used management and restoration of the ecosystem; and (ii) CEPA (Communication, Education and Public Awareness). The draft of the Praka to ensure that each of the Rio conventions continues their collaboration is ready and is in the process to be endorsed.

### 3.2.4 Project Finance

In line with the UNDP/GEF TE guide, the TE has assessed the differences between the actual expenditure and the leveraged financing and co-financing during the TE mission presented in Table 4, which provides an overview of the budgeted expenditures of the GEF Project of US\$990,000. As of September 2018, **US\$ 673,137.85 about (68%)** of the project total budget, has been dispersed. However, around **US\$293,319.59 about (29.63%)** are committed to be disbursed during the period of October to December 2018 (encumbrance). This amount will be used to finalize the work of the project technical advisor, the TE, and the production of the project's deliverables.

The first project component has the largest share of the budget that has been spent (around 51%). Reallocations between the project components (ranged between 5% to 12%) have been foreseen during the TE period. Consequently, the spending of the budget is in the plan, however, it is not in line with the period of implementation, as are also the results of the project delivered so far.

The project budget includes **US\$ 150,000** from the Government of Cambodia as an in-kind contribution. As of September 2018, the confirmed Project co-financing from the Government has amounted to an estimated **US\$ 109,450 or 73%** of the total planned co-financing with details provided in Table 5. However, and as stated earlier, the TE consultant believes that the Government of Cambodia has provided more than the reported amount, mainly through the Orchids piloting site.

UNDP provided higher than the planned financial support. As of September 2018, the confirmed UNDP co-financing amounted to an estimated **US\$221,499 (147.67%)**. UNDP also provided an in-kind contribution of **US\$750,000** or about **75%** of the originally planned in-kind contribution (**US\$1,000,000**). Furthermore, UNDP provided financial oversight of the project in a manner consistent with the UNDP/GEF financial guidelines.

No annual audits have been conducted for this Project.

The GEF grant and UNDP contribution have been monitored through the UNDP's Atlas system.

**Table 4: Project Budget and Expenditures (US\$)**

Project Component	Budget Approved (US\$)	Disbursed as of September 2018							Committed budget (2018)	Total (US\$) (Spent and committed)	Difference between planned and actual (US\$)
		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total spent	% of budget spent			
<b>Component 1</b>	<b>470,650</b>	0.00	22,558.3	83,192.8	83,028.40	130,284.21	319,063.79	<b>68%</b>	173,266.40	<b>492,330.19</b>	<b>(21,680.19)</b>
<b>Component 2</b>	<b>429,350</b>	0.00	7,053.73	64,819.7	86,954.07	128,979.06	287,806.62	<b>67%</b>	107,203.60	<b>395,010.22</b>	<b>34,339.78</b>
<b>Project Management</b>	<b>90,000</b>	0.00	7,605.06	25,517.0	22,085.96	11,059.38	66,267.44	<b>74%</b>	12,849.59	<b>79,117.03</b>	<b>10,882.97</b>
<b>TOTAL GEF</b>	<b>990,000</b>	0.00	37,217.1	173,529.	192,068.4	270,322.65	673,137.85	<b>68%</b>	293,319.59	<b>966,457.44</b>	<b>23,542.56</b>

**Table 5: Co-financing of Project Partner (US\$)**

Source of co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of co-financing	Amount confirmed at the CEO endorsement (US\$)	The actual amount contributed at the stage of TE (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
<b>UNDP</b>	UNDP	Cash	150,000	109,450	72.97%
<b>UNDP</b>	UNDP	In-kind	1,000,000	221,499	147.67%
<b>The government of Cambodia</b>	GSSD/MoE	In-kind	150,000	750,000	75%
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,300,000</b>	<b>1,080,949</b>	<b>83.14%</b>

### 3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)

#### **M&E Design at Entry**

The standard UNDP/GEF budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan was included in the Project document with identified responsible parties, allocated budget, and specified time frame for each M&E activity. The M&E plan is supposed to be conducted in accordance with the established UNDP and GEF procedures. A total of US\$ 35,500, about 3.5% of the total GEF grant was allocated for the M&E activities. Supposedly, this amount is enough to conduct the proposed M&E plan except for the MTR which is not a requirement for this size of projects, however, due to the necessity to conduct it, allocations were mobilized from other resources. The TE consultant could not get an update on the total budget utilized for the M&E activities and hence is unable to define if the originally planned budget was enough or not.

All standard UNDP/GEF M&E tools were included in the project document, including the log-frame, indicators, targets, inception workshop, and inception report, terminal evaluation, the quarterly and annual progress reports and board meetings. The MTR was also planned in the Project Document although it is not required for this project, however, no budget was allocated for MTR as well as for the TE.

**Based on the above, the M&E design at project startup is rated as Satisfactory:**

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
	S				

#### **Implementation of M&E**

The TE reviews the UNDP role and considers that it has been correctly applied to this project, based on the following notes:

- The UNDP/GEF Regional Unit and UNDP Cambodia's provisions of financial resources have also been in accordance with project norms and in the timeframe.
- The UNDP CO has been active in (i) preparing all project progress reports including the annual and quarterly reports, (ii) preparing, discussing, and finalizing annual work plans in line with the UNDP/GEF guidelines, (iii) follow up in all financial payments and transactions, and (iv) providing the needed support to mobilize international consultants/advisors to support project implementation.
- The project's M&E activities followed the UNDP/GEF established procedures as the UNDP CO and the UNDP/GEF RTA have conducted several monitoring exercises including preparation and review of the project progress reports, and participation in the project board meetings.
- The UNDP CO has helped the PMU in recruiting the needed international consultants in line with the established Rules and Regulations of the United Nations.

However, the M&E framework could have been strengthened due to the presence of several key challenges including; the absence of a clear adaptive management framework, the project's slow and complicated start, and the absence of strategic guidance from the UNDP CO and UNDP/GEF during the project inception phase.

The following elements are identified in the project document as the principal components of monitoring and evaluation:

**A Project Inception Phase (Inception Workshop and Inception Report):** The Inception Phase is a key activity at the beginning of any UNDP/GEF project. The IW is used to introduce an understanding and ownership of the project's goals and objectives among the project

stakeholder groups. As mentioned above, a Project IW was organized almost 22 months after the signing of the Project Document, however, during the IW, the management structure was not discussed or nor modified, some changes were introduced to the Project Log-Frame<sup>26</sup>, the limited discussion was done on the project's annual work plan. Furthermore, the IR was a copy of the project document, it did not capture the discussion took place during the workshop, and hence, the Inception Phase (Workshop and Report) represent a substantial weakness in the project cycle.

**Annual Progress Reports (APRs) and Project Implementation Report (PIR)**. The APRs are UNDP monitoring tool while the PIR is a UNDP/GEF monitoring and reporting tool. The project has prepared and submitted three APRs for 2015, 2016, and 2017, and one PIR for the year 2017/2018. The APRs are used as a critical analysis of the project's status and are submitted to the PB for review, discussion, and endorsement.

There have been limited revisions to the project LFA despite significant delay encountered by the project over its lifetime. Indeed, the quarterly and annual reports have been based upon the 7 Outputs rather than on 8 outputs as suggested during the IW. The project is focusing on delivering a few specific products, rather than addressing the issues of improving access to environmental information related to the Rio Conventions. This has affected the projects ability to link activities with outcomes and progress towards the project objective.

**Annual Project Board (PB) meeting**. The project is subject to Project Board meetings at least twice per year as per the project document. Five PB meetings were organized since the Project document was signed (7 March 2016, 5 September 2016, 25 January 2017, 2 August 2017, and 2 January 2018). The TE echoes the MTR observation concerning the role of the PB which should have been strengthened to deal with strategic issues rather than following up on operational day-to-day issues pertaining to project implementation.

**Quarterly Progress Monitoring (QPRs)**; the QPRs are used to report on progress made based on the UNDP Enhanced Results-Based Management Platform. The TE evaluator did review all Project's QPRs (3 for 2016, 3 for 2017 and 2 for 2018) and has observed that although the project has managed to submit all needed QPRs, key information was missing like the updated risks logs, and the reporting was at the outputs level using the original outputs (7 outputs instead of 8) with a focus on describing the activities to a great extent.

**Day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress** is the responsibility of the PMU based on the project's AWP and its indicators.

**Mid Term Review and Final Evaluation**: the MTR was concluded in August 2017 as a result of the monitoring visit conducted by the UNDP/GEF RTA in 2017<sup>27</sup>. The TE was organized to take place during the last three months of the project's operation in accordance with UNDP and GEF requirements.

**Project Terminal Report (PTR)**. The PTR is a full report that summarized all activities, achievements, and outputs of the project, lessons learned, the extent to which objectives have been met, structures and mechanisms implemented, capacities developed, among others. This report should be prepared during the last three months of the project implementation and to be discussed during the terminal review meeting. Ideally, this report should be prepared by the Project team who has overseen all project's operational issues since its inception. However, the TE consultant noted that the CTS is preparing it and the PTR is scheduled to be delivered by mid-December, to be presented to the PB for the terminal review.

---

<sup>26</sup> Project Inception Report

<sup>27</sup> UNDP/GEF RTA verbal discussion with UNDP CO management, 2017.

**Terminal review meeting.** The terminal reviewing meeting will be organized by the project board, with the participation of its members, in December 2018. The terminal review meeting will discuss the PTR that is under preparation by the CTS.

According to the Project Document, a technical group should have been established as part of the Project Steering Committee to review and validate the project's technical deliverables. Neither a project steering committee nor a technical group was established to support the PMU in project's implementation. The MTR consultant has pointed out this shortcoming in the Project management governance and recommended that *"a technical oversight committee is set up at the executive level of the GSSD/MoE, is overseen by the head of GSSD/MoE and involves the input of the three corresponding existing committees for leading conversations and inter-sectoral processes for the development of IM system indicators and the CHM. An overarching technical committee meeting is needed to promote the intersectoral collaboration around the rigor of the science, i.e. for the MIS vetted set of indicators (It is not apparent in the strategy on how to engage science input into the products.) and to assess gaps and promote a learning by doing platform for intersectoral learning, i.e. work on CHM content and indicators. This will relieve the Board from operational and detailed discussions on implementation and or project products."*<sup>28</sup>. However, this was not addressed during the last year of the project implementation and no technical group was established to support the PMU in vetting project's technical deliverables.

Overall, TE consultant feels that the project had contributed to the GEF objectives and contributed positively to the process of building the needed capacity at the national level in Cambodia. Hence, the monitoring of the project has been **satisfactory**.

**Based on the above, the implementation of the M&E plan is rated as Satisfactory:**

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
	S				

### 3.2.6 UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation/execution coordination, and operational issues (\*)

#### UNDP implementation

The Senior Supplier is UNDP as GEF Implementing Agency. UNDP has the Project Assurance role, which supports the Project Board Executive by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. The key aspects of the UNDP implementation are as follows:

- UNDP followed up on the Project and continuously examined if it is being implemented with a focus on project activities.
- The UNDP support to the PMU is regarded as highly satisfactory and, in many cases, timely:
  - There have been significant number of monitoring and review exercises conducted by the UNDP Cambodia including preparation of the Annual Project Review /Project Implementation Review reports, and production of the Combined Delivery Report.
  - The UNDP has also been active in reviewing and following up on the project's QPRs, financial reports, and project AWPS.

<sup>28</sup> 5222 UNDP/GEF MTR Report, Page 32.

- The UNDP Cambodia’s provision of financial resources has also been in accordance with project norms and in a timeframe that is supportive of covering the costs of project activities
- Facilitate the recruitment and engagement of several international consultants in the implementation including recruitment of a few chief technical specialists.
- UNDP Country Office Cambodia is offering full support to project implementation, including administrative support as well as high-level support by the participation of the UNDP Country Director in the Project Board.

The Project was originally planned to last for three years and is to be closed in December 2018. Nevertheless, a no-cost time extension (max. 1 year) was granted on the 8<sup>th</sup> of January 2018, based on the PB decision on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of August 2017.

UNDP is recognized as a very supportive partner and the Government of Cambodia could see the UNDP comparative advantages mainly in mobilizing international consultants/advisors. Evidence gathered during the TE mission indicates that once the project was up and running, UNDP fulfilled its oversight and supervision responsibilities, with strong communication with the executing partners and the PMU. The Project is considered as well managed according to the UNDP and the GEF guidelines. Furthermore, UNDP CO has allocated more track money to support the implementation of the project’s activities and to mobilize the needed international CTS. This was highly appreciated by the Government officials.

***Rating for UNDP implementation is Satisfactory:***

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
	<b>S</b>				

**GSSD/ MOE Execution**

The project followed the full NIM modality; executed by the GSSD/MOE and implemented by the UNDP CO in Cambodia through a PMU with the support of a group of national and international consultants.

The DBD/GSSD/MOE was appointed to serve as Executing Agency. A National Project Director (NPD) was appointed and is actively responsible for financial management and disbursements with accountability to GSSD/MoE and UNDP. According to the Project Document, the Executive is represented by a senior official of GSSD/MoE, as an individual representing the project ownership to chair the group. The Senior Beneficiary is the Departments of Biodiversity and Climate Change, GSSD/MoE and the Department of International Cooperation, MAFF act as the Senior Beneficiary of the Project.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) is located at DBD/GSSD/MoE. It is administered by a full-time Project Coordinator (PC) and supported by a full-time Administrative Officer, Finance Officer, Secretary and support staff. The Project Coordinator oversees running the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the NPD, which is day-to-day management and decision-making for the project with approval from NPD. The Project Administrative officer provides project administration, management, and technical support, and the Project finance officer provides a financial arrangement, management, and technical support to the PC.

During the IW, it has been agreed that the Project will follow the approved Operations Manual for the Secretariat of the National Climate Change Committee. The GSSD/MOE has provided the project with the needed co-financing and has contributed significantly to support the project’s activities. The top management of the GSSD/MOE is very supportive to the Project and is following up contiguously on its work. The co-financing provided by the GSSD/MOE for the establishment of the piloting site (Orchid Gardens) demonstrates significant commitment

by GSSD/MOE and the Government to integrate the Rio Conventions in national decision-making processes.

**Rating for execution by the GSSD/MOE is Satisfactory:**

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
	<b>S</b>				

### 3.3 Project Results

#### 3.3.1 Overall Results (attainment of objectives) (\*)

The achievements of expected results were evaluated in terms of attainment of the overall objective as well as identified project's outcomes and outputs, according to the UNDP/GEF evaluation guidelines. For this the performance by outcome is analyzed by looking at (i) general progress towards the established baseline level of the indicators; (ii) actual values of indicators by the end of the Project vs. designed ones; (iii) evidences of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the results as well as how this evidence was documented.<sup>29</sup>

The summary of an evaluation of the attainment of objective and outcomes of the Project are presented in Table 6. The assessment of progress is based on observations, findings, and data collected during the field mission in Cambodia, interviews with key stakeholders, data provided in the annual reports, technical reports reviewed. The progress at the output level is provided in **Annex 9**.

The Capacity Development Monitoring and Evaluation Scorecard was conducted in 2014 during the formulation of Project. The results of the assessment were considered as a baseline in the revised Log-Frame. The MTR discussed the capacity development in the scorecards but did not provide any rating. The rating of the assessment of achievement at the time of the TE is presented in **Annex 10**.

**Overall results of the Project are rated as Moderately Satisfactory:**

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
		<b>MS</b>			

<sup>29</sup> UNDP/GEF Terminal Evaluation Guide

**Table 6: Matrix for rating the Achievement of Outcomes**

The below key is used for indicator assessment (Color Coding):

<b>Green = completed, the indicator shows successful achievement</b>
<b>Yellow = On target to be achieved by the end of the project</b>
<b>Red = Not on target to be achieved by project closure</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
<p><b>Objective:</b></p> <p><b>To improve access to environmental information related to the Rio Conventions through the harmonization of existing environmental management information systems and improving coordination of the implementation of these conventions in Cambodia.</b></p>	<p>Key environmental management information systems are harmonized with open-access and covering areas related to the Rio Conventions.</p>	<p>Environmental knowledge related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia is comprehensive and easily accessible.</p>	<p>The project is first implemented through NIM. This is a tremendous achievement for Cambodia. The government and UNDP now have established their new way of working and agreed on the implementation modality -guidance of the CCCA manual. NIM is optimal for learning especially for a capacity building project about capacity building.</p> <p>The project is now moving - the critical missing aspect is a Technical Advisor /Specialist on EIMS system, Rio Conventions Standards and CB specialist to develop and take responsibility for the core project deliverables (Output 1) and to guide the capacity development strategy.</p> <p>While some capacity building events have taken place, it needs to</p>	<p>The layout of the Information Management System (IMS) is designed, developed and endorsed.</p> <p>A Clearing House Mechanism on the 4 common thematic areas of the Rio conventions is online yet a lot of work needs to be done in order to finalize the work as some key sections are under construction.</p> <p>The CHM is designed for public access to the relevant information regarding the 3 Rio conventions, focusing on the synergy themes.</p> <p>The development of the CHM web- was completed and put up online, it was officially launched on 19th of December 2018.</p>	<p><b><i>Indicators show successful achievement</i></b></p>	S

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
			be situated in a structured strategy and roadmap that can be monitored for results. Capacity building will need both process and concrete targets and indicators that can be measured at the end of this project in line with the scorecard	Focal persons are assigned from each of the conventions to ensure the gradual upload of the information.		
	Quality of monitoring reports and communications to measure implementation progress of the Rio Conventions.	Reports present adequate disaggregated data at the sub-national level, are informative and present environmental trends over time.		<p>The communication and monitoring report on the implementation progress of the three conventions are produced based on more evidence, technical analysis with support from experts, and information sharing among the three conventions.</p> <p>Key deliverables were produced, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communication reports related to the implementation of the strategic plans for the respective Rio conventions;</li> <li>- Interim report on the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing, submitted in 2017</li> </ul> <p>Identification of the scope of synergy among the Rio conventions and a list of joint indicators to measure the implementation progress under each of the common thematic areas, the instruments and</p>	<b><i>Indicators show that target to be achieved by the end of the project.</i></b>	<b><i>MS</i></b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				<p>monitoring tools were also identified to track the progress.</p> <p>The reporting of the implementation progress under respective Rio Conventions during Ad-hoc and COP meetings in 2017 and 2018 were made based on more systematic consideration of evidence info shared from each of the conventions, although the information sharing is not yet done in a systematic manner.</p> <p>Disaggregated data at the national and sub-national level from biodiversity, climate change, and land, and its interrelated impact are being used as input data to develop the 6<sup>th</sup> National Report on the status of the implementation of the National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBSAP) in Cambodia.</p>		
	Capacity development scorecard rating	Capacity for: -Engagement: 7 of 9 -Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 10 of 15		To support the rollout of the common web-portal, known as Clearing House Mechanism, the project also supports the following products:	<b>Indicators show successful achievement</b>	

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
		-Policy and legislation development: 5 of 9 -Management and implementation : 5 of 6 -Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6 (Total targeted score: 31/45)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roadmap and action plans to implement partnership and communication strategy;</li> <li>• 5-year capacity development plan to enhance synergy among the three Rio conventions and its implementation; and</li> <li>• Communication and partnership strategies for the 3 Rio Conventions have been developed.</li> </ul> <p>The Project updated Capacity Development Scorecard showed great progress in building the national capacities towards the achievement of the Project objective. The set target was achieved.</p> <p>The updated scorecard shows that the target was achieved as the total score at the end of the Project increased to 31 out of the 45, as was planned.</p>		S

### 3.3.2 Relevance (\*)

All evidence – during the TE mission- showed that the project is very relevant to the government and addressed the highly regarded topic. The key stakeholders interviewed during the mission expressed the added value of the project and emphasized that another phase or a second phase to follow up on the Piloting site (Orchid Gardens) and to use properly the environmental economic valuations is critical. To the TE consultant opinion, the Project managed to improve national capacity and awareness pertaining to biodiversity, land degradation, and climate change and the relevant international conventions. It also managed to develop a system that integrates all info related to the RIO Conventions into a single system and that would contribute to increase and enhance effective analysis, reporting, and information sharing and data access.

The project has been highly relevant to UNDP activities in Cambodia. It represents a contribution to the fulfillment of Cambodia's 2010-2015 UNDAF, mainly Country Programme Outcome 1 which calls for *“Sustainable, Inclusive Growth and Development”*. More Specifically to the Country Programme Output 1.2 on *“Scaled-up action on a national program for climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors that are funded and implemented, targeting the most vulnerable poor populations”*. The UNDP strategic plan Outcome 1, which focuses on *“Growth and development is inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded “*. It also corresponds to UNDP Strategic Plan Output 1.3: on *“Solutions developed at national and subnational levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals, and waste”*.

The Project has also helped Cambodia in building the needed capacities and making crucial data available to achieve its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). More specifically, the project has helped and will continue to help Cambodia in advancing its capacity towards the achievement of *SDG 13 on Climate Action, SDG 14 on Life Below Water, SDG 15 on Life on Land, and SDG 17 on Partnerships for the Goals*.

**Based on the abovementioned the Relevance is rated as Relevant (R).**

Relevant (R)	Not Relevant (NR)
R	

### 3.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency (\*)

#### Effectiveness

The Project has made tangible progress towards the achievements of its overall objective *“to improve access to environmental information related to the Rio Conventions through the harmonization of existing environmental management information systems and improvement of coordination of the implementation of these conventions in Cambodia*. It specifically helped in *“improving the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia through the development of national capacities to better coordinate and generate better information related to the implementation of these conventions.”* The Project objective and main outputs have been achieved; the most of established targets have been met. However, not all targets were achieved within the implementation period, and some of them are planned to be achieved by project closure.

Considering the above-mentioned facts, Effectiveness was rated **Moderately Satisfactory**.

#### Efficiency

The rating for project **Efficiency** is **Moderately Satisfactory** for the following reasons:

- Major project results have been achieved in 4 years, however, the quality of some of the project's results was not vetted nor endorsed by national and international experts as many of them will be delivered during the last month of project implementation.
- The hosting of the project within the BDB/GSSD/MOE premises with other UNDP and other donors funded projects enhanced the projects' efficiency and facilitated its work and cooperation with different projects and their stakeholders like GIZ, and UN Environment.
- The international consultants and the project technical specialists were able to provide the needed technical backstopping and develop some critical outputs during the project implementation, however, the timeline is not in line with the original plans.

Furthermore, the Project has managed to leverage around 73% of in-kind financial resources (from the Government), and more than the planned UNDP cash contribution (147.67%).

**Based on the above mentioned the Effectiveness & Efficiency is rated:**

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
		MS			

### 3.3.4 Country Ownership

As per the project document, *"Cambodia ratified the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD) on February 9, 1995, and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) on December 18, 1995, and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought (UNCCD) on August 18, 1997."*<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, Cambodia ratified other important protocols under the Rio Conventions in later years, namely *"The Cartagena Protocol on Biological Safety to protect biodiversity from the potential risks posed by genetically modified organisms that are the product of biotechnology; The Kyoto Protocol; Cambodia acceded to the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress on remedial measures arising from damages caused by the transboundary movement of living modified organisms on August 30, 2013.; and Cambodia signed the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization on February 1, 2012."*<sup>31</sup>

Cambodia is a GEF eligible country. It obtained a UNDP-GEF grant to conduct its National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA), which started in 2005 and was concluded in 2006

The country ownership is evident in the strong interest and participation of government stakeholders and by the appointed of the NPD. As a result, all project's activities were approved by all authorized parties presented in the Project Board. The project was considered strategic as it helped Cambodia in developing and strengthening national capacities for sustainable management and use of natural resources and of the environment, for the benefit of the Cambodian poor. Its objective was to identify country level priorities and needs for capacity development, to address global environmental management requirements, particularly the thematic concerns of the three UN conventions. The project investigated existing capacities and capacity needs in Cambodia, to address domestic environmental issues and concerns that are also concerns of the three Rio Conventions: UNFCCC, UNCCD, and UNCCD, which Cambodia is a party to.

<sup>30</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project Document. Pages 8-9, Section B, Subsection B.1 Country Eligibility.

<sup>31</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project Document. Pages 8-9, Section B, Subsection B.1 Country Eligibility.

### 3.3.5 Mainstreaming

Based on project documents reviews and the observations collected during the TE mission to Cambodia, it was evident that the Project addresses UNDP priorities of developing the Government's capacity to comply with the Rio Conventions implementation and obligations in national plans. The Project was able to positively mainstream several UNDP priorities. In particular:

- Some frameworks and tools have been developed and endorsed such as the EIMS, CHM, a 5-year capacity development plan to enhance synergy among the Rio Conventions implementation, a communication and partnership strategies for the 3 Rio conventions, and the Roadmap and action plan to implement partnership and communication strategy.
- The Project developed the capacity and provided support to Cambodian delegation by enhancing evidence-based papers for negotiations in international meetings
- The Project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDAF and National Development Plans.
- The Project managed to target provinces in order to pilot the produced tools. In the piloting site.
- The project accounts in a limited manner for gender differences when developing and applying project activities; however, as the primary focus of the project is improving access to information which is gender neutral, it is not inappropriate to limit gender considerations to those project components which do have a gender impact.
- International and national consultants included both women and men (43% of the consultants were women).
- Around 25% of the project leadership position were women.
- The Project targeted both women and men in its capacity building and public awareness components. The project document stated that *"the project will take steps to ensure that women account for at least 40% of all training and capacity building in the project."* Based on data provided by PMU, it was noticed that the project was almost successful in achieving this target by including **38.8%** women in its training and capacity building initiatives. Lists of all project's activities indicating the total number of women and men are included in **Annex 7**.

### 3.3.6 Sustainability (\*)

The Project's main approach to sustainability is to strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines and enhance generation, accessing and use of information and knowledge. The project's exit strategy should be dependent on the continuation of commitments and activities without the need for long-term international financing. However, it was noticed that the Project does not have an exit strategy. A set of activities are defined to ensure the sustainability of the Project's results after the project life, but those were not developed as a comprehensive strategy as stated in the Project Document *"An exit strategy will be prepared 6 months before the end of the project to detail the withdrawal of the project and provide a set of recommendations to the government to ensure the long-term sustainability and the up-scaling of project achievements to other parts of Cambodia."*<sup>32</sup>

As stated in the UNDP-GEF guideline for TE, sustainability is generally considered to be the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. Consequently, the assessment of sustainability considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes.

---

<sup>32</sup> 5222 Project Document, Section C.3.b. Replicability and Lessons Learned. Page 37.

Below is the detailed assessment of the four main risks categories:

### Financial risks

There is only one financial risk related to mobilizing needed resources to ensure the finalization of key project's activities such as the finalization of the work related to the CHM, EIMS and the work at the piloting sites which needs substantial financial resources to ensure data collection, screening, and sharing with the CHM and IMS. The operationalization of key project's deliverables, which are supposed to be finalized during the last month of the project implementation, needs financial resources to ensure implementation. Nevertheless, the project established two cooperation mechanisms with the RUPP and the DBD/GSSD/MOE in order to continue the work in the piloting site and make sure that the tools developed is going to be utilized and tested.

**Based on the above discussion, the financial risks are limited, and the sustainability is rated as Moderately Likely (ML):**

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
	ML		

### Socio-economic risks

No significant social risks were not identified by the project, or in the project document. However, as some of the project's deliverables concerning the environmental economic valuation tools might be implemented in the piloting site, this might have an impact on the stakeholders and local communities in the piloting area. Thus, a detailed assessment of the socio-economic impacts should be taken into consideration.

**Based on the above-mentioned Socio-economic Risk, risks are negligible and thus the sustainability is rated as Likely (L)**

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
L			

### Institutional framework and governance risks

As identified in the Project MTR report, the Project's "*deliverables need to link to the new GSSD/MOE structure and be anchored for institutional sustainability*"<sup>33</sup>. Although DBD/GSSD/MOE is interested to continue the work of the project and the Project's outcomes have already established the needed institutional capacities and infrastructure that would ensure the project's outcomes on sustainability, the need to link these outcomes/deliverables to the DBD/GSSD/MOE work is still missing.

**The Institutional framework and governance risks are low, and the sustainability is Moderately Likely (L):**

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
	ML		

### Environmental risks to sustainability

There are no activities that may pose any environmental threats to the sustainability of the project's outcomes

<sup>33</sup> 5222 UNDP GEF Project's MTR Report, Subsection 4. Sustainability. Institutional framework and government risks. Page 38.

**The Environmental risks are negligible, and the sustainability is Likely (L):**

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
L			

**Overall rating: All the associated risks are negligible and thus, the overall rating for Sustainability is Moderately Likely (L):**

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
	ML		

**3.3.7 Impact**

The Project has made major advances in the deployment of EIMS and CHM in Cambodia and building national capacities to advance the work on the Rio Conventions at the national level. Many outputs and Project's results were first time achieved in Cambodia. The successful impact of the project is evident through;

- ✓ The concept on the Information Management System aiming at sharing environmental information among the RIO Conventions was designed, developed, and endorsed by the RIO Conventions Focal Points;
- ✓ A comment web-portal playing a role as Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) is designed and launched. To support the rollout of the common web-portal, known as clearing house, the project also supports to produce (<http://rio.picdaro.com/en/>):
  - Roadmap and action plan to implement partnership and communication strategy;
  - 5-year capacity development plan to enhance synergy among the three Rio conventions and its implementation
  - Communication and partnership strategies for the 3 Rio Conventions have been drafted.
- ✓ The role of key stakeholders is upgraded through a Prakas (joint declaration between the institutions of the Rio Conventions focal points). This Prakas is being developed and expected to be endorsed by the end of this year. The Prakas aims at upgrading the role of the member of the technical working group (The technical working group composes of key stakeholders from line ministries and the Rio conventions). It is also expected to bring in more collaboration specifically on the Rio conventions thematic areas;
- ✓ A technical paper was produced with focuses on the analysis of the environmental economic valuation tools produced. The relevant documents were used in some initiatives launched by the MoE/NCS D namely in the Ecotourism sector with a focus on the Orchid Research and Conservation Centre/ Siem Reap Province.
- ✓ The project has mobilized technical support to Cambodia delegation, enhancing evidence-based paper for negotiations in more than 3 international meetings as listed below:
  - 15 interventions on Cambodia positions related to biodiversity conservation and management were presented at SBSTTA 21, SBSTTA 22, 10th meeting of Working Group on Article 8j (WG 8(j)-10) and the 2nd meeting of Subsidiary Body on Implementation of the Conventions on Biological Diversity (SBI-2)
  - 5 Cambodia statements were intervened in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th sessions of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES-2, IPBES-3, IPBES-4).
  - Interventions were made during UNFCCC and UNCCD's meetings and COPs; and
  - Involvement in negotiation processes for 3 Rio Conventions' Ad-Hoc, SBSTTA meetings and COPs such as CBD COP 13 in Cancun, Mexico in 2016; UNFCCC COP 23 in Bonn, Germany 2017; and UNCCD COP 13, Ordos, China in 2017 and their related meetings.

## 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

---

### Conclusions

The Project has had a sustainable and considerable effect on developing EIMS and CHM in Cambodia. The Project facilitated the implementation of a set of capacity development, public awareness, and measures aimed at improving access to environmental information related to the RIO Conventions through the harmonization of existing environmental management information systems and improving coordination of the implementation of these conventions in Cambodia.

The Project has achieved key Project's results and most of Project's targets. Overall, the Project was able to improve the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia through the development of national individual and institutional capacities to better coordinate and generate better information related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions. The Project is considered successful in leveraging considerable co-financing from the government and UNDP.

The Project delivered many of its planned results, however, with a substantial delay from the originally planned timeframe. It took the Project four years (one-year extension was granted with no cost) to achieve the intended results.

Taking into consideration the complex nature of the Project (multi-stakeholders and multi-focal area) of the project, the difficulties the project's team had faced during project launching phase mainly the delay in project's commencement as the first NIM Project at the national level, the project overall rating is **Moderately Satisfactory**.

The Project is very much acknowledged by the Government of Cambodia. It is considered relevant to the national context and to the UNDP programmatic direction. Many positive results have been already achieved, yet, there remains a need to continue consolidating results and promoting lessons learned from the Project experiences. There are some very positive indications for potential sustainability, but that would need confirmed funding for follow-up activities. Without a confirmed financial government commitment prospects for sustainability are uncertain, and overall sustainability is considered **moderately likely**.

### 4.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project

The project is relevant to the national development priorities and the UNDP programming direction at the national level and continues to be of relevance to the current national development strategy. Yet, the Project design could have been strengthened by taking into consideration the following key facts: (i) the complex nature of the Project which requires special support from UNDP CO and UNDP/GEF, and (ii) the timeframe needed to implement the Project's activities needs to take into consideration the difficulty to mobilize the Project's team and national and international experts.

#### *For the Design*

**Corrective Action 1:** Ensure that the project management structure takes the local context into consideration as well as the difficulty in mobilizing international support to provide the needed technical and administrative guidance to the Government of Cambodia and the project management team and.

#### *For the Implementation*

**Corrective Action 2:** Review and revise the project management structure and define a set of adaptive management measures to effectively avoid the project's commencement delay. The

inception phase proposed in the Project Document was not clearly well-developed and did not take the Cambodian national context into consideration. However, since the PMU was hosted at the DBD/GSSD/MOE premises, this provided the project with the needed direct technical, administrative and financial support. It also allowed for direct and effective monitoring of the project activity by the NPD.

#### ***For the Monitoring and Evaluation***

**Correction Action 3:** This Project is complex and needed a group of international and national consultants to support the PMU to deliver the intended results. For this reason, the Project needs to develop a lesson learned report and an exit strategy. These will be useful for other projects and technical people working on any of the three Rio Conventions technical fields; climate change, biodiversity consideration, and land degradation.

#### **4.2 Actions to follow up or reinforce the initial benefits of the project**

A set of follow up actions are proposed below, to reinforce initial benefits from the project, based on the valuable yet immature achievements of the Project:

**Recommendation 1:** As nine major Project's products will be finalized by early December 2018 (a month before the project official closure) and will be discussed and endorsed at a national workshop during the third week of December, an urgent and clear plan of action needs to be developed to ensure the utilization of these products after 2018 to ensure Project's outcomes sustainability. These products include *the 5-years capacity development plan, the strategy to bring the synergy among the Rio conventions in its implantation, the Roadmap, and action plan to implement partnership and communication strategy, as well as the guidebook to produce a joint report for the Rio Conventions (UNDP, GSSD/MOE, and MAFF)*

**Recommendation 2:** The Project has managed to produce a set of valued public awareness products on the Rio Conventions and is currently in the process to finalize the CEPA (Communication, Education, Public Awareness) package on the synergy among the Rio Conventions. It is recommended to develop a dissemination plan for those public awareness and outreach tools as part of the DBD, DCC, and CCD future work, to ensure that future initiatives would build on the Project activities and results and will incorporate the project's products in its work. ***(UNDP, GSSD/MOE and MAFF).***

**Recommendation 3:** Despite the fact the TE was unable to review several Project's products as they are not finalized yet, it is recommended that the remaining project training and piloting activities be completed as soon as possible, including piloting the testing of the economic valuation tools in Siem Reap Province that incorporating environmental economic valuations for ecosystem services, which aimed to demonstrate measurable indicators of delivering global environment benefits. ***(UNDP, and GSSD/MoE).***

**Recommendation 4:** The work to improve access to data and enhance national capacities for Rio conventions implementing has just begun through this Project. It still at the early stages hence other UNDP and Government of Cambodia initiatives and projects should continue working on the upgrading of the national capacity, the infrastructure, and project's deliverables produced to ensure that the Country will achieve the Project's Objective ***(GSSD/MOE, UNDP, development partners, and donor agencies).***

#### **4.3 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives**

The finalization of the remaining Project's deliverables (nine technical documents) being developed by the Project is very crucial to ensure that Cambodia has an improved access to environmental information related to the Rio Conventions and an enhanced, harmonized, and

well-coordinated environmental management information system which would improve the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia.

#### **4.4 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success**

The project demonstrated a few good and worst practices which resulted in the implementation of the project that may be adopted for the formulation of other projects. Some of the best practices are:

- i. Capacity development at different levels (institutional, organizational, and individual) is very crucial for achieving the project outcomes and to ensure its sustainability. This project shows the best practice in the role of well-trained and heavily involved government officials in project management and the importance of capacity development to ensure the successful implementation of a project.
- ii. This Project (a CCCD Project) is a multi-focal and multi-sectoral and hence it needs special attention during the project design, implementation and monitoring, and evaluation. Yet, its role in building the needed capacities, infrastructures, legislation, tools and practices to ensure the implementation and mainstreaming of global environmental conventions in decision-making processes is very critical and unique despite its small size.
- iii. Project preparation phase and project inception phase are very critical to ensure successful implementation of the project. UNDP Country Offices and the Governments need extra support from the UNDP/GEF team at the regional and global levels to ensure the smooth launching of the project activities, including the support to develop a timely and well-developed adaptive management measures to help the PMU to avoid project delay and waste some of the existing opportunities that would have helped to offer solutions to some problems. Many of the CCCD projects at the global level have a similar focus and had developed sets of tools, frameworks, and legislation. Countries could benefit from these developed materials and hence knowledge sharing between countries and study tours/exchange are very much recommended.
- iv. The Project has faced a substantial delay in commencing its activities due to several factors some of them were beyond the capacity of the project team. The worst practice is directly related to: (i) the project development phase that did not articulate the local needs, (ii) the project inception phase that was not utilized in the right way to retrofit the project and its log-frame based on local context and circumstance, and (iii) the Project relied on one international expert (CTS) who was in charge of different project's technical activities and deliverables. The CTS was unable to deliver the work on time, which has affected all Project's activities. A best forward strategy is to involve several consultants each responsible for specific project activities, to ensure that the Project is not relying on one person who proved to be incapable to deliver the technical work.

## **5. Annexes**

---

**Annex 1. ToR**

**UNDP-GEF Terminal Evaluation  
Individual Contractor**

**Assignment Information**

Assignment Title:	International Consultant to Conduct Project Terminal Evaluation
UNDP Practice Area:	Programme
Cluster/Project:	Generating, Accessing and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions Project
Post Level:	Senior Specialist
Contract Type:	Individual Contractor (IC)
Duty Station:	Home/Phnom Penh
Expected Place of Travel:	Phnom Penh
Contract Duration:	28 days, with 10 days mission to Phnom Penh, Cambodia

**INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project: 'Generating, Accessing, and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions', (PIMS 5222).

**PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE**

Project Title:	Generating, Accessing, and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions			
GEF Project ID:	5295		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00092117 PIMS 5222	GEF financing:	0.990	0.990
Country:	Cambodia	IA/EA own Cash In-kind:	0.150 1	0.274 1
Region:	RBAP	Government:	0.150	0.150
Focal Area:	MFA	Other:	n/a	n/a
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CD2, CD4	Total co- financing:	1.300	1.424
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment	Total Project Cost:	2.290	2.414
Other Partners involved:	UNDP (GEF Impl. Agency)	ProDoc Signature date:		14 January 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:		Proposed: 31 Dec 2017      Actual: 31 Dec 2018

## **Project Description**

The Generating, Accessing and Using Information related to the 3 Rio Conventions project is in line with the GEF-5 CCCD Programme Frameworks two (2) and four (4), which calls for countries to generate, access and use information and knowledge and to strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines. It is also aligned with the first objective of GEF6 that is to integrate global environmental needs into management information systems (MIS). It is a direct response to national priorities identified through the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) conducted in 2005-2006 and that is part of the institutional strengthening underway at GSSD/MOE and MAFF. Through a learning-by-doing process, this project will harmonize existing environmental information systems, integrating internationally accepted measurement standards and methodologies, as well as develop a more consistent reporting on the global environment. Under the first outcome, the project will support the development of national capacities to effectively and efficiently standardize environment-related information that is generated on the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia and give open-access to this information. In parallel to this, the project will support the strengthening of Cambodia's capacity to better engage stakeholders and better coordinate the implementation of the Rio Conventions in the country. Under the second outcome, project resources will be used to improve the use of environment-related information for the development of innovative tools supporting decision-making processes related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions. The project support will also include activities to develop the capacity in using this environment-related knowledge of national institutions involved in international negotiations at Conventions COPs, as well as using this knowledge to produce national reports meeting Conventions reporting obligations.

The project's objective is to improve access to environmental information related to the Rio Conventions through the harmonization of existing environmental management information systems and improving coordination of the implementation of these conventions in Cambodia. The harmonization of these existing systems will be translated into better access to information related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia.

The project is delineated into two main components as follows:

- Component 1: Improved access and generation of information related to the three Rio Conventions
- Component 2: Improved use of information and knowledge related to the Rio Conventions.

Following its approval, the project has continued to implement the agreed activities plan toward delivering its result. The project is going to end on 31 December 2018. To evaluate the progress made by the project, the project plans to recruit an International Consultant to conduct Terminal Evaluation for the project.

## **Objective and Scope of Work**

The Terminal Evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules, and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the terminal evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

## **Evaluation approach and method**

An overall approach and method<sup>34</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Annex C: Evaluation Questions) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

---

<sup>34</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. Since the project has no field office, the Consultant is not expected to travel to the field. He/she will take lead in conducting stakeholder interview. (Find in Annex B: List of documents to be reviewed by the evaluator – list of key stakeholders).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in (Annex B: list of documents to be reviewed by the evaluator) of this Terms of Reference.

### Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ( Annex A: project logical framework), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in (Annex D: Rating scales).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

### Project finance / co-finance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

#### The cumulative expenditures as of 30 June 2018.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual

Grants	150,000						150,000	
Loans/Concessions								
In-kind support	1,000,000		150,000				1,150,000	
Other								
Totals	1,150,000		150,000				1,300,000	

### Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

### Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>35</sup>

### Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations, and lessons.

### Evaluation timeframe, Expected Outputs, and Deliverables

The total duration of the evaluation will be 28 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	3 October 2018
Evaluation Mission	10 days	25 October 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	16 November 2018
Final Report	5 days	30 November 2018

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of the evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	The full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs

<sup>35</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.
---------------	----------------	---	---------------------------------------

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

While the total number of days allocated for this assignment is fixed, the tentative schedule of the each of the outputs above can be slightly adjusted once the consultant is on board based on the consultation with the project team.

### **Institutional Arrangement**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Cambodia in close coordination with the respective project Implementing Partner. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Under overall direct supervision of the 3, Rio conventions project management team, ACD/Programme Team Leader, oversight of Programme analyst and direct guidance from the 3 Rio Conventions Project Coordinator, the consultant will be responsible to deliver the outputs stated above with the level of quality expected.

### **Role of the consultant**

- The consultant is responsible to provide his/her technical expertise to produce the expected outputs;
- The consultant shall cover all the related cost for his mission to Cambodia;
- The consultant shall work under the assigned focal persons from the UNDP project team and PMU;
- The consultant needs to maintain daily communication with the UNDP project focal person as and when problems emerge during the consultancy period, especially if they affect the scope of the job.
- Evaluator ethic: Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'
- Role of project focal team and UNDP
- The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country;
- The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the Government etc.
- 3 Rio Conventions PMU and the relevant UNDP programme team will provide overall quality assurance for this consultancy;
- 3 Rio Conventions PMU and the relevant UNDP programme team will review deliverables for payment release;
- Focal points from PMU and UNDP will act as the focal persons to interact with the consultant to facilitate the assignment, facilitate the review of each output and ensure the timely generation of the comments from stakeholders on each output.

### **EVALUATOR ETHICS**

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'

### **Payment Milestones**

The consultant will be paid on a lump sum basis under the following installments.

N	Outputs/Deliveries	Payment Schedule	Payment Amount
1	1.Upon satisfactory completion of the Preparation Plan to deliver the assignment.	1st week of October 2018	15%
2	2.Upon satisfactory completion of the Evaluation Mission	4th week of October 2018	20%
3	Following the submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report	3rd week of November 2018	25%
4	Following submission and approval (Project Management, UNDP-CO, and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report	1st week of December 2018	40%

### Duty Station

This assignment is home-based and requires the consultant to travel to Cambodia one time. The initially proposed mission schedule is as the following:

Cambodia country mission: around the 2nd and 3rd week of October 2018. To have around of stakeholder meeting to kick-start the assignment. The expected duration in the country is 10 working days;

The above mission plan could be further discussed and could be adjusted based on the discussion between the consultant and the project focal persons, to be validated by the project management team and UNDP Program Head.

### Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as <http://jobs.undp.org>, etc.) by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with an indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

### Minimum Qualifications of the Individual Contractor

Education:	An advanced University education (MS or Ph.D.) with expertise in natural resource management, biodiversity management, agriculture, forestry, climate change, environmental management, and other related disciplines
Experience:	Minimum of 5 years of experience in conducting an evaluation for development projects and GEF funded the project; Minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience in working for similar multi-focal area capacity development projects, e.g. on the three thematic areas of the 3Rio convention namely Climate Change, Biodiversity, and Land Degradation; Experience working in Asia region, especially on capacity development and Rio Conventions; Experience working for development projects, with multi-stakeholders including government agencies, development agencies, and UN agencies. Knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
Another Competency	Time management (in managing deliverables) Team management Professionalism, courtesy, patience

	Outstanding inter-cultural communication, networking and coordination skills
Language Requirement:	Excellent written and oral English

**Criteria for Evaluation of Level of Technical Compliance of Individual Contractor**

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Obtainable Score
Minimum 5 years of experience in conducting an evaluation for development projects and GEF funded project	30
Minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience in working for similar multi-focal area capacity development projects, e.g. on the three thematic areas of the 3Rio convention namely Climate Change, Biodiversity, and Land Degradation	15
Experience working in Asia region, especially on capacity development and Rio Conventions	15
Experience working for development projects, with multi-stakeholders including government agencies, development agencies, and UN agencies	10
Knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies	15
Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies	15
Total Obtainable Score:	100

**Annexes:**

Annex A: Project Logframe;

Annex B: Draft list of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluator;

Annex C: Evaluation Question;

Annex D: Rating Scale

Annex E: Evaluation consultant code of conduct and agreement form

Annex F: Sample outline of the evaluation report

Annex G: Evaluation report clearance form

**Approval**

Signature: .....

Name: Rany Pen .....

Title/Unit/Cluster: Programme Unit Team Leader .....

Date: .....

**Annex 2. List of documents reviewed**

The TE consultant reviewed the following documents prior to, during and after leaving Cambodia:

Document Title	
1.	Project's Mid-term Evaluation Report
2.	Management Response to the MTR recommendations
3.	Reported progress against project logical model document
4.	The Project's Identification Form
5.	UNDP/GEF Project Document
6.	GEF CEO Endorsement letter
7.	Project Implementation Report, 2018
8	Project Inception Report
9	Annual Project Progress 2015, 2016, and 2017
10	Quarterly progress reports: 3 for 2015, 4 for 2016, 3 for 2017, and 2 for 2018
11	List of participants – training and capacity development
12	Capacity Building Score Card - at CEO endorsement
13	Minutes of the Project Board Meetings
14	Project Log-frame
15	List of public awareness events
16	Snapshots of UNDP Risks and issues log
17	In-kind assistance table
18	Technical reports produced by the international and national consultants (since the start of the project until its completion)
19	Training sessions reports - photos
20	Project's activities media coverage – Samples
21	Request Letter from Implementing Partner requesting no cost extension
22	Approval from the UNDP GEF on the project no-cost extension
23	The project's Facebook and website

**Annex 3: Itinerary**

**International Expert Dr. Amal Aldababseh**  
**Terminal Evaluation of the project**  
**“Generating, Accessing and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions”**

Mission period: 14-22 November 2018: Phnom Penh and Siem Reap, Cambodia

**15 November 2018**

Time	Description	Venue	Objectives
9:00-10:00	Meeting with UNDP staff - Ms. NORNG Ratana, UNDP	Small Meeting Room, UNDP Office	Get a view from the oversight body on the project progress and expectation from the assignment
10:00-12:00	Meeting with PMU staff members - Mr. CHHIN Nith, Project Coordinator; - Ms. NORNG Ratana, UNDP - Ms. KY Lineth, Project Finance Officer	Project Office GSSD/MoE	Understand about the project progress, issues/challenges, expectation from the assignment

**16 November 2018**

Time	Description	Venue	Objectives
10:00-12:00	Meeting with UN-CBD representative - <i>Mr. UNG Samoeurn, Deputy Director of DBD, representing the Project focal point of UNCBD</i>	Dept. of Biodiversity	Understand the view of the focal person on the project progress, their expectation on the project, any other relevant perspectives
2:30-3:30	Meeting with <b>H.E. Tin Ponlok</b> Chair of Board and Secretary General of GSSD	SG Office GSSD/MoE	Get overall views of the project implementation and advice/guidance on the assignment

**17 November 2018 (Saturday 2018)**

Time	Description	Venue	Objectives
7:30 AM	Traveling to Siem Reap Province		Meet with stakeholders

**18 November 2018 (Sunday 2018)**

Time	Description	Venue	Objectives
9:00-10:30AM	Traveling to Orchid Garden - <i>Mr. CHHIN Nith, Project Coordinator;</i> - <i>Ms. NORNG Ratana, UNDP</i> - <i>Mr. Sam Oeurn Sothy Roth, Project Knowledge Management Officer</i>	Siem Reap and Orchid Center	- Conduct field visit; - Understand the piloting concepts of 3 Rio conventions.
10:30-12:00AM	Visit the Center		
12:00-2:00PM	Lunch Break		
2:00-4:00 PM	Meeting with piloting site's staff: - <i>Mr. SOK Vichea, Field technical assistant/Orchid Taxonomist;</i>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Mr. KONG Varong, Phnom Kulen National Park Director; and</i></li> <li>- <i>Phnom Kulen National Park Rangers</i></li> </ul>		
--	---	--	--

**19 November 2018**

Time	Description	Venue	Objectives
8:00-10:30AM	Meeting principal of Wat Bo Primary School in Siem Reap, Environmentally friendly school and 2018 IDBD Celebration Venue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Mr. ORN Kunroith, Vice Principal of School</i></li> </ul>	Wat Bo School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Understand the project concepts, especially the Biodiversity and environment within the school;</li> <li>- Get a view on the project benefits</li> </ul>
10:30 AM	Traveling back to Phnom Penh		

**20 November 2018**

Time	Description	Venue	Objectives
9:00-09:45	Meeting with UNCCD focal point <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Dr. MEAS Pyseth, Project focal point, Deputy Secretary General of MAFF</i></li> </ul>	Dept. of International Cooperation/MAFF	Understand the view of the focal person on the project progress, their expectation on the project, any other relevant perspective
10:00-11:30	Review the project progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Mr. CHHIN Nith, Project Coordinator</i></li> </ul>		
11:45-12:15	Meeting with MoE Department of Information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Mr. CHHOR Elette, Department Director, MoE</i></li> </ul>	Dept of Information	Understand the views of the relevant people who works for MoE information dissemination
2:30 – 3:30 PM	Meeting with UNDP Management team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Mr. Nick Beresford: UNDP Country Director;</i></li> <li>- <i>Ms. Rany Pen: Head of Programme Unit</i></li> </ul>	Small Meeting Room, UNDP Office	Get the overall view about the project and expectation

**21 November 2018**

Time	Description	Venue	Objectives
9:30AM-12:00	Review the project progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Mr. CHHIN Nith, Project Coordinator;</i></li> <li>- <i>Ms. NORNG Ratana, UNDP</i></li> </ul>	UNDP	Reviewing the project outputs possible
1:00-2:00PM	Meeting with Royal University of Phnom Penh representative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Mr. CHHIN Sophia, Senior Researcher</i></li> </ul>	RUPP	Understand the view of the project implementation and project benefits
2:00 -3:00PM	Meeting for the Scorecards Review with the UNDP representative and the Project Coordinator; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Mr. CHHIN Nith, Project Coordinator;</i></li> <li>- <i>Ms. NORNG Ratana, UNDP</i></li> </ul>	UNDP Office	Update the scorecards

**22 November 2018**

Time	Description	Venue	Objective
------	-------------	-------	-----------

01:00-02:00PM	Overall review of the Project Progress - <i>Mr. CHHIN Nith, Project Coordinator;</i>	Hotel	
2:00-3:00 PM	Virtual meeting with UNFCCC Focal Point - <i>Mr. SUM Thy, Project Focal Point of UNFCCC and Director of the Department of Climate Change of GSSD</i>		Understand the view of the focal person on the project progress, their expectation on the project, any other relevant perspective
4:30- 5:30 PM	Wrap Up meeting <i>Mr. CHHIN Nith, Project Coordinator;</i>		Final review and discussion of project progress, risks and challenges faced the PMU during project implementation

**Annex 4. List of persons interviewed**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>
1.	<i>H.E. Tin Ponlok</i>	<i>Chair of Board and Secretary General of GSSD</i>	<i>GSSD/MOE</i>
2.	<i>Ms. Somaly Chan</i>	<i>National Project Director and Deputy Secretary General of GSSD</i>	<i>GSSD/MOE</i>
3.	<i>Mr. UNG Samoeurn</i>	<i>Deputy Director of DBD, representing the Project focal point of UNCBD</i>	<i>MOE</i>
4.	<i>Mr. SUM Thy</i>	<i>Project Focal Point of UNFCCC and Director of the Department of Climate Change of GSSD</i>	<i>GSSD/MOE</i>
5.	<i>Dr. MEAS Pyseth,</i>	<i>Project focal point, Deputy Secretary General of MAFF</i>	<i>MAFF</i>
6.	<i>Ms. NORNG Ratana</i>	<i>Programme Analyst</i>	<i>UNDP</i>
7.	<i>Mr. CHHIN Nith</i>	<i>Project Coordinator</i>	<i>GSSD/MOE</i>
8.	<i>Ms. KY Lineth,</i>	<i>Project Finance Officer</i>	<i>GSSD/MOE</i>
9.	<i>Mr. SOK Vichea</i>	<i>Field technical assistant/ Orchid Taxonomist; Phnom Kulen National Park Rangers</i>	<i>MOE</i>
10.	<i>Mr. KONG Varong</i>	<i>Phnom Kulen National Park Director</i>	<i>MOE</i>
11.	<i>Mr. ORN Kunroith</i>	<i>Vice Principal of School</i>	
12.	<i>Mr. CHHOR Elette,</i>	<i>Information Technology Department Director</i>	<i>MoE</i>
13.	<i>Mr. Nick Beresford</i>	<i>UNDP Country Director</i>	<i>UNDP</i>
14.	<i>Ms. Rany Pen</i>	<i>Head of Programme Unit</i>	<i>UNDP</i>
15.	<i>Sam Oeurn Sothy Roth</i>	<i>Project Knowledge Management Officer</i>	<i>GSSD/MOE</i>
16.	<i>Phnom Kulen National Park rangers</i>	<i>Rangers</i>	<i>MOE</i>

**Annex 5. Evaluative Question Matrix**

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Indicators	Means of Verification
<b>i. Project Strategy</b>		
<b>1. Project design</b>		
Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context of achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.	Reported adaptive management measures in response to changes in context.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project progress reports.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.</li> </ul>
Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?	Reported progress toward achieving the results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project progress reports.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.</li> </ul>
Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?	<p>Endorsement of the project by governmental agencies.</p> <p>Provision of counterpart funding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Documents endorsements and co-financing.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with UNDP, project staff and governmental agencies.</li> </ul>
Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?	Level of participation of project partners in project design and actual inclusion in project implementation arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with stakeholders.</li> <li>▪ Project progress reports.</li> </ul>
Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.	Level of gender issues raised outlined in project documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project documents</li> </ul>
<b>2. Results Framework/ Logframe:</b>		
Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log frame indicators and targets, assess how "smart" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.	Indicators and targets of outcome and outputs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project framework</li> </ul>
Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and within its time frame?	The stated contribution of stakeholders in project implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with stakeholders.</li> </ul>

Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyze beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.	Indicators of the project's outcome (from the project results framework)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Field visits and interviews with local stakeholders involved with these projects and the direct beneficiaries.</li> </ul>
Ensure the broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend smart 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.	Measures were taken to ensure proper project implementation based on project monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project's reports.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with PSC/Project board members</li> <li>▪ Minutes of interviews with key stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>ii. Progress Towards Results</b>		
<b>3. Progress towards outcomes analysis</b>		
Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix.	Output level indicators of the Results Framework.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project progress reports.</li> <li>▪ Tangible Products (publications, studies, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Interviews with the project's staff, partners, and stakeholders.</li> </ul>
<b>iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management</b>		
<b>4. Management arrangement</b>		
Review the overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.	Level of implementation of mechanisms outlined in the project document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff and partners.</li> <li>▪ Project progress reports.</li> </ul>
Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.	Level of satisfaction (among partners and project staff) of overall management by Implementing partner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff, consultants, and partner organizations</li> </ul>
Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.	Level of satisfaction (among partners and project staff) of overall management by UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff, consultants, and partner organizations</li> </ul>
<b>5. Work planning</b>		
Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.	Level of compliance with project planning / annual plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project progress reports.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff.</li> </ul>

Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?	List of results proposed in the work plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project work plan.</li> </ul>
Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.	Level of compliance with project results framework and logframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project progress reports.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff.</li> </ul>
<b>6. Finance and co-finance</b>		
Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.	Level of compliance with project financial planning / annual plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project financial reports.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff.</li> </ul>
Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.	Level of compliance with project financial planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project financial reports.</li> </ul>
Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for the timely flow of funds?	<p>Quality of standards for financial and operative management.</p> <p>Perception of management efficiency by project partners and project staff/consultants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with the project and UNDP finance staff.</li> <li>▪ Financial reports.</li> </ul>
Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?	Level of co-financing in relation to the original planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Financial reports of the project.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project management staff and UNDP RTA.</li> </ul>
<b>7. Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems</b>		
Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?	<p>Measures were taken to improve project implementation based on project monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>Level of implementation of the M&amp;E system.</p> <p>Changes in project implementation as result of supervision visits/missions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project progress and implementation reports.</li> <li>▪ Interview with project staff, UNDP team, and key stakeholders.</li> </ul>
Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and	The number of cases where resources are insufficient.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project progress reports/ financial reports/ consultant contracts and report</li> </ul>

evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?	The number of cases where budgets were transferred between different budget lines.	
<b>8. Stakeholder Engagement</b>		
Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?	Level of participation of project partners in project design and actual inclusion in project implementation arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with key stakeholders</li> </ul>
Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?	<p>Endorsement of the project by governmental agencies.</p> <p>Provision of counterpart funding</p> <p>Perception of ownership by national and local agencies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with national partners, UNDP and project staff.</li> <li>▪ Project progress reports/PIR.</li> <li>▪ Documented endorsements and co-financing.</li> </ul>
Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards the achievement of project objectives?	<p>Perceived level of collaboration and coordination.</p> <p>The stated contribution of stakeholders in the achievement of outputs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with the Project Management team.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with stakeholders.</li> <li>▪ Citation of stakeholders' roles in specific products like publications</li> </ul>
<b>9. Reporting</b>		
Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.	Reported adaptive management measures in response to changes in context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project progress reports</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders</li> </ul>
Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfill GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly rated PIRs, if applicable?)	Level of alignment with the GEF mandate and policies at the time of design and implementation; and the GEF CCCD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Comparison of project document and annual reports and policy and strategy papers of local-regional agencies, GEF and UNDP.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with UNDP, project and governmental agencies.</li> </ul>
Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented,	Reported adaptive management measures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project progress reports.</li> </ul>

shared with key partners and internalized by partners.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.</li> </ul>
<b>10. Communications</b>		
Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?	<p>The degree to which plans were followed up by project management.</p> <p>Perception of effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project progress reports.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.</li> </ul>
Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)	<p>Stated the existed means of communication.</p> <p>The degree to which plans were followed up by project management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project progress reports.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>iv. Sustainability</b>		
Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.	<p>Identified risks and mitigation measures during project design and the updated risk-log sheet in ATLAS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project document</li> <li>▪ Progress report</li> <li>▪ Risk log</li> </ul>
<b>11. Financial risks to sustainability.</b>		
What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income-generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?	<p>Estimations on financial requirements.</p> <p>Estimations of the future budget of key stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Studies on financial sustainability.</li> <li>▪ Documented estimations of the future budget.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>12. Socio-economic risks to sustainability.</b>		
<p>Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</p> <p>What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?</p> <p>Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?</p> <p>Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?</p>	<p>Key factors positively or negatively impacted project results (in relation to the stated assumptions).</p> <p>Main national stakeholders participate actively in the implementation and replication of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff, key stakeholders.</li> <li>▪ Project progress reports.</li> <li>▪ Revision of literature on context</li> <li>▪ Documentation on activities of key stakeholders</li> </ul>

<p>Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?</p>	<p>project activities and results.</p>	
<p><b>13. Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability</b></p>		
<p>Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures, and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.</p>	<p>Key institutional frameworks that may positively or negatively influence project results (in relation to stated assumptions)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analysis of existing frameworks.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders</li> </ul>
<p><b>14. Environmental risks to sustainability</b></p>		
<p>Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?</p>	<p>Number of identified risks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Risk log and management response.</li> </ul>

## **Annex 6. The questionnaire used for the interviews**

A set of questions, listed below, were prepared during the TE inception phase and were used in the interviews in Cambodia. Some of the questions were not asked depending on the person who is being interviewed. The list of questions was used to ensure that all aspects of the TE are covered, and the needed information is requested to complete the review exercise and a guide to prepare the semi-structured interviews.

### **I. Relevance - How does the Project relate to the main objectives of the GEF and to the environment and development priorities of Cambodia?**

1. Is the Project relevant to the GEF objectives?
2. Is the Project relevant to UNDP objectives?
3. Is the Project relevant to Cambodia development objectives?
4. Does the Project address the needs of target beneficiaries?
5. Is the Project internally coherent in its design?
6. How is the Project relevant considering other donors?
7. What lessons have been learned and what changes could have been made to the Project to strengthen the alignment between the Project and the Partners' priorities and areas of focus?
8. How could the Project better target and address the priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries?

### **II. Effectiveness – To what extent are the expected outcomes of the Project being achieved?**

1. How is the Project effective in achieving its expected outcomes?
2. How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?

### **III. Efficiency - How efficiently is the Project implemented?**

1. Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?
2. Did the Project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?
3. Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for Project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?
4. Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?
5. Was Project implementation as cost-effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? Was the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happening as planned? Were financial resources utilized efficiently?
6. Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?
7. Were there institutionalized or informal feedback or dissemination mechanism to ensure that findings, lessons learned and recommendations pertaining to Project design and implementation effectiveness were shared among Project stakeholders, UNDP and GEF Staff and other relevant organizations for ongoing Project adjustment and improvement? Did the Project mainstream gender considerations into its implementation?
8. To what extent were partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations encouraged and supported?
9. Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which one can be considered sustainable?
10. What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? (between local actors, UNDP/GEF and relevant government entities)
11. Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?
12. Did the Project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the Project?

### **IV. IMPACTS - What are the potential and realized impacts of activities carried out in the context of the Project?**

1. Will the project achieve its objective that is to improve fiscal measures for collecting, managing, and allocating revenues for global environmental management?
2. How is the Project impacting the local environment such as impacts or likely impacts on the local environment; on poverty; and, on other socio-economic issues?

**V. Sustainability - Are the initiatives and results of the Project allowing for continued benefits?**

1. Are sustainability issues adequately integrated into Project design?
2. Did the Project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?
3. Is there evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project support?
4. Are laws, policies, and frameworks being addressed through the Project, in order to address the sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?
5. Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?
6. Did the Project contribute to key building blocks for social and political sustainability?
7. Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?
8. What are the main challenges that may hinder the sustainability of efforts?

**Annex 7: List of Project's Key Events (Meetings, Training sessions, and Public Awareness Events)****1. Board meetings**

No.	Meetings	Date	Number of participants	
			Total	Female
1.	First Board Meeting of the Project	June 2016	9	2
2.	Second Board Meeting of the Project	September 2016	14	7
3.	Third Board Meeting of the Project	Jan 2017	13	8
4.	Fourth Board Meeting of the Project	August 2017	19	9
5.	Fifth Board Meeting of the Project	Jan 2018	18	6
<b>Total</b>			<b>73</b>	<b>33</b>

**2. Consultation meetings**

No.	Events	Date	Number of participants	
			Total	Female
1.	Consultation on project plans with UNDP representative and focal points	July 2016	11	5
2.	Deliverable consultation meeting	September 2016	12	5
3.	Deliverable consultation meeting	February 2017	12	6
4.	Deliverable consultation meeting	March 2017	24	11
5.	Deliverable consultation meeting	April 2017	19	8
6.	Deliverable consultation meeting	Early May 2017	15	8
9.	Deliverable consultation meeting	Late May 2017	15	6
10.	Deliverable consultation meeting	July 2017	15	6
11.	Joint technical meeting	February 2018	15	8
12.	Deliverable consultation meeting	June 2018	20	9
13.	Deliverable consultation meeting (Jo)	July 2018	20	11
14.	Deliverable consultation meeting (Jo)	September 2018	16	4
<b>Total</b>			<b>196</b>	<b>81</b>

**3. Training sessions/workshops**

No.	Events	Date	Number of participants	
			Total	Female
1.	Inception workshop	May 2016	93	45
2.	Training workshop on "Implementation of UNCCD in Cambodia"	November 2016	65	30
3.	Training workshop on "Biodiversity Management and Youth"	February 2017	272	120
4.	Mainstreaming Workshop on "Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Biosafety Policies into Practices"	October 2017	150	65
5.	Project Product Disseminating and Technical Data Collecting Workshop	April 2018	66	20

6.	Capacity Building on Specimen Collection and Management in Siem Reap province	August 2018	75	7
7.	Capacity Building on Specimen Collection and Management in Kampong Thom province	Later August 2018	35	3
8.	Gender Mainstreaming Capacity Building	November 2018	48	29
9.	Communication and Partnership Strategy in Kampot	November 2018	33	8
<b>Total</b>			<b>837</b>	<b>326</b>

#### 4. International Day for Biological Diversity (IDBD) and World Day to Combat Land Degradation (WDD) and Video Spot Development

No.	Events	Date	Main venue	Estimated number of participants	
				Total	Female
1.	IDBD	May 2016	Kampong Thom+5 Province	1200	500
2.	WDD	June 2016	Kampong Speu	600	200
3.	IDBD	May 2017	RUPP, Phnom Penh+5 provinces	1200	500
4.	WDD	June 2017	Royal University of Agriculture	1000	300
5.	IDBD	May 2018	Siem Reap + 6 provinces	1400	600
6.	Video Spot development	October 2018	TVK, Phnom Penh	50	25
<b>Total</b>				<b>5450</b>	<b>2125</b>

#### 5. Upcoming events

No.	Events	Date	Location	Estimated number of participants	
				Total	Female
1.	Consultation meeting on international advisor's assignment outputs	Week of November 2018	Phnom Penh	15	8
2.	Project output dissemination seminars at 3 regional levels	Week 2 of December 2018	Kampong Cham	200	100
3.		Week 2 of December 2018	Battambang	150	150
4.		Week 3 of December 2018	Kampot	150	120
5.	IMS and website launching	Week 1 of December 2018	Phnom Penh	200	100
6.	Final project workshop	Week 2 of December 2018	Phnom Penh	120	70
7.	Final project board meeting	Week 4 of December 2018	Phnom Penh	15	7
<b>Total</b>				<b>635</b>	<b>555</b>

## **Annex 8: Changes on the Log-frame proposed during the Project' Inception Workshop.**

Important changes made to the Project Document 10. The following changes were made to the Project Document to update and complete it:

- The GEF Theory of Change approach was applied to clarify the project objectives and outputs and identify the whole suite of activities needed to achieve them. Thus, section C2 a3 "Expected Outcomes and Outputs" was revised and completed. More specifically,
  - (a) Output 1.1, the emphasis was broadened to include effectiveness and efficiency, feasibility, i.e. beyond harmonization of existing systems;
  - (b) Output 1.3 was added on information generation;
  - (c) Output 1.4, more details are provided;
  - (d) Output 2.1, two additional tools of critical importance to Cambodia i.e. scenario/ modeling and impact assessment were added;
  - (e) Output 2.2, not only capacity to negotiate is important (see output 2.3 below) but also and mainly capacity to implement the 3 Rio Conventions in a more coherent, coordinated and efficient manner;
  - (f) Output 2.3, not only the capacity of existing institutions needs to be strengthened but also of individuals;
  - (g) Output 2.4, not only 'unified' process is needed but it should be coherent and well-coordinated.
- The general approach for identifying main activities under each output:
  - (i) surveyor assessment of the situation,
  - (ii) strength/weakness/opportunity/threat (SWOT) assessment or problem and opportunities identification,
  - (iii) addressing SWOT at small scales (pilot phase): identifying and testing possible solutions,
  - (iv) upscaling application of best solutions and capacity building;
- The NCSA triangulation procedure was used for SWOT analysis, and for effectiveness, efficiency and success assessment. The procedure consists of (i) desk study, (ii) Interviews and small group discussions, and (iii) stakeholders' workshops and validation;
- The three-year work plan was revised considering the revised outputs and identified main activities, and the first-year work plan considered during the Inception Workshop was finalized with related targets for the year. These work plans are contained in Annexes 5.1 and 4.2b, with their related budgets in annexes 4.1 and 4.2a;
- The text of the Project Document has been updated in general taking into account that the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) deadline was reached at the end of 2015; that the world community had adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development - Transforming our world with Sustainable Development Goals for 2030; that the 21st meeting of the UNFCCC COP 21 had taken place in Paris, France; and that Cambodia adopted its revised NBSAP in early 2016;
- In section B2b, the sub-section on biodiversity was revised in line with the revised NBSAP because, as written, that section focused on forests without covering all aspects of biodiversity. The section now refers to the value of biodiversity, ecosystem services, green economy, sustainable development, the impact of climate change and other drivers including

desertification/drought and resulting ecosystem degradation. The links with the other Rio Conventions have now been highlighted;

- Throughout the document, the role of MOEYS, research institutions, and local communities was highlighted for the generation of information/knowledge and as users of information;
- Table 3 on “Risks for each outcome and output, their levels and assumptions” was revised and completed in the light of new outputs and main activities; (i) In Annex 3 on “Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard”, two new indicators were added for their relevance to the project: (i) Indicator 6bis – Amount of information and data generated on biodiversity, climate change and land degradation/ drought/ desertification including biological/ecological, socioeconomic information and traditional knowledge, practices and know-how, and (ii) Indicator 9bis. The extent of gender mainstreaming planning and implementation. The columns on “Comments” and “Next steps” were also revised and the contributions to the outcomes adjusted accordingly;
- The Annex4 on “Project Results Framework” was also revised by taking into account the new state of the outputs and having in mind the main activities that would lead to the outputs;
- (k) Texts on MEAs that have been ratified or signed by the country were revised.

**Annex 9: Progress evaluation for the complete Log-frame**

The below key is used for indicator assessment (Color Coding):

<b>Green = completed, the indicator shows successful achievement</b>
<b>Yellow = On target to be achieved by the end of the project</b>
<b>Red = Not on target to be achieved by project closure</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
<p><b>Objective:</b></p> <p><b>To improve access to environmental information related to the Rio Conventions through the harmonization of existing environmental management information systems and improving coordination of the implementation of these conventions in Cambodia.</b></p>	<p>Key environmental management information systems are harmonized with open-access and covering areas related to the Rio Conventions.</p>	<p>Environmental knowledge related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia is comprehensive and easily accessible.</p>	<p>The project is first implemented through NIM. This is a tremendous achievement for Cambodia. The government and UNDP now have established their new way of working and agreed on the implementation modality - guidance of the CCCA manual. NIM is optimal for learning especially for a capacity building project about capacity building.</p> <p>The project is now moving - the critical missing aspect is a Technical Advisor /Specialist on EIMS</p>	<p>The layout of the Information Management System (IMS) is designed, developed and endorsed.</p> <p>A Clearing House Mechanism on the 4 common thematic areas of the Rio conventions is online yet a lot of work needs to be done in order to finalize the work as some key sections are under construction.</p> <p>The CHM is designed for public access to the relevant information regarding the 3 Rio conventions, focusing on the synergy themes.</p> <p>The development of the CHM web- was completed and put up online, it was officially launched on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2018.</p>	<p><i>Indicators show successful achievement</i></p>	S

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
			system, Rio Conventions Standards and CB specialist to develop and take responsibility for the core project deliverables (Output 1) and to guide the capacity development strategy.	Focal persons are assigned from each of the conventions to ensure the gradual upload of the information.		
	Quality of monitoring reports and communications to measure implementation progress of the Rio Conventions.	Reports present adequate disaggregated data at the sub-national level, are informative and present environmental trends over time.	While some capacity building events have taken place, it needs to be situated in a structured strategy and roadmap that can be monitored for results. Capacity building will need both process and concrete targets and indicators that can be measured at the end of this project in line with the scorecard	<p>The communication and monitoring report on the implementation progress of the three conventions are produced based on more evidence, technical analysis with support from experts, and information sharing among the three conventions.</p> <p>Key deliverables were produced, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communication reports related to the implementation of the strategic plans for the respective Rio conventions;</li> <li>- Interim report on the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing, submitted in 2017</li> </ul> <p>Identification of the scope of synergy among the Rio conventions and a list of joint indicators to measure the implementation progress under each of the common thematic areas, the instruments and monitoring tools were also identified to track the progress.</p> <p>The reporting of the implementation progress under respective Rio</p>	<b>Indicators show that target to be achieved by the end of the project.</b>	<b>MS</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				<p>Conventions during Ad-hoc and COP meetings in 2017 and 2018 were made based on more systematic consideration of evidence info shared from each of the conventions, although the information sharing is not yet done in a systematic manner.</p> <p>Disaggregated data at the national and sub-national level from biodiversity, climate change, and land, and its interrelated impact are being used as input data to develop the 6<sup>th</sup> National Report on the status of the implementation of the National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBSAP) in Cambodia.</p>		
	Capacity development scorecard rating	Capacity for: -Engagement: 7 of 9 -Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 10 of 15 -Policy and legislation development: 5 of 9		<p>To support the rollout of the common web-portal, known as Clearing House Mechanism, the project also supports the following products:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roadmap and action plans to implement partnership and communication strategy;</li> <li>• 5-year capacity development plan to enhance synergy among the three Rio conventions and its implementation; and</li> </ul>	<b>Indicators show successful achievement</b>	<b>S</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
		-Management and implementation : 5 of 6 -Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6 (Total targeted score: 31/45)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication and partnership strategies for the 3 Rio Conventions have been developed.</li> </ul> <p>The Project updated Capacity Development Scorecard showed great progress in building the national capacities towards the achievement of the Project objective. The set target was achieved.</p> <p>The updated scorecard shows that the total target was achieved as the total score is 31 out of the 45, as planned.</p>		
<b><i>OUTCOME 1: IMPROVED ACCESS AND GENERATION OF INFORMATION RELATED TO THE THREE RIO CONVENTIONS</i></b>						
<b>Output 1.1: An efficient and effective information management system covering the three Rio Conventions.</b>	A system and a data architecture to harmonize key environmental information systems	Environmental information systems are harmonized using internationally recognized standards.	Products are developed but they need to be technically vetted for quality and certain gaps addressed i.e. legal /institutional scoping /costing for EMIS. No discussion on the importance of indicators, data collection and its relationship to the NCS monitoring system has transpired yet.	The project has closely consulted with all the RIO Conventions focal points to define the layout of the Information Management System which was already designed, developed and endorsed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An inventory of existing information/information management systems of relevance to the three Rio conventions in Cambodia;</li> <li>- A SWOT analysis of the effectiveness and efficiency of the existing environmental information</li> </ul>	<b><i>Indicators show that target to be achieved by the end of the project.</i></b>	<b><i>MS</i></b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				management system (IMS) in Cambodia. - The Clearing House Mechanism on the 4 common thematic areas of the 3 Rio convention expect is online.		
<b>Output 1.2: A common clearinghouse mechanism for the three Rio Conventions.</b>	A developed clearinghouse mechanism in place at GSSD/MOE and covering all environmental areas related to the Rio Conventions.	Open-access to all data, reports, plans, and documents available on the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia.	The work on CHM is advancing. Through participation in the project board meetings, the three focal points for the conventions is collaborating and being attuned to the work. A draft inventory has been produced. The raft, however, is weak on institutional requirements and costing for systems maintenance. it needs to be accompanied by a vision of what the CHM links to in terms of EMS and the document produced intended to inform the design of the CHM needs to be technically vetted and approved by a knowledgeable RIO conventions advisor before	A set of analytical papers were prepared to support the development of the CHM: - Report on the inventory of existing information/information management systems of relevance to the Rio conventions in Cambodia; - Report on organs/bodies/agencies that generate data/information concerning the Rio conventions in Cambodia, and SWOT analysis and recommendations on the best agency for the project to follow; - SWOT Analysis report of existing websites related to the Rio conventions in Cambodia.  As of November 2018, the features, interfaces, and title of the joint RIO Conventions Clearing House Mechanism have been identified as “Synergistic Implementation of UNCBD, UNFCCC, and UNCBD”.  The prospective location of the information management system and	<b>Indicators show that target to be achieved by the end of the project.</b>	<b>MS</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
			<p>the work can advance. There may be gaps that need to be addressed before the products produced can be useful. The recommendation and risk are that this product is used in the absence of a Technical Advisor / Specialist with a background in the EMIS system and international riot standards are not involved in the design of the CHM.</p>	<p>the joint Clearing House Mechanism is determined under the GSSD/MoE domain. For sustainability purpose, a focal point will be assigned to ensure the functioning of this common web portal.</p> <p>Cambodia CHM: <a href="http://www.chm.gdancp-moe.org/">http://www.chm.gdancp-moe.org/</a></p> <p>3 Rio Conventions website: <a href="http://3rio.chm.gdancp-moe.org/en/">http://3rio.chm.gdancp-moe.org/en/</a></p> <p>In addition to the plans to share all the project reports via the Clearing House Mechanism, the printed materials of the project have been shared with the main stakeholders (the focal points of the 3Rio conventions), their partners, decision-makers, academia and youths etc. by means of and/or during training workshops, meetings; CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD-related events such as International Day for Biological Diversity, World Day to Combat Desertification, Energy Saving Time etc.</p> <p>The CHM is designed for public access to the relevant information regarding the 3 Rio conventions, focusing on the synergy themes.</p>		

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				<p>The development of the CHM web- was completed and put up online, it was officially launched on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2018.</p> <p>Focal persons are assigned from each of the conventions to ensure the gradual upload of the information.</p>		
<b>Output 1.3: Generation of information related to the Rio Conventions enhanced qualitatively and quantitatively, coherent and better coordinated for complementarity, synergy, and efficiency</b>	Multi-stakeholder, multi-disciplinary, multiple-authored articles published in scientific journals, conference proceedings, and reports.	Increased number of high-quality publications of relevance to 2 or the 3 Rio Conventions and produced efficiently through multiple-authored efforts	This target can be linked to the capacity development plan and the need for evidence-based COP negotiations and documentation of the state of the environment in Cambodia building on the information arising from the CHM work. These targets can be linked to the preparation of the three RIO focal points for their next COPs. It should also be linked to the data that is now being collated by the /through the clearing house mechanism and linked to the expected outcome of this project.	<p>Some work has been initiated with the RUPP, however, no articles have been published in any scientific journals yet.</p> <p>Cambodia's summary statements- with the support of the Project- were published in Earth Negotiations Bulletin in the high-level meeting and COP events; <a href="http://enb.iisd.org/">http://enb.iisd.org/</a></p> <p>The focal team from climate change and biodiversity, with stronger engagement among each other under the project support, had shared evidence-based technical input during the Greater Mekong Sub-region Roundtable on Climate Change Adaptation which was held in 2016 in Bangkok. As the result, the input from Cambodia was integrated and used as part of the development of Guideline for Watershed Vulnerability and Adaptation</p>	<b><i>The indicator shows successful achievement</i></b>	<b>S</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				<p>Assessment, finalized in 2018. This guideline will be used for the country in the region, and particularly for Cambodia, to ensure a more systematic approach to identify a solution to climate change issue, which will lead to more effective management of biological resource and resource of Mekong river basin.</p> <p>Based on the exchange of evidence-based data from the 3 Rio conventions, a delegation from Cambodia had share inputs and contribute to the scientific platform (SBSTTA) and papers covering different thematic areas. Below is the list of contribution from Cambodia over the year 2017 and 2018 produced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenarios for the 2050 vision for biodiversity (CBD/SBSTTA/21/2)</li> <li>• Mainstreaming into other sectors (CBD/SBSTTA/21/5)</li> <li>• Protected Areas and Ecosystem Restoration (CBD/SBSTTA/21/6)</li> <li>• Updated scientific assessment of progress towards selected Aichi Biodiversity Targets and options for accelerating progress (CBD/SBSTTA/22/5)</li> </ul>		

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protected areas and other measures for enhanced conservation and management (CBD/SBSTTA/22/6)</li> <li>• Biodiversity and climate change: ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction (CBD/SBSTTA/22/8)</li> <li>• Mainstreaming of biodiversity within and across sectors and other strategic actions to enhance implementation (CBD/SBI/2/5)</li> <li>• Capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer (CBD/SBI/2/10)</li> <li>• Review of progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (CBD/COP/14/8)</li> <li>• Knowledge management and communication (CBD/COP/14/11)</li> <li>• Mechanisms for national reporting, assessment, and review (CBD/COP/14/12)</li> <li>• Enhancing integration under the Convention and its Protocols with respect to provisions related to access and benefit-sharing,</li> </ul>		

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				biosafety, and Article 8(j) and related provisions (CBD/COP/14/13) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooperation with other conventions, international organizations, and initiatives (CBD/COP/14/14)</li> <li>• Second work programme of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (CBD/COP/14/16)</li> <li>• Long-term strategic directions to the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity, approaches to living in harmony with nature and preparation for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (CBD/COP/14/17)</li> <li>• Biodiversity and climate change (CBD/COP/14/21)</li> <li>• Mainstreaming of biodiversity within and across sectors (CBD/COP/14/22)</li> <li>• Spatial planning, protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (CBD/COP/14/24)</li> <li>• Capacity-building (CBD/BS/MOP/9/8)</li> <li>• Preparation for the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Strategic Plan for the</li> </ul>		

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				<p>Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CBD/BS/MOP/9/14)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk assessment and risk management (CBD/BS/MOP/9/15)</li> <li>• Socio-economic considerations (CBD/BS/MOP/9/18)</li> <li>• Measures to assist in capacity-building and capacity development (CBD/NP/MOP/3/9)</li> <li>• The Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House and information-sharing (CBD/NP/MOP/3/10)</li> <li>• Measures to raise awareness of the importance of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge (CBD/NP/MOP/3/12)</li> <li>• Preparation for the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (CBD/NP/MOP/3/16)</li> <li>• Two more Odonata species recorded for Cambodia. Cambodian Journal of Natural History (CJNH)</li> <li>• A small terrestrial mammal survey and analysis of bait consumption at Bokor National Park, Cambodia. Cambodian Journal of Natural History (CJNH)</li> <li>• National Biodiversity Status in Cambodia. Cambodian Journal of Natural History (CJNH)</li> </ul>		

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of Fiscal Gap and Financing of Cambodia's Protected Areas. (IJERD – International Journal of Environmental and Rural Development (2015) 6-2</li> </ul>		
<b>Output 1.4: Existing stakeholder platforms strengthened and better coordinated in order to facilitate access and exchange of information, and increase stakeholder networking and engagement in Convention related dialogues and processes</b>	Stakeholders engagement in Rio Conventions related dialogues.	<p>A platform to exchange environmental information related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions.</p> <p>And An increase of 50% of stakeholders' engagement in related dialogues</p>		<p>Key events were organized to ensure proper engagement with stakeholders to exchange environmental information related to the implementation of 3 Rio conventions, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical Working Group (TWG) meetings and related events;</li> <li>- Annual biodiversity and natural resource management forums;</li> <li>- Training sessions and workshops on the status and implementation of 3 Rio conventions with approximately 873 participants, 209 of whom are women;</li> <li>- World days to combat land degradation/desertification;</li> <li>- International day for biological diversity to raise awareness among the public on the key messages of land issues, climate change, and biodiversity; and</li> <li>- Climate change day to save energy;</li> </ul> <p>Engagement of stakeholder in dialogues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Convention dialogue meetings;</li> </ul>	<i>The indicator was partially achieved.</i>	<b>MS</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				<p>- Consultation meetings, seminars, training, TV programs on 3 Rio conventions in its implementation.</p> <p>The working group composing of around 21 line-ministries, academic institutions, is functioning. This working group will have convening power to gather different relevant stakeholders at the national level for the relevant thematic areas. The meeting of the working group will be served as the platform at the national level to ensure dialogue among relevant stakeholders. The project also supports and coordinates to get agreement from all the conventions, issue a Joint-Declaration among the three conventions to discuss, share, and make a joint decision for the selected synergy thematic areas of the Rio conventions. This Joint-Declaration was drafted and submitted for approval, it will be used as the add on, to explain the extended role of the working group members focusing on the thematic areas related to 3 Rio Conventions.</p> <p>However, the project did not manage to establish a good and comprehensive partnership and stakeholder's</p>		

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				engagement agreements with many stakeholders. Most of the work was limited to the project's main beneficiaries (GSSD/MOE, MAFF).		
	An operational inter-sectorial coordination mechanism that builds on existing coordination instruments.	An operational inter-sectorial coordination mechanism in place to coordinate the implementation of MEAs in Cambodia.		<p>Based on the discussions with each of the Rio conventions focal point and in line with the project board approval, a Prakas (joint declaration between the institutions of the 3 Rio focal points) was drafted and expected to be finalized by end of Project.</p> <p>This Prakas aims at upgrading the roles of each of the convention focal point in ensuring collaboration in implementing and monitoring the implementation progress in a synergic manner. This Prakas is built on the existing Technical Working Group mechanism, named Biodiversity Technical Working Group which composes of all the 3 Rio convention focal persons and other relevant line ministries.</p> <p>At national level, following the establishment of the National Council of Sustainable Development in 2015, which plays role as national coordinating body across the board to address the environmental and natural resources issue covering the areas</p>	<p><b>Indicators show that target has been partially achieved. With the remaining work that the project planned to undertake, the needed coordination should be achieved.</b></p>	<b>MS</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				committed under the 3 Rio convention, a more focused mechanism is also in place to ensure close coordination among stakeholder to address MEAs in Cambodia. The ongoing mechanism is Working Group on Climate Change, Working Group on Green Economy.		
<b>Outcome 2: Improved use of information and knowledge related to the Rio Conventions.</b>						
<b>Output 2.1: Innovative tools piloted for decision-making using the economic valuation of the use of natural resources.</b>	Model to implement environmental economic valuation in Cambodia.	A strategy on how to implement environmental economic valuation as a policy instrument in Cambodia	Evaluator reviewed this tool and does not see a training plan linked to a broader capacity development strategy. The output needs an overarching strategy and implementation plan. It should cover the needs for the target beneficiaries and for the broader stakeholders and the public. The capacity development can also focus on learning by doing as much as possible and some thought needs to go to get the focal points ready for negotiations undoing data from the CHM and system before the end of the project so	The MTR consultant recommended some changes to this output. However, there is no justification for the changes proposed. Hence, the TE consultant followed the original log-frame and thus provided the evaluation based on the original logframe, targets, and indicators.  A technical paper was produced with a focus on the analysis and identification of environmental economic valuation tools. However, no economic valuation tools were developed by the Project.	<b>Not on target to be achieved by project closure</b>	<b>MUS</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
			this can be measured. The output should include the development of learning guides for public sector workers and for schools. It might be interesting to partner with universities to develop a Mayer programmer on information [environmental] management systems and a 3 Rios children's education guide for primary schools.			
	Use of environmental economic valuation, impact assessments and scenarios and projections in environmental decision-making	3-4 policies, programmes or plans are developed using environmental economic valuation, impact assessments, and scenarios and projections, respectively.	The output needs an overarching strategy and implementation plan. It should cover the needs for the target beneficiaries and for the broader stakeholder and public. The capacity development can also focus on learning by doing as much as possible and so some though need to go to the getting the facial points ready for negotiations undoing data from the	Although the Project was able to influence the work on ecosystem services by utilizing the tools on environmental economic valuations, the work is not systematic and does not follow a specific environmental economic valuation tool.  A Project piloting is taking place in the Orchid Research and Conservation center in Siem Reap Province. With the support from the project and based on the need to feed the information management system and Clearing House Mechanism with native species	<b>Not on target to be achieved by project closure</b>	<b>MUS</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
			<p>CHM and system before the end of project spa this can be measured.</p> <p>The output should include the development of learning guides for public sector workers and for schools.</p> <p>It might be interesting to partner with universities to develop a Mayer programmer on environmental management systems... and a three Rios children's education guide for primary schools.</p>	of orchid and plants, part of obligations of ABS protocol, UNCBD.		
<b>Output 2.2: Institutional and individual capacities to implement the three Rio Conventions in a more coordinated and synergistic manner strengthened using the new reporting guide, and the environmental knowledge as well as the improved information</b>	Number of individuals and institutions using the new CHM and participating in the implementation of the other Rio Conventions when they belong institutionally one of the three conventions	Individuals and institutions taking part in 2 or the 3 Rio Conventions		Management and assigned focal team from CBD and UNFCC are currently working together to start and implement the next step of Orchid Research and Conservation Centre which aims to conserve and restore wild Orchid variety of Cambodia. As per the master plan, the Orchid Conservation Centre will cover the size of 1,500 ha of land, plan to explore/conservate/and expand more than 200 wild orchid varieties.	<b><i>Indicators show that target to be achieved by the end of the project.</i></b>	<b>MS</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
mechanisms being set in place under outcome 1				The work is on-going however, there is no mechanism to define the number of individuals and institutions using the new CHM.		
<b>Output 2.3: Capacity of existing institutions and individuals to advance Cambodian national interests on biodiversity, climate change and desertification/land degradation and drought matters and their interlinkages in regional and global networks and forums strengthened.</b>	Negotiation capacity of Cambodia at COPs meetings and in other regional or global forums	Negotiations at 2-3 COP meetings and in other regional or global forums with position papers for Cambodia		<p>The project has mobilized technical support to Cambodia delegation, enhancing evidence-based paper for negotiations in more than 3 international meetings as listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 interventions on Cambodia positions related to biodiversity conservation and management were presented at SBSTTA 21, SBSTTA 22, 10th meeting of Working Group on Article 8j (WG 8(j)-10) and the 2nd meeting of Subsidiary Body on Implementation of the Conventions on Biological Diversity (SBI-2)</li> <li>• At least 5 Cambodia statements were intervened in the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> sessions of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES-2, IPBES-3, IPBES-4).</li> <li>• Interventions were made during UNFCCC and UNCCD's meetings and COPs; and</li> </ul>	<b>Indicators show successful achievement</b>	<b>S</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Involvement in negotiation processes for 3 Rio conventions' Ad-Hoc, SBSTTA meetings, and COPs.</li> </ul>		
<b>Output 2.4: A coherent and coordinated reporting process for the three Rio Conventions.</b>	Quality, quantity, and timeliness of reports submitted to conventions	National communication s/ reports are submitted on time and contain primary data provided by the harmonized system(s)	There is every indication that the government will, and UNDP cooperation is in place for this project to succeed. With a competent Technical Advisor / Specialist onboard and a rescheduling of the project. The CN advisor will develop a good capacity development strategy and training plan /shadow learning that considers the need of all three RIO Conventions' stakeholder including the public and also for targeting the capacity building to the three RIO conventions focal points and delegation for negotiations and for reporting on conventions will lead to the success for this indicates. The big risk	<p>A few key reports were developed and submitted by Cambodia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communication reports related to the implementation of the strategic plans for respective RIO Conventions;</li> <li>- Position statement for COP meetings was developed with close consultation with relevant stakeholder of each of the Rio conventions;</li> <li>- Interim report on the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and benefit sharing.</li> </ul> <p>The project plan to produce guideline on producing a joint report to report the progress of the synergy among the 3Rio conventions. Yet, based on a series of stakeholder consultations, there is the need to carefully consider the current different requirement of reporting under each of the separate conventions regarding substantive side and</p>	<b>Indicators show successful achievement</b>	<b>S</b>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	2018 Proposed Targets End of Project	Mid-term Review level assessment	Progress at the TE time November 2018	TE Comments	Rating
			is that a competent advisor to develop and guide the stringy is not found.	timeframe of reporting. Further consultation will be conducted in this regard with each of the 3Rio convention.		

**Annex 10: Updated Capacity Scorecards**Project Name: **Generating, Accessing and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions Project.**Project Cycle Phase: Terminal EvaluationDate: 30 November 2018

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Score at MTR	Score at TE
<b>CR 1: Capacities for engagement</b>					
Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations	Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are not clearly defined	0			
	Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are identified	1			
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management are partially recognized by stakeholders	2	2		
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management recognized by stakeholders	3			3
Indicator 2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms	No co-management mechanisms are in place	0			
	Some co-management mechanisms are in place and operational	1	1		
	Some co-management mechanisms are formally established through agreements, MOUs, etc.	2			2
	Comprehensive co-management mechanisms are formally established and are operational/ functional	3			
Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups	Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in decision-making is poor	0			
	Stakeholders are identified but their participation in decision-making is limited	1	1		1.5
	Stakeholders are identified, and regular consultations mechanisms are established	2			
	Stakeholders are identified, and they actively contribute to established participative decision-making processes	3			
<b>CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge</b>					
Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders	Stakeholders are not aware of global environmental issues and their related possible solutions (MEAs)	0			
	Stakeholders are aware of global environmental issues but not about the possible solutions (MEAs)	1	1		
	Stakeholders are aware of global environmental issues and the possible solutions but do not know how to participate	2			2.5
	Stakeholders are aware of global environmental issues and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions	3			
Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders	The environmental information needs are not identified, and the information management infrastructure is inadequate	0			
	The environmental information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate	1			
	The environmental information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to manage and give information access to the public is limited	2	2		2
	Comprehensive environmental information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure	3			

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Score at MTR	Score at TE
Indicator 6 – Existence of environmental education programmes	No environmental education programmes are in place	0			
	Environmental education programmes are partially developed and partially delivered	1	1		1
	Environmental education programmes are fully developed but partially delivered	2			
	Comprehensive environmental education programmes exist and are being delivered	3			
Indicator 6bis – Amount of information and data generated on biodiversity, climate change and land degradation/ drought/ desertification including biological/ecological, socioeconomic information and traditional knowledge, practices, and know-how	No structure in place to generate or collect information of relevance to the three Rio Conventions	0			
	Some structures are in place to generate or collect information of relevance to the three Rio Conventions	1	1		1.5
	A wide range of structures are in place to generate or collect information of relevance to the three Rio Conventions	2			
	A comprehensive set of structures in place to generate and collect all kinds of information of relevance to the three Rio Conventions	3			
Indicator 7 – Extent of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development	No linkage exists between environmental policy development and science/research strategies and programmes	0			
	Research needs for environmental policy development are identified but are not translated into relevant research strategies and programmes	1	1		1
	Relevant research strategies and programmes for environmental policy development exist but the research information is not responding fully to the policy research needs	2			
	Relevant research results are available for environmental policy development	3			
Indicator 8 – Extent of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making	Traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making processes	0			
	Traditional knowledge is identified and recognized as important but is not collected and used in relevant participative decision-making processes	1	1		1
	Traditional knowledge is collected but is not used systematically into relevant participative decision-making processes	2			
	Traditional knowledge is collected, used and shared for effective participative decision-making processes	3			
<b>CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy, and legislation development</b>					
Indicator 9 – Extent of the environmental planning and strategy development process	The environmental planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental plans and strategies	0			
	The environmental planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental plans and strategies but there are not implemented/used	1			
	Adequate environmental plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding constraints and/or other problems	2	2		2
	The environmental planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead environmental organizations and produces the required environmental plans and strategies; which are being implemented	3			
Indicator 9bis. The extent of gender mainstreaming	Gender issues are not mainstreamed in policies and in processes for accessing, generating and using information of relevance to the Rio Conventions	0			

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Score at MTR	Score at TE
planning and implementation	Some plans exist to mainstream gender issues in policies and in processes for accessing, generating and using information of relevance to the Rio Conventions but they are not implemented	1	1		1
	Gender mainstreaming plans exist but they are applied only in a few sectors	2			
	Gender mainstreaming plans exist, and they are applied widely	3			
Indicator 10 – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks	The environmental policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment	0			
	Some relevant environmental policies and laws exist but few are implemented and enforced	1			
	Adequate environmental policy and legislation frameworks exist but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them	2	2		2.5
	Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment; a compliance and enforcement mechanism are established and functions	3			
Indicator 11 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making	The availability of environmental information for decision-making is lacking	0			
	Some environmental information exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes	1	1		
	Relevant environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly	2			2
	Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use the updated environmental information to make environmental decisions	3			
<b>CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation</b>					
Indicator 12 – Existence and mobilization of resources	The environmental organizations don't have adequate resources for their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed	0			
	The resource requirements are known but are not being addressed	1			
	The funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed	2	2		2
	Adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations	3			
Indicator 13 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer	The necessary required skills and technology are not available, and the needs are not identified	0			
	The required skills and technologies needs are identified as well as their sources	1			
	The required skills and technologies are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources	2	2		2
	The required skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies	3			
<b>CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate</b>					
Indicator 14 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process	Irregular project monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework detailing what and how to monitor a project or programme	0			
	An adequate resourced monitoring framework is in place, but project monitoring is irregularly conducted	1	1		

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Score at MTR	Score at TE
	Regular participative monitoring of results in being conducted but this information is only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2			2
	Monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action	3			
Indicator 15 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring and evaluation process	None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted without an adequate evaluation plan; including the necessary resources	0			
	An adequate evaluation plan is in place, but evaluation activities are irregularly conducted	1	1		
	Evaluations are being conducted as per an adequate evaluation plan, but the evaluation results are only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2			2
	Effective evaluations are conducted timely and accurately and are used by the implementation team and the Agencies and GEF Staff to correct the course of action if needed and to learn for further planning activities	3			
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>18/45</b>			<b>31/45</b>

## **Annex 11: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

### **Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about it and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners, and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings, and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### **Terminal Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: AMAL ALDABABSEH

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at Jordan (Place)

on 27 December 2018 (Date)

Signature:



**Annex 12: Evaluation Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by UNDP Country Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP GEF RTA	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____