

### GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
Review date:				
GEF Project ID:	1086		<u>At endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>At completion**</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:		<b>GEF financing:</b>	\$0.99	\$0.95
Project Name:	Developing an integrated protected area for the Cardamom Mountains	IA/EA own: (FFI, CI, UNF)	2.25	1.78
Countries:	Cambodia	Government:	0.00	0.00
		Other* (EU, ADB):	1.10	1.37
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	3.35	3.15
Operational Program:	OP#3: Forest Ecosystems & OP#4: Mountain Ecosystems	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$4.34	\$4.10
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	UNF, EU, Fauna & Flora International (FFI), Conservation International (CI)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		June 2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: Oct. 2006	Actual: April 2007
Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 48 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 58 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 10 months
Author of TE: ???		TE completion date: 30 April 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: April 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 12 months

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

\*\* From 2008 PIR.

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S	N/A	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes		Unlikely	N/A	U (1)
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	MS	N/A	MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	S	S	N/A	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes, the TE report provides a comprehensive and detailed assessment of project outcomes, implementation, and sustainability. The evaluation team clearly reviewed all project documents and interviewed a diverse group of project stakeholders.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No such findings were mentioned in the TE report.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

**a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

Based on information in the ProDoc, the global environmental objectives of this project were to conserve biodiversity, support long-term conservation, and promote sustainable management of the Cardamom Mountains ecosystem.

There were no changes in global environmental objectives during project implementation.

**b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (Describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)**

The development objectives of the Cardamom Mountains Protected Forest and Wildlife Sanctuaries Project were to enhance national and local government capacities to conserve, protect, and ensure sustainable use of the area's natural resources, and develop a long-term conservation framework for the Cardamom Mountains Protected Area Complex (CMPAC), to be secured in part through World Heritage designation.

The two sub-projects were:

1. The Central Cardamom Protected Forest (CCPF) project, funded by the United Nations Foundation (UNF) and Conservation International (CI), and implemented by CI and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries-Forestry Administration (FA) from July 2001 to September 2004.
2. The Cardamom Mountain Wildlife Sanctuaries (CMWS) project in Phnom Aural and Phnom Samkos Wildlife Sanctuaries, funded by UNF, GEF and Flora and Fauna International (FFI), and implemented by FFI and the Environment Ministry-Dept. of Nature Conservation and Protection (MoE) from April 2003 to April 2007.

The GEF funded CMWS sub-project had five expected outcomes:

- (i) Improved planning, management, and regulatory frameworks for the Phnom Aural and Phnom Samkos Wildlife Sanctuaries.
- (ii) Significant improvement in species and habitat protection.
- (iii) More sustainable use of natural resources by local communities.
- (iv) Improved livelihoods and welfare local populations
- (v) Sustainable financing in place for long-term management of sanctuaries.

There were no changes in development objectives during this project.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)	
<b>c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)</b>				
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

### 4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

**4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)**

<b>a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating:</b>	
A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:	
<b>(i) The national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?</b>	
As mentioned in the ProDoc, the foremost priority for the Cambodian government is post-war reconciliation and economic recovery programs, as well as immediate humanitarian aid. This project was designed to support efforts to integrate biodiversity conservation with post-war recovery and reconciliation programs under the umbrella of UNDP Cambodia Area Reconciliation and Rehabilitation Program, the principal agency operating post-war recovery & recovery programs in the Cardamom Mountains.	
<b>(ii) The national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?</b>	
A 1998 forest inventory by the Dept. of Forestry and Wildlife highlighted the high rates of deforestation and resource degradation in Cambodia. This project supports Cambodia's National Forestry Policy, which aims to balance forest conservation with commercial timber production and rural resource needs, by developing an integrated system for forest management. The project will enhance the capacities of the Department of Nature Conservation and Protection (DNCP) to manage the Phnom Aural and Phnom Samkos Sanctuaries in a way that is sustainable and compatible with human needs. The project also contributes to the National Environmental Action plan, the Strategic Plan for the Ministry of Environment, and the National Biodiversity Action Plan.	
<b>(iii) The achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?</b>	
This project supports OP 3 and OP 4 on Forest and Mountain ecosystems and is relevant to the GEF focus on biodiversity.	
<b>(iv) The implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)</b>	
The project contributes to Cambodia's obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).	
<b>A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership<sup>1</sup></b>	
The project did not have any regional or international linkages.	
<b>b. Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<p>Based on the TE report and the PIRs, the GEF funded CMWS project has significantly improved management of Samkos and Aural Sanctuaries and it has achieved most of the planned outputs. Based on a World Bank-WWF tracking tool assessment, the effectiveness of protected area management has increased by 40% over the course of the project. However, the broader objective—a reduction in conservation threats, settlement expansion and illegal resource extraction has been only partially achieved given limited government capacity and the scale and distribution of human pressures in the area.</p> <p>The project has produced management plans for the sanctuaries involving a wide range of stakeholders and providing clear guidance for land use decisions to meet conservation objectives. The plans are based on stakeholder consultations carried out over two years at the national, provincial, district, commune, and village levels. The MoE executive and Provincial governors have endorsed the plans. However, additional communication with local officials and staff is required to increase local support for these plans.</p> <p>The project collected baseline biological, land use and socio-economic data for each sanctuary, which was integrated with zoning recommendations. This database system provides an important foundation for sound technical assessment and management decision-making. The project has also assisted in preparing a list of endangered species, in various biological surveys, and vegetation mapping. Field guides for rare and endangered species<sup>2</sup> have been produced.</p> <p>The boundaries of the Phnom Samkos and Phnom Aural Wildlife Sanctuaries were demarcated with concrete posts. Conservation law enforcement has been initiated for the first time in the sanctuaries through ranger patrols, which provide a visible deterrent to the widespread illegal activity in the sanctuaries. Patrolling has been effective in curbing hunting of threatened species and commercial timber harvesting in the Samkos sanctuary, but much less so in Aural sanctuary where illegal activities (with government complicity) and security concerns still prevail. The TE report notes that while project activities have significantly enhanced enforcement, there is a need to review and reorganize the sometimes overlapping responsibilities of the different law enforcement agencies. The dual-project concept (FA-CI and MoE-FFI) has reinforced the traditional divisions between agencies that exist in Cambodia and constrained the potential for coordinating conservation efforts in the Cardamom Mountains.</p> <p>Community based management has led to some reduction in resource abuse. 18 Community Protected Areas were established (10 in Samkos and 8 in Aural) under the guidance of locally elected committees. 22 other CPA sites were identified. The committees manage activities in the CPA. Community rangers have been trained to liaise between the communities and MoE, and provide ongoing support for the CPAs. <i>Save Cambodia's Wildlife</i> and other NGOs have</p>	

<sup>1</sup> Please consider for regional and global project only

assisted in promoting community understanding of the sanctuaries. While this has considerably increased local awareness of conservation issues, the TE reports that only modest gains have been made in changing local behaviors regarding resource use. Hunting activity has declined partly in response to improved food security in the area, but plant and fuel wood harvesting has not been reduced. Some financial incentives were offered on a pilot basis, but results were not available by the project closing date. In one commune, an NGO, *CEDAC* has assisted households in increasing agricultural production and incomes, with a subsequent decline in the need for forest resources. There is substantial potential to expand rural development and livelihoods in support of conservation objectives in the Cardamoms, but MoE will need to become a more active partner in this endeavor.

Progress has been made in securing financial commitments from CI and FFI toward the establishment of endowment funds for the sanctuaries. Further development and consolidation of funding mechanisms and government endorsement are needed. The gap between government funds and the base scenario management funding requirements is in the order of \$ 200,000 annually for the two sanctuaries. Potential revenue sources, including eco-tourism, are under review.

**c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)**

**Rating: S**

The total project cost was \$4.10 M. The GEF/UNF/EU budget for the MoE-FFI wildlife sanctuaries sub-project was \$3.12 M, while the CI – FA protected forest sub-project was \$1.13 M. Based on information in the TE report, the project completed most of its planned activities in 60 months, rather than 48 months as originally planned. The extension was required because of delays in commencing the project, limited MoE capacities, bottlenecks within the DNCP, and security issues in the region. These factors were largely outside the control of the project team or the executing agency. The TE report notes that the efficiency of the project was “acceptable,” and that based on the WWF tracking tool, management of the sanctuaries has improved by 40% from the 2002 baseline.

Approximately 97 % of the available funding (excluding EU project funds) has been expended. Funds of approximately \$145,000 remained as of 31 December 2006.

**d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.**

The project design attempted to address both environmental and developmental priorities through components focusing on both conservation area enforcement, community based management, and sustainable livelihoods development. During implementation, however, efforts focused more on conservation area enforcement and community based management, rather than promoting alternative livelihoods. The reasons for this trade off in implementation can be attributed to project design. The design did not include a detailed framework for funding sustainable livelihoods at the local level and none was subsequently developed. The design included MoE as an executing partner, so there was a preference during implementation to channel resources to enhancing the enforcement and management capacities of the MoE.

**4.1.2 Results / Impacts<sup>3</sup> (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)**

The project has succeeded in establishing the initial framework for planning, management and regulation for the two large wildlife sanctuaries in the Cardamoms Mountains. The project has had partial success in developing and delivering combined DNCP-MoE conservation and protection services on the ground. Sanctuary management units have been established within DNCP-MoE. Ranger patrol units have been created and are functioning effectively with project support in the Samkos sanctuary. The project has also had a significant, but modest-scale impact on community involvement by establishing community protected areas, promoting public awareness and education, and facilitating sustainable livelihoods development. These impacts are limited by the scope of the project, which operated in a select number of communities within the sanctuaries. The review and development of financing options is still under preparation. Both FFI and CI are actively seeking donor contributions and working to establish long-term endowment trust funds to support the continued conservation and protection of the wildlife sanctuaries. Approval of the Protected

<sup>3</sup> Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

Area Law (promoted by the project) has been delayed due to deadlock in formation of a new government. This has hampered the emergence of a clear framework for introducing structured management of the wildlife sanctuaries and in clarifying management rights and responsibilities.

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

<b>a. Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: ML (3)</b>
The gap between government funds and base scenario management funding requirements is in the order of \$0.20 M annually for the two sanctuaries. Progress has been made in securing financial commitments from CI and FFI toward the establishment of endowment funds such as the Global Conservation Fund. FFI and CI are exploring potential fee and revenue sources, including ecotourism development, to fund ongoing management operations.	
<b>b. Socio-economic / political</b>	<b>Rating: ML (3)</b>
There is extensive support and admiration for the MoE-FFI project and its staff. The project has laid the initial framework for protection and conservation under very difficult conditions, and it has mobilized community awareness and involvement. Stakeholder support for the long-term objectives of the project is strong. The Community Protection Areas however are unlikely to continue activities without ongoing support by the MoE or FFI.	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: U (1)</b>
Weak government capacity poses a serious risk to the sustainability of project outcomes. Illegal timber extraction and land encroachment is widespread and associated with corruption in the military, district authorities and commune councils. Despite efforts to professionalize the MoE, the TE report states “allegations of corruption were expressed against many parties, including some of the MoE rangers.” The scale and growth of illegal activities in the sanctuaries far exceeds the capacity of the MoE alone to enforce the law.	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: U (1)</b>
Given the extent of illegal timber harvesting and the growth of settlements during the course of the project, it appears highly unlikely that the integrity of the Sanctuaries can be maintained. “An estimated 200-300 motor-carts and over 100 vehicles per day transport mostly illegal wood on the road through Aural Sanctuary, virtually with impunity and with the alleged complicity of FA and local authorities. Rapid, unauthorized tree cutting and land clearing are underway, driven by land speculation and planned road improvements. Social unrest is growing in Aural Sanctuary because of everyday conflicts over land clearing and land sales/transfers (TE report).”	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
No technological risks are associated with this project.	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role<sup>4</sup>

<b>a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders?</b>
The PIRs note that the extent of illegal activities is directly linked to the state of household food security and the availability of alternative livelihoods. But, the project did not establish an overall programmatic framework for sustainable livelihoods within the sanctuaries. Financial incentives were tried on a pilot basis, but results on impacts were not available by project closing.
<b>b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors?</b>
The project has enhanced public awareness and law enforcement function at the community level and developed draft management and zoning plans for the sanctuaries. Based on information in the TE report, the project design primarily focused on protection and conservation activities and did not sufficiently emphasize the long-term institutional capacity of MOE to manage the wildlife sanctuaries. The principal approach for training professional staff has been to mentor local counterparts alongside the foreign advisors, but there was no formal training plan or monitoring process.
<b>c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?</b>
The project has focused largely on operational impacts. The absence of a clear mechanism to affect recommendations at higher levels in the government, the initial limited role of the National Project Coordinator, and the very uncertain government commitment to protected areas have constrained the project’s potential to advance conservation policies.
<b>d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (This is different than co-financing.)</b>
FFI has been able to leverage some additional funding besides UNF, GEF and EU funds. Both FFI and CI are actively

<sup>4</sup> Please review the ‘Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework’ prior to addressing this section.

drafting financial models for sustainability of the Cardamoms protected area program. FFI are considering three strategies: an endowment fund, attracting more donors, and exploring internal (to Cambodia) options to generate sources of recurring costs of sanctuary management. A major endowment fund is being proposed by FFI, working with a private capital bank in Hong Kong. CI is in discussions with AFD (France) regarding a \$ 5 million contribution (subject to gaining World heritage designation) to match CI's \$2.5 M contribution.

**e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?**

The NGOs, FFI and CI, have been the driving agents behind designing, funding, and implementing this project.

#### 4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

**a. Co-financing.** To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

There was no government co-financing contribution for this project. International project funding managed through UNDP was \$3.25 M, 38% of which was committed by the UN Foundation and 31% by GEF. In addition, the EU contributed \$1M to the CMWS sub-project, providing for a total project funding of \$4.25 M. The GEF/UNF budget for the CMWS sub-project was \$2.12 M, while the budget for the CCPF sub-project was \$1.13 M. All of the UNF/GEF funding was administered by UNDP through contracts to FFI (\$1.98 M) and CI (\$0.85 M). The balance of the UNF/GEF funding (\$110,126) went to monitoring and evaluation, and training activities.

Co-financing was critical for achieving project outcomes, as the personnel cost alone for the CMWS sub-project was \$1.7M. The TE report notes, "this appears to be similar to other projects in Cambodia where a large proportion of funding is directed to international advisors, salary supplements to government staff and secondment of government staff to the project implementing organization."

**b. Delays.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project experienced several delays, which delayed closing by one year. The CMWS sub-project, implemented by MoE-FFI, was supposed commence in July 2001 alongside the CCPF sub-project implemented by CI-FA, but because of delays in contracting and in securing GEF co-financing the MOE-FFI activities started April 2003, and after two-six month extensions closed in April 2007. Several security-related incidents prompted the project to suspend activities and temporarily remove staff from Phnom Aural Wildlife Sanctuary, causing serious disruptions to project implementation. The rise in illegal resource extraction by organized groups, primarily in Aural, required revising and strengthening law enforcement. The limited capacity of national project staff led to delays in identifying and mobilizing the project implementation team in MoE, and in the replacement the director of one sanctuary. Social unrest, an influx of poor migrants into the sanctuaries, and the delay approving the Protected Areas Law have all slowed down the participatory zoning process.

**c. Country Ownership.** Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.

Country ownership of this project has been limited. Although the Agriculture and Environment Ministries were executing partners, much of the leadership came from the NGOs, Conservation International (CI) and Flora and Fauna International (FFI). The project evolved toward more of an NGO-based project due to the limited capacity within government to oversee the project, the poor relations and coordinating mechanisms between government agencies, and the reluctance of the participating agencies to establish a Steering Committee. This may have ensured the achievement of outcomes in the short-run, but it poses risks for longer-term sustainability.

#### 4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

**a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): S**

The M&E design in the project appraisal document included an implementation timeline, a description of expected outcomes with underlying assumptions, and a list of relevant indicators to assess achievement of project outcomes. The project appraisal document did not include a logical framework matrix, but a more detailed M&E plan and log-frame was to be developed as soon as the project was funded. Monitoring was to be conducted through quarterly and annual performance reports as well as independent annual audits, a mid-term and a termination evaluation.

**b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MS**

Based on the TE report and the PIRs, the log-frame was developed early in the project and used effectively as a tool to guide activity planning and detailed progress reporting. The log-frame includes indicators for project outcomes and a list of critical assumptions. It remains a relevant tool to guide long term goals for strengthening sanctuary management. However, the TE report notes that there was no dedicated monitoring system to track the changes in project indicators

such as levels of illegal activities and changes in community livelihoods. Ranger patrol data was collected but has not been used to guide project activities. The M&E plan contains all the elements necessary for effective, real-time monitoring. A IS database has been developed to track various indicators including illegal activities, species density, forest cover, and population growth, but the system has not been operationalized.
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? The proposed budget did not include a separate line for M&E.
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Yes, the TE report notes that \$110,126 was allocated to M&E.
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? According to the TE report, the project has not implemented a real-time feedback monitoring system to track changes on the ground.
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. No, the M&E has not been systematically implemented, but the design is satisfactory.

#### 4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<b>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S</b>
<b>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S</b> <i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</i>
<p>Based on information in the TE report, UNDP oversight of the project has been adequate. The Tri-Partite Review Committee met four times, and UNDP staff reviewed progress reports. Financial disbursements and administrative approval of project activities were timely. UNDP also responded to difficulties working with the Cambodian government by appointing a National Project Facilitator to assist the executing agencies.</p> <p>The project experience indicates that the project design and the expected results may have been too ambitious given the complexities on the ground and the time frame. Government capacity, notably the MoE, was poor, and the level of poverty and insecurity in the project areas created delays and limited outcomes. Additional UNDP supervision might have been warranted in dealing with the implementation difficulties created by the security situation in Aural sanctuary, as well as inter-agency conflicts in the government.</p> <p>UNDP also faced some trade-offs in allocating resources to ensuring project sustainability or to smooth implementation. More active UNDP support for the project at the central government level might have led to better integration of Cardamom Mountains conservation issues into the broader national development agenda, and consequently improved the sustainability of project outcomes. But, given the considerable workload pressures of UNDP in Cambodia, this would also have presented another challenge in implementation.</p>
<b>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>5</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale): MS</b> <i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.</i>
<p>The execution arrangement described in the project appraisal document appoints FFI as the agency directly responsible to GEF for overall management of the project, and overseeing the financial and technical aspects of implementation. FFI, in partnership with the MoE, executed the CMWS sub-project. FFI management of the project has been effective, despite the high turnover in project managers (four in five years), due to “excessive workloads.” Reporting by FFI has been timely, detailed, and realistic. Financial management and oversight of contractors has been sound. Local outreach has been extensive and the TE report notes that the CPA committees, and district-level committees are a major contribution of the project. FFI has also maintained a strong focus on results even in the absence of a Steering Committee and with the turnover of project leadership.</p> <p>Nevertheless, project outcomes have been constrained due to inter-agency coordination problems, poor linkages to the policy level in Cambodia, and the limited management capacity of the MoE. Based on the TE report, the handing over of the activities to MoE staff may be problematic, as the project is generally seen as an FFI program and there are not</p>

<sup>5</sup> Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

enough qualified MoE staff to take on project activities.

Not

## 5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

### a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects

The experiences of CMWS and CCPF projects suggest that:

1. Sufficient government support for security is needed in order to undertake effective protection and conservation services.
2. Conservation programs in adjoining protected areas should pro-actively coordinate law enforcement, management and buffer zone strategies.
3. Opportunities for data collection and service delivery efficiencies, as well as joint learning, can be exploited through better coordination (including at a national level).
4. Ecosystem approaches generally require perspectives that cross administrative boundaries and functions and a conscious effort is needed to integrate strategies in a manner that focuses on maintaining ecosystem processes and integrity.
5. Despite ministerial territoriality, working relationships between agencies both within protected areas and between adjoining areas need to be continuously developed over time.

### b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

1. Protection and conservation programmes in the Cardamom Mountains should, as a priority, address the institutional challenges involved in developing coordinating mechanisms, programme delivery partnerships and division of responsibilities between the relevant agencies for protection and conservation services. A **revised Cardamoms development cooperation programme** should be formulated that draws upon the experiences of the Cardamom Mountains Protected Forest and Wildlife Sanctuaries Project and the conclusions and recommendations of this evaluation.
2. MoE and FFI should immediately complete the Wildlife Sanctuaries boundary demarcation on the ground, and further promote awareness of these boundaries with local people. MoE and FFI should undertake follow-up local consultation on the zoning plans, refining zoning boundaries if necessary, and consider measures to begin implementation of the plans while awaiting passage of a proposed Protected Area Law. FFI and CI should continue to collaborate and report on an integrated and joint technical and financial support programme that addresses the Cardamom Mountains management needs as a whole.
3. Training needs assessments should be undertaken of operational managers and ranger patrol/law enforcement staff within MOE, including assessment of the institutional context for such training. A priority is to further develop the capacity of technical managers within DNCP.
4. MoE and FFI should develop a biophysical inventory and information systems strategy that outlines objectives, approaches and protocols for data collection, compilation, storage and retrieval. This should serve as a guide for investment in physical and biological inventory and assessment.
5. Future projects in the Cardamom Mountains should be designed to draw upon the experiences and lessons from this project. Project need to be 'owned' by Cambodian organizations. A results-based monitoring plan and dedicated project monitoring officer should be included in project operations.

## 6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

### 6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

### 6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report

Ratings



<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> The report contains a comprehensive assessment of project outcomes and impacts.</p>	S
<p><b>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</b> The report is internally consistent, and no major evidence gaps were noted.</p>	S
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The report assesses the financial, social, and institutional aspects of sustainability</p>	S
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> The lessons learned are drawn from the project implementation experience.</p>	S
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> Actual project costs are included in the TE report, but there is no breakdown of costs by activity or major output.</p>	MS
<p><b>e. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The report contains a brief assessment of the project's M&amp;E plan and its implementation.</p>	S

**7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.**

**8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)**

--

**9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)**

--