



Evaluation of the CAFOD Cambodia Program
(with focus on DRR/CCA, Livelihoods, Land & NRM)

2010 to 2013



Evaluator meeting with community leaders in Sraemeunthang2 village, Ratanakiri

Evaluation conducted by:
Mrs. Bernie O'Neill, Consultant

[February-March 2014]

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<i>List of acronyms used</i>	3
Executive Summary	5
Main Report	
I. Introduction and background	7
II. Objectives and methodology	9
III. Findings	11
III.1 Grant agreements with partners over last 3 years	11
III.2 Cambodian Civil Society Partnership (CCSP)	14
III.3 Development & Partnership in Action (DPA)	17
III.4 Banteay Srei (BS)	21
III.5 NGO Forum	24
IV. Discussion in relation to TOR objectives	29
IV.1 Relevance of the program	29
IV.2 Effectiveness: successes compared to Program Framework	31
IV.3 Efficiency of implementation	35
IV.4 Monitoring and reporting (incl. use of CAFOD tools)	37
IV.5 Impact of the program	38
IV.6 Sustainability and replicability of the program	39
IV.7 Lessons learnt and best practices	41
V. Conclusions and recommendations	43
Annexes:	
1. Term of Reference	45
2. List of documents reviewed	48
3. Reflection (before corruption)	54

List of Acronyms Used

APSARA	Authority for the Protection and Management of Angkor and the Region of SRP
BPA	Best Practice Awards
BS	Banteay Srei
BTB	Battambang (province)
CAFOD	Catholic Agency for Overseas Development
CAP	Community Action Plan
CARD	Council for Agriculture and Rural Development
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCCSP	Cambodia Climate Change Strategic Plan
CCDM	Commune Committee for Disaster Management
CCSP	Cambodian Civil Society Partnership
CDP	Commune Development Plan
CEDAC	Cambodian Center for Study and Development in Agriculture
CF	Community Forestry
CF	Community Facilitator (term used by BS)
CIDSE	Cooperation International for Development and Solidarity
CIP	Commune Investment Plan
CLT	Communal Land Title
CLUP	Commune Land Use Planning
CRR	Citizens Rating Report
CSO	Civil Society Organization
D&D	Decentralization and De-concentration
DCA/CA	Dan Church Aid/Christian Aid
DCDM	District Committee for Disaster Management
DEAP	Development Education & Advocacy Program (of DPA)
DFID	Department of International Development (of British Government)
DLMUPC	Department of Land Management, Urban Planning & Construction
DPA	Development & Partnership in Action
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EC	European Commission
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EISEI	Extractive Industries Social & Environment Impact (Network)
ELC	Economic Land Concession
EU	European Union
FAC	Forestry Administration Cantonment
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPS	Global Positioning System
GVO	Green Vision Organization
HVCA	Hazard Vulnerability & Capacity Assessment
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
ICD	Integrated Community Development
ICS	Investing in Children and their Societies
iDE	International Development Enterprises

IG	Income Generation
JAT	Joint Assessment Team
JCCI	Joint Climate Change Initiative
LUP	Land Use Planning
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture Forestry & Fisheries
MDK	Monduliri (province)
MIME	Ministry of Industry Mines and Energy
MLMUPC	Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning & Construction
MO	Member Organization (CAFOD term)
MO	Monitoring Officer (DPA term)
MOE	Ministry of Environment
MOWRAM	Ministry of Water Resources & Meteorology
MRC	Mekong River Commission
MRD	Ministry of Rural Development
NCDM	National Committee for Disaster Management
NGOF	NGO Forum
NLO	NGO Liaison Office
NPA	Norwegian People's Aid
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NSA	Non-State Actors
NSDP	National Strategic Development Plan
PCDM	Provincial Committee for Disaster Management
PDA	Provincial Department of Agriculture (Forestry & Fisheries)
PLUP	Participatory Land Use Planning
PNP	Phnom Penh
PPA	Partnership Program Agreement (between DFID & CAFOD)
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PVT	Prom Vihear Thor
RAT	Ratanakiri (province)
RGC	Royal Government of Cambodia
SNV	Netherlands Development Organization
SRP	Siem Reap (province)
TOR	Terms of Reference
TWG	Technical Working Group
V&A	Voice & Advocacy (tool)
VAW	Violence Against Women
VDA	Village Development Association
VDC	Village Development Committee
VDMT	Village Disaster Management Team
VDP	Village Development Plan
VIA	Vulnerability and Inequality Analysis
WASH	Water Sanitation & Hygiene
WGPD	Working Group for Partnerships in Decentralization

Executive Summary

CAFOD is the official Catholic aid agency for England and Wales. Having been involved in programs in Cambodia since 1980, CAFOD's work has evolved over the years to its current purpose that "*CAFOD's partners are strengthening a society in which the most vulnerable men, women and children can lead healthy lives, exercise their rights and responsibilities and benefit from livelihoods that are sustainable*". Within this overall purpose, two main Goals have been set:

- Goal 1: Reduced vulnerability and greater environmental and livelihood stability for communities through more sustainable management of natural resources and effective engagement with local government and other stakeholders
- Goal 2: CAFOD's partners are working collaboratively and in coordination with relevant stakeholders to contribute to sustained reduction in HIV prevalence and improved QoL for women, men and children affected by HIV and AIDS.

This evaluation has been commissioned by CAFOD to examine Goal 1 only as Goal 2 has been evaluated separately at the end of 2013. In line with CAFOD strategy of partnership, Goal 1 is being implemented by four local partners – Cambodian Civil Society Partnership (CCSP), Banteay Srei (BS), Development & Partnership in Action (DPA) and the NGO Forum.

The objectives of the evaluation were to evaluate the success of CAFOD's program on Disaster Risk Reduction and Sustainable Livelihood and Land and Natural Resources Management, examine the achievement of outcomes, document lessons learnt and make recommendations for the future strategic planning process. Document review, internet research, partner meetings/field visits as well as key informant discussions were the key processes employed in conducting this evaluation.

The key finding of the evaluator is that all partners have been very honest and transparent in their reporting. Achievements and constraints encountered have been clearly described in the numerous reports produced over the last few years. The CAFOD Cambodia program is characterized by a group of strong and diversified partners who are highly committed to their core goals. These are strongly in line with the goal of the CAFOD program.

The findings show that the program has been **highly relevant** to the various stakeholders and **has been effective** in achieving its stated outcomes. The program was **efficiently managed** in that partner grants were managed with minimal human resources while the same time satisfying the needs of these partners. A lot of **impact was achieved** at a very low cost. These impacts are **expected to be sustained** due to the commitment of, and resources available to, partners and some good lessons have been learnt during the implementation process, some of which can be shared as best practices with others.

Some important lessons learnt from the program were:

- Partnership is central to CAFOD's operational strategy. This means that the program is build around the work of the partners, rather than opening a call for proposals for partners to implement a CAFOD program. The result is a diverse program that addresses the thematic issues from different perspectives.
- The program design and implementation has enabled CAFOD to achieve extensive results with a small team and a relatively small budget
- The mixture of community level actions and national level advocacy complement each other very well – in that partners at community level can share real-life experiences from their communities to give credence to issues being discussed at national level
- Wide participation in the activities of all partners demonstrates the relevance of the project. In particular, it is clear that water management is becoming an increasingly important issue to the Cambodia people (and thus the government)
- The opening of a CAFOD office in Cambodia has resulted in a closer working relationship between CAFOD and its partners and offered more opportunities for dialogue and capacity building support when needed.
- Partners working at community level take an integrated approach in their work. This enhances the effectiveness of actions under each theme as the issues are closely inter-linked.

- Actions of the NGO Forum and its members have demonstrated that it is possible to engage with government institutions to foster greater cooperation and openness to dialogue but it takes time and patience to achieve this. Results include the invitations by various Ministries to the NGO Forum to join their Technical Working Groups and the change in government practice to gradually publish more information on public finances.
- Land related projects such as CLTs and CFAs take a long time to work through the regulatory processes. Thus donors must be willing to stick with the process until completion.

As the findings were generally very positive about the program there are not too many recommendations for change. A few recommendations specific to partners are noted in Chapter V. The recommendations for CAFOD are summarized here under two sub-sections – program issues and capacity building of partners. Further discussion on these recommendations can also be found in Chapter V.

Summary of recommendations to CAFOD

Program Issues

1. **Program content:** The analysis above showed that CAFOD program is already highly relevant. Therefore CAFOD should continue with its current strategies. The evaluator would recommend placing greater emphasis on two of the issues – water management and corruption.
2. **Partner focus:** CAFOD strategic plan “Just One World” recognizes that working in partnership is an essential part of CAFOD identity. Therefore in developing its strategic plans, CAFOD should ensure that the program is build around the partners and not try to fit the partners into a CAFOD plan.
3. In line with the above, CAFOD should consider re-wording outcome one under Goal 1 to align it more with the work currently being carried out by partners (refer to discussion under “effectiveness”, section IV.2 above).
4. Consider extending the scope of support to CCSP to allow them to expand the Provincial D&D Networks and promotion of Citizens Rating Reports (CRR) to all provinces in Cambodia – in the short term, at least to ensure all target provinces of CAFOD are covered.
5. In the Program Framework, CAFOD should make indicators more SMART. Some of the current indicators are too lengthy and the working is rather ambiguous.

Capacity Building Support

6. Conduct refresher training on the HVCA process (especially how to conduct annual reviews to ensure as much details assessment of hazards and vulnerabilities)
7. Support partners engaged in DRR at community level to undertake exchange visits to other organizations who have longer experience with this (e.g. AAC, LWD)
8. Continue building partners understanding on water issues – including the wider picture of watershed management
9. Assist partners using the V&A tool to develop sub-sections for any of the four main categories where they work with diversified groups (with whom the advocacy may be at different stages). These could be appendices to the main report.
10. CAFOD should re-asses the added value of the VIA tool in light of the vulnerability analysis that partners already undertake as part of the HVCA process. If still considered of value to partners, conduct refresher training on the tool to all partners.
11. Consider request from partners for more holistic tool to measure overall village development (is PRA tool the best way or does CAFOD have other tools to help?)
12. Organize exposure visits for partners to other organizations who take a more market orientated approach to income generation (e.g. iDE, ICS)
13. Conduct further coaching of partners on reporting. Current reports of some partners have excessive descriptive detail on activities but lack concrete quantitative (cumulative) data at outcome level.
14. In order to assist partners to improve their reporting, CAFOD should give written feedback on all reports.

In conclusion, the evaluator would like to thank all those who gave up their valuable time to share information and suggestions during the course of this evaluation. Congratulations to CAFOD and partners for all the hard work and the resulting successes. Such work is of great importance to the ongoing development of Cambodia. The evaluator wishes you all further success with this work in the years to come.

I. Introduction and background

CAFOD is the official Catholic aid agency for England and Wales. CAFOD works with partners across the world, wherever the need is greatest, to bring hope, compassion and solidarity to poor communities, standing side by side with them to end poverty and injustice. CAFOD works with people of all faiths and none. CAFOD works with more than 500 partners overseas, and with partners in the UK - all working to reduce poverty. Inspired by Scripture and Catholic Social Teaching, and the experiences and hopes of people living in poverty, CAFOD works for a safe, sustainable and peaceful world.¹

CAFOD's first involvement in Cambodia was as a member of a consortium of 13 member agencies supporting the CIDSE program. CIDSE localized in 2006 as a local NGO called DPA (Development and Partnership in Action), which CAFOD continued to support. From 1990, CAFOD supported the NGO Forum for Cambodia, whose mandate is to advocate in relation to issues pertaining to Cambodia's development process, economic, social and political change. CAFOD has also supported projects to fight against HIV/AIDS, including those of Mary Knoll, American Catholic Order, Karol & Setha and the Salvation Center Cambodia who work through the Buddhist Pagoda network.

Following consultation with partners, the 2010 CAFOD program was narrowed down to focus on the area of HIV/AIDS and Economic Justice/Sustainable Livelihoods. Disaster Risk Reduction was mainstreamed into the livelihood project. Humanitarian considerations remained a priority across all country programs. Advocacy is a significant component across all programs and Gender is identified as a key cross cutting issue. The 2010 framework emphasizes strengthening partnerships and considering a local presence in countries as a means of achieving this.

The 2010 program framework has continued with only slight annual revisions between 2011 and 2013. Within the overall purpose that *"CAFOD's partners are strengthening a society in which the most vulnerable men, women and children can lead healthy lives, exercise their rights and responsibilities and benefit from livelihoods that are sustainable."*, two main Goals have been set:

- Goal 1: Reduced vulnerability and greater environmental and livelihood stability for communities through more sustainable management of natural resources and effective engagement with local government and other stakeholders
- Goal 2: CAFOD's partners are working collaboratively and in coordination with relevant stakeholders to contribute to sustained reduction in HIV prevalence and improved QoL for women, men and children affected by HIV and AIDS.

This evaluation focuses on the achievements of Goal 1, as a separate evaluation will be conducted on Goal 2. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide information to CAFOD team and partners, from the view of an external evaluator that will inform the next Country Strategic Planning phase.

In line with CAFOD program strategy in Cambodia, Goal 1 is implemented in partnership with local organizations. There are four partners implementing projects which aim to achieve this goal, all of whom have had a long-standing relationship with CAFOD:

- Banteay Srei (BS)
- Cambodian Civil Society Partnership (CCSP)
- Development & Partnership in Action (DPA)
- NGO Forum (NGOF)

Although it is expected that most readers of this report will already be familiar with these organizations, a short description of each follows:

Banteay Srei (BS)

Banteay Srei (meaning 'Citadel of Women') a local Cambodian non-governmental organization (NGO) was named after a tenth-century Cambodian temple, which is dedicated to the Hindu god Shiva. Banteay Srei evolved from an

¹ CAFOD website: <http://www.cafod.org.uk/About-Us>

Australian NGO, the International Women's Development Agency (IWDA) that had been working in Cambodia since 1985. Banteay Srei registered with the Cambodian Ministry of Interior as a local NGO in June 2000. Banteay Srei empowers vulnerable women to improve their political, economic and psycho-social situation through implementation of community development projects, advocacy work and encouraging men's participation in addressing issues affecting women. Banteay Srei works with 53 communities in Cambodia's Siem Reap and Battambang provinces.² CAFOD first came into contact with Banteay Srei through CIDSE Cambodia. Project activities relate to food security, health education & work to prevent violence against women. Banteay Srei works with Village Development Committees to forge stronger links with Commune Councils, especially with regard to Village Development Plans & leadership opportunities.

Cambodian Civil Society Partnership (CCSP)

CCSP was initially established in 2000 as an action research project, following the 2000 Commune Council Act that set up local level government bodies. Civil society wanted to take advantage of the new space opened up by this Act. CCSP at that time stood for Commune Council Support Project. In January 2010, CCSP changed its name to Cambodian Civil Society Partnership for Decentralization and De-concentration but the acronym remains the same as before "CCSP". The vision and mission remains the same as before in terms of focusing on decentralization and local governance reforms that is intended to reduce poverty in Cambodia by encouraging local economic development, the protection of natural resources, and community capacity building. CAFOD has been a supporter of the original CCSP project and has partnered with the newly established local organization since its formation.

Development & Partnership in Action (DPA)

Development and Partnership in Action (DPA) is a non-political, non-religious, non-partisan, non-profit making Cambodian non-governmental organisation devoted to furthering community development, partnership work with Cambodian NGOs and lobbying and advocacy. DPA is the successor of Cooperation International for Development and Solidarity (CIDSE) Cambodia which was established in 1979 as part of the larger CIDSE Cambodia, Lao and Vietnam (CLV) programme created by a consortium of International NGOs, of whom CAFOD was a member. Due to the evolving social climate and the strong capacity and commitment of its local staff, CIDSE Cambodia decided to localise and in 1996 began a transition process which enabled the organisation to emerge as DPA in January 2006. DPA assumed responsibility for all of CIDSE Cambodia's work from 1 January 2006. DPA tackles issues as diverse as gender equality, natural resource management, health education and food security as well as adapting to address emerging issue such as land right, climate change and extractive industries as these topics became relevant to the Cambodian context. Committed to a community organizing and rights-based approach that empowers partner communities to be their own advocates of change, DPA works to build the capacity of the people and partner organizations with which it works and to effect positive change that will benefit all Cambodians³. CAFOD has been a consistent partner with DPA since its formation, supporting Integrated Community Development (ICD) projects in the Northeast of Cambodia (Ratanakiri and Mondulakiri provinces).

NGO Forum (NGOF)

NGO Forum's long-term goal is to ensure that citizens and civil society organizations are well-equipped to contribute and influence policy making and implementation processes for the benefit of poor and vulnerable people of Cambodia. CAFOD began supporting the NGO Forum in 1990. The NGO Forum was established in 1986 by international NGOs. In its early days the Forum focused on the issue of the international isolation of the country. With the opening up of Cambodia in 1991, membership of the Forum was extended to emerging local NGOs. It currently has 80 members, both national and international. NGO Forum works to highlight the impact on Cambodians of development processes and economic, social and political change. The Forum Secretariat co-ordinates and supports the advocacy efforts of its members. Through its activities, NGO Forum also builds the capacity of its members to carry out effective advocacy work on issues such as logging, land grabbing and the garment industry. They have recently gained an interest in analyzing the oil and gas sector. The NGO Forum and its members sit on several Technical Working Groups (TWGs) set up to monitor the National Strategic Development Plan and is lobbying for representation on those TWGs that do not have representation from civil society.⁴

² Banteay Srei website: <http://banteaysrei.info/>

³ DPA website: <http://www.dpacam.org/index.php/about-dpa>

⁴ Description of NGO Forum from CAFOD Country Strategy Plan 2009-2011

II. Objectives and Methodology

Objectives

The objectives of this evaluation as set out in the TOR by CAFOD (attached as Annex 1), were as follows:

1. To evaluate the success of CAFOD's program on Disaster Risk Reduction and Sustainable Livelihood and Land and Natural Resources Management within the target provinces where our partners have been implementing projects and examine the achievement of outcome targeted within the Cambodia program framework.
2. Comment and make recommendations on current program M&E and reporting and how this may be adjusted in the next Country Strategic Planning.
3. Document lessons learned and best practice to inform future strategy.
4. Make recommendations for future objectives and actions that will inform the future Strategic Planning process

Evaluation Methodology

Document review, internet research, partner meetings/field visits as well as key informant discussions were the key processes employed in conducting this evaluation.

Over the period under review the program has produced a significant amount of documentation. The list of documents received and reviewed is set out in Annex 2. Review of these documents gave the consultant a good overall understanding of the program and helped to identify key informants as well as the most relevant areas to focus on with partners.

Following the review of documents received, the consultant conducted internet research to gain additional information on the key issues involved. As well as the examination of the websites of CAFOD and partners, the evaluator accessed many sites of the Government of Cambodia related to issues of land and natural resource management as well as reports from external bodies who have assessed Cambodia's progress on such issues.

Key informants from CAFOD were Ms. Keo Kanika, Program Officer for Cambodia (and the Philipppians) and Ms. Clodagh Byrne, Program Manager for DRR and Livelihoods. Partner meetings and field visits were conducted between 25th February and the 14th March, as set out in the table below:

Partner name	Person(s) interviewed	Location	Dates
CCSP	Ms. Prak Sokhany (Director)	Phnom Penh	25 February
NGO Forum	Mr. Tek Vannara (Director)	Phnom Penh	26 February
Banteay Srei	Ms. Chim Bun Chenda (Program Manager, BTB)	Battambang	26 February
	Ms. Sok Panha (Executive Director)	Siem Reap	27 February
	Various community women leaders	Leang Dai commune, Siem Reap	28 February
DPA	Mr. Khiev Sopheak (Provincial Program Manager, Ratanakiri)	Ratanakiri	12 March
	Mr. Mam Sambath (Executive Director)	Ratanakiri	12 March
	Community leaders (VDCs, CF committee members, dam committee members and village elders	Sraemeunthanh2 village, Teun commune, Kon Mum district, Ratanakiri	14 March

As the consultant has extensive contacts in the various government Ministries and Provincial Departments related to the CAFOD program (e.g. Industry, Mines and Energy; Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Environment, and the National Committee for Disaster Management), many informal meetings and telephone conversations were held. Although the majority of these informants prefer not to be named in any reports, the information supplied was very informative to the consultant in understanding the goals of the Government regarding some key issues of relevance to the CAFOD program (and also the many limitations and constraints faced by some government officials in the implementation of such programs).

Limitations and constraints

No major constraints were encountered during the process. Although it took some time to receive all the required documents, often after meeting the relevant stakeholders, it was possible to follow up new questions via telephone and email. All partners were highly cooperative in responding quickly to such questions. However, as the evaluation period coincided with the preparation of annual reports for some partners, some reports for 2013 (especially financial reports) were not available or only in draft form, pending audit confirmation of figures.

Another minor constraint to completing this evaluation was the short timeframe (dictated by the budget available to CAFOD) in which to consider a wide range of issues. It meant limited time for field level verification. However, finally the evaluator was satisfied that sufficient consultations were conducted to form an opinion on the issues requested in the TOR.

It also needs to be noted that this was not an evaluation of the partners but of CAFOD strategy so the level of detailed review of each partner has its limitations and thus relies more on secondary data than on primary evidence. However some partners had conducted separate external evaluations over the course of the period under review and these were used to inform the process where appropriate. These evaluations included:

DPA: Evaluation of the EU-NSA co-funded project 2009-2011) – evaluation conducted in July 2011

Banteay Srei – Evaluation of BS Strategic Plan 2010-2013 – conducted in July 2011

Banteay Srei – Joint Partner Assessment of SRP project – by NPA/CAFOD/DIAKONIA in January 2014

NGO Forum – Final Term Evaluation (of Strategic Plan) – finalized in June 2011

Findings and conclusions from these evaluations are noted in this report, where appropriate.

III. Findings

Having reviewed all documentation and completed discussions with the stakeholders described in the previous chapter, one of the key findings of the evaluator is that all partners have been very honest and transparent in their reporting. Achievements and constraints encountered have been clearly described in the numerous reports produced over the last few years. Reproducing all these again here would be superfluous. Rather, as the evaluator was requested to look at three key issues of concern to CAFOD (DRR/CCA, Land/NRM and Sustainable Livelihoods), this chapter will extract the key achievements from the reports that relate to these issues.

However it needs to be understood that the context in which each partner addressed these issues differed according to their overall organizational focus. This can be understood by examining the grant agreements between CAFOD and partners. The tables below present a summary of the grants allocated to partners over the last three years and the main outcomes expected according to the grant agreements. This table gives an overall picture of each partner focus as well as indicating where CAFOD support has remained the same or where key changes have taken place.

III.1 Summary of grant agreements with partners over last 3 years

2011	2012	2013
Cambodian Civil Society Partnership (CCSP)		
Grant: GBP 25,000	US\$ 40,000 (approx. GBP 25,000)	GBP 25,000
Project Goal: To increase capacities of civil society organizations to effectively influence and participate in the implementation of the decentralization and de-concentration reforms in Cambodia	Project Goal: To strengthen the collaboration between civil society organization and local government to solve local problems using decentralization and de-concentration (D&D) reform	Project Goal: To build capacity with local authority and at community level in adapting to climate change challenges using decentralization and de-concentration (D&D) reforms platform
<p>Outcome 1: Heightened level of awareness and understanding among CSOs on the ongoing D&D reforms program</p> <p>Outcome 2: Innovative strategies for capacity building of CSOs promoted and sustained.</p> <p>Outcome 3: CSOs are benefiting from their improved collaboration for engaging in the D&D reform processes at local and national levels</p> <p>Outcome 4: Sustained civil society-government collaboration and feedback through the NGO Liaison Office (NLO)</p>	<p>Outcomes as for 2011 (with the exception of Outcome 1 which was not included in the grant agreement)</p>	<p>Outcome 1: To enhance the integration and mainstreaming process of Climate Change (CC) concepts into Commune and District Development Plan through capacity building, advocacy, and engagement with local authority under technical support of CCSP and active involvement of the two NGO partners; PVT and GVO, and Commune and District Councils.</p> <p>Outcome 2: To build resilience within communities in adapting to CC challenges by continuing support to the existing activities of PVT project under the support of JCCI project (Jan-Dec 2012) and expanding to one new commune which will be led by GVO.</p> <p>Outcome 3: To generate and coordinate for lessons learnt and best practices on CCA Model which are implementing by CSOs from selected NGOs across WGPD network through WGPD platform.</p>
<p>Evaluator comments: Focus of project changed in 2013 as CCSP developed (sub) partnership agreements with two local NGOs concentrating on Pursat province. Previous focus was broader but retained somewhat under Outcome 3 (via WGPD platform).</p>		

Evaluation Report on CAFOD Cambodia Program 2010-2013 (Goal #1), February-March 2014

2011	2012	2013
DPA		
Grant: GBP 159,328 ⁵	GBP 75,000	GBP 60,000
Project Goal: Ethnic minorities, indigenous and vulnerable communities empowered to lead their own development and improve their quality of life, through sustainable management of natural resources and improved livelihoods, health and education, in the 34 target villages		Project Goal: Empower and support indigenous, poor and vulnerable communities to access and manage natural resources, improve livelihoods equitably and sustainably in 29 villages
Outcome 1: Communities benefit from increased land ownership, and are upholding their rights related to NRM through increased awareness and improved collaboration with local government Outcome 2: Communities have more sustainable livelihoods and improved food security & nutrition levels as a result of improved agricultural production methods, more varied livelihood strategies and strengthening of community organizations Outcome 3: Adults and children have improved educational opportunities & attainment, and enhanced sense of identity of indigenous culture Outcome 4: Target communities have improved health through community based education	Outcome 1: 3,766 target beneficiaries (1,935 women) in nine villages have their rights to managing community forestry, communal land. Outcome 2: 1,110 target beneficiaries (396 women) in 16 villages have increased adaptive capacity in addressing climate change and DRR Outcome 3: 1,429 target beneficiaries (802 women) in 16 villages improved diversified agricultural productivity and off-farm production	Outcome 1: Beneficiaries (47% female) in 12 villages have their rights to protect and sustainably manage the natural resources of their forests and lands, leading to the conservation of their cultural and traditional resources of food and livelihoods Outcome 2: Beneficiaries (44% female) in 29 villages have improved livelihoods as a result of reducing vulnerability to disasters and the ability and resources to adapt to adverse impact of climate change and improving water management Outcome 3: Beneficiaries (42% female) in 19 villages have improved food security and increased income level through enhanced agrarian skills and diversified on and off-farm productions
		Additional GBP 35,000
		Project Goal: Poor women and men in marginalized communities increase their access to and control over decisions relating to water resources and sanitation
		Outcome 1: Improved management of water resources in poor and marginalized communities Outcome 2: Poor women and men in marginalized communities have increased access to clean water and improved hygiene and sanitation Outcome 3: Strengthened CAFOD and partner capacity to deliver programmes to improve water management and WASH and women's leadership Outcome 4: Evidence based advocacy from communities based on assessments and water management planning is leading to changes in local government, national government and regional policies and practices
Evaluator comments: After the end of the EU-NSA project in 2011, DPA dropped one output (#3: education) in order to focus on their key priorities of land, NRM and livelihoods. The focus for 2012 and 2013 is largely similar but with slight revision of the wording of outcomes.		

⁵ This is Y3 portion of the 3-YR EU-NSA project (CAFOD co-funding about 46% of total grant)

Evaluation Report on CAFOD Cambodia Program 2010-2013 (Goal #1), February-March 2014

2011	2012	2013
Banteay Srei (BS)		
Grant: GBP 24,500	US\$ 39,750 (approx. GBP 25,000)	GBP 20,000
Project Goal (same for all years): Vulnerable women in Banteay Srei target areas will be empowered to improve their political, economic and psycho-social status		
<p>Outcome 1: More women in BS target areas can exercise their rights to participate in decentralization processes and are elected as commune councilors</p> <p>Outcome 2: Vulnerable families in BS target villages have improved their livelihoods through developing women's skills in sustainable agriculture, micro-entrepreneurship and natural resource management</p> <p>Outcome 3: An increase in positive behavior change among men and women, evidenced by decreased violence against women, increased participation of women in social activities and increased shared household decision making</p> <p>Outcome 4: Old villages have been effectively phased out and new villages have been identified</p> <p>Outcome 5: During the period 2009 – 2013, organizational development and program management systems are strengthened</p>	<p>Outcomes 1 and 2 same as for 2011 and 2012</p> <p>Outcome 3 (slightly reworded): Increased evidence of positive behavior change (decreased Violence against Women (VAW), increased participation of women in social activities and shared household decision making) among men and women</p> <p>Outcome 4 same as for 2011 & 2012</p> <p>Outcome 5 dropped for 2013</p>	
		Additional GBP 30,000
		Project goal: Strengthened resilience and well being of 13 water stressed communities through improved water management
		<p>Outcome 1: Improved management of water resources in poor and marginalized communities</p> <p>Outcome 2: Poor women and men in marginalized communities have increased access to clean water and improved hygiene and sanitation</p> <p>Outcome 3: Strengthened CAFOD and partner capacity to deliver programs to improve water management and WASH and women's leadership</p> <p>Outcome 4: Evidence based advocacy from communities based on assessments and water management planning is leading to changes in local government, national government and regional policies and practices</p>
<p>Evaluator comments: While overall program goal remained the same over these three years, a minor change in 2013 for outcome 3 suggests the increasing attention to violence against women. Dropping outcome 5 in the grant agreement suggests that CAFOD has confidence that the organizational development goals had been achieved by 2012.</p>		

2011	2012	2013
NGO Forum		
Grant: GBP 25,000	GBP 25,000	GBP 27,500
Project Goal (same for all years): To ensure that citizens and civil society organizations are well equipped to contribute and influence policy making and implementation processes for the benefit of poor and vulnerable people of Cambodia		
No specific outcomes set out in the Grant Agreement for 2011	Outcome 1: The human Resource and organization development are effectively functioning. Outcome 2: Gender is mainstreamed into all NGOF's Project Cycle Management, advocacy activities and NGOF Organization as a whole. Outcome 3: NGOs, affected communities, DPs, and the government are actively engaged in policy consultation and dialogue promoting land and housing rights, while ensuring gender equality. Outcome 4: NGOs cooperating to ensure that the concerns of affected community with a focus on effective and just resolution of land disputes, an improved land registration process and land allocation and distribution are brought to the attention by decision makers by an effective advocacy strategy. Outcome 5: NGO network members have strengthened capacity and skills to effective advocacy on environmental issues and climate change policy. Outcome 6: Climate change policy and practices were effectively influenced by NGOs/CSOs to ensure that the best practice of climate change policy for climate change adaptation benefit the poor and vulnerable community	
Evaluator comments: NGO Forum has annual budget of almost 1 million dollars per annum so CAFOD contribution to this is relatively small but the contribution is intended to contribute to the achievement of the six outcome listed in the agreement.		

As can be seen from the above tables, all partners work on outcomes contributing to the three themes suggested for this evaluation. In addition, they also have outcomes which contribute to the wider issue in Goal 1: "effective engagement with local government and other stakeholders".

The following sections extract a brief summary in relation to each of the themes, extracted from the partner reports and supplemented by discussions and some field verification – a brief summary, as it would be unnecessarily lengthy to describe all the activities and achievements which have been set out in detail in the partners' annual reports. Some comments follow under each partner on advocacy, monitoring & evaluation as well as presenting a summary of the direct beneficiaries to the extent this is possible to identify.

As would be expected, there are a number of overlaps between these three themes, with DRR/CCA and NRM actions being significant factors that can contribute to Sustainable Livelihoods and some CCA actions playing an important part towards natural resource management. Therefore rather than discussing each theme separately, the following sections of this chapter summarize the actions per partner which helps to understand the inter-linkages of the various themes as well as the context in which each partner is implementing them.

III.2 Cambodian Civil Society Partnership (CCSP)

Introduction

CCSP goals over the last few years have consistently focused on their main theme of achieving Decentralization and De-concentration (D&D) reforms. However, as noted under CCSP table in section III.1 above, the focus of CAFOD support to CCSP changed for 2013. Prior to 2013, CCSP program focused on ensuring greater understanding of D&D among provincial CSO networks and building linkages between CSOs and government through the NGO Liaison Office. There was no specific focus on thematic areas such as DRR/CCA, NRM or Livelihoods. But during that time CCSP had received support for CCA activities via the Joint Climate Change Initiative (JCCI) supported by Forum SYD and DCA/CA. During the course of implementation of that project, CCSP build up good relations with local NGOs in Pursat province. Thus in 2013, CCSP program to CAFOD included working in partnership with these local NGOs –

Prom Vihear Thor (PVT) in Tnout Chum commune of Krakor district and Green Vision Organization (GVO) in Pteas Rong commune of Kravanh district – to implement projects integrating DRR/CCA, NRM and Livelihood issues. However, outcome three of the 2013 grant contract retained a small part of their earlier focus by planning to share lessons learnt between CSOs from other provinces on CCA through the Working Group for Partnerships in Decentralization (WGPD) platform

DRR/CCA

The JCCI project helped to build the capacity of CCSP and local partners in Pursat to integrate CCA into their decentralization and de-concentration processes. In 2013 these partnerships developed with the local NGOs in Pursat were included in the CAFOD project, continuing agriculture adaptation strategies with demonstration farmers and activities related to forestry protection. Both local partners, PVT and GVO, have actively integrated DRR & CCA actions into the commune development planning in their respective communes following training of commune councils on CCA.

Land/NRM

CCSP actions related to land and NRM are closely linked to the climate change adaptation strategies mentioned in the previous paragraph. Actions included strengthening community management of forests previously under the jurisdiction of the Forestry Administration, building fire breaks and organizing forestry patrols. Capacity building activities to strengthen forestry management included training on NRM, forestry laws, CCA and DRR as well as exchange visits to learn from other provinces. Both PVT and GVO have been active in supporting tree planting activities in their respective target communes.

Livelihoods

As with NRM, livelihood activities supported by CCSP are closely linked to their CCA project. Through local partner PVT, model farmers were selected (initially under the JCCI project, then expanded under the 2013 CAFOD grant agreement) to pilot agriculture techniques which can help them adapt to climate change. These techniques include DRIP irrigation for vegetable growing (to reduce the amount of water used) and fish raising in ponds (to supplement shortage of fish from natural sources). To date, both of these actions have been done on a relatively small scale – 38 farmers for vegetable growing and 21 families engaged in fish raising.

Advocacy and networking

Although CCSP has not yet developed a specific advocacy strategy, they actively engage in advocacy at various levels. Core to their work is advocating for greater women's participation in all elected councils at sub-national level. Transparency of such elected councils is another focus of CCSP advocacy work, through projects such as the Citizens' Rating Report. There is some visible success from the advocacy on women's participation as all councils have at least one woman but there is a lot more work to be done to ensure more equal participation. An issue noted by CCSP is that the few women who are on elected councils receive an unequal share of the workload of the council. Regarding success of advocacy towards greater transparency, CCSP acknowledge that there is still a long way to go to achieve even a minimum standard.

Advocacy of CCSP regarding issues of climate change and natural resource management is more focused at the community level – through their local partners, PVT and GVO. As noted above, although the target group is confined to a small geographical area, these communities are already adjusting agriculture practices to adapt to climate change and they take initiatives such as tree planting as a means of awareness raising on the importance of the forest to their livelihoods.

Networking continues to be a key focus of CCSP who host both the NGO Liaison Office (NLO) and the WGPD in their offices. Membership of provincial D&D networks has increased over the last few years but the number of networks remains at seven provinces; there has not been any expansion to new provinces. The WGPD is appreciated by key National level institutions as providing an important platform for engaging civil society organizations with government to discuss key issues around D&D.

Beneficiaries

Determining the total number of beneficiaries of the CAFOD supported CCSP actions over the last few years is a bit difficult for the broader activities of the NLO and WGPLD platform. The evaluator has taken the numbers of those who attended trainings or workshops for provincial network activities as being the main beneficiaries – it would be expected that participants of these trainings or workshops would have passed on their learning to others but such information is not available. The numbers who access CCSP resources via the D&D bulletins and CCSP website are available but it would take a more specific evaluation with the recipients to know clearly whether they made use of the information. A lot of data has not been segregated by gender.

Considering the limitations mentioned in the previous paragraph, the table below attempts to estimate the number of beneficiaries of the CCSP projects supported by CAFOD over the last three years.

	2011		2012		2013				TOTALS	
	# pers	# fem	# pers	# fem	Tnout Chum		Pteas Rong		# pers	# fem
Provincial D&D networks:										
1. Kompong Channang (KCH)	14	?	5	?					19	?
2. Pursat (PST)	27	?	1	?					28	?
3. Battambang (BTB)	13	?	1	?					14	?
4. Kompong Thom (KPT)	16	?		?					16	?
5. Siem Reap (SRP)	10	?		?					10	?
6. Banteay Meanchey (BMC)	14	?	1	?					15	?
7. Kompong Cham (KCM)	31	?	6	?					37	?
CRR training to n/works - SRP/KPT/KCM	22	7							22	7
CRR training to NGOs	33	11							33	11
CRR training to dist & comm councils	59	?							59	?
CRR learning & evaluation forum	61	?							61	?
Accessing CCSP D&D website	2,422	?							2,422	?
NLO - meetings	124	41							124	41
Think Tank	10	6							10	6
Lecture series - BMC/KCM/BTB	89	26							89	26
Lecture series - KCM	92	?							92	?
Lecture series - BTB	70	31							70	31
Received D&D bulletins:										
NGOs across 23 provinces	1,817	?							1,817	?
Phnom Penh Municipality	100	?							100	?
NGOs in Phnom Penh	390	?							390	?
Libraries in Phnom Penh	184	?							184	?
CCSP activity participants	320	?							320	?
Sub-grant with PVT/GVO										
Mainstreaming CCA into D&D					30	15	33	6	63	21
Formation of fishery committee					3	1			3	1
Fish raising group members					21	5			21	5
Model farmers (use CCA mitigation measures)					38	?			38	?
Tree farm committees					5	2			5	2
Tree planting activities					102	40	300	?	402	?
Workshop on forestry protection/CC							100	?	100	?
Creating fire path					252	108			252	108
Forestry patrols					71	?			71	?
TOTALS	5,918	122	14	0	522	171	433	6	6,887	259

Monitoring, evaluation & reporting

CCSP has good internal systems for monitoring the work of their local partners and they conduct regular visits to them. There has been less direct monitoring of CCSP by CAFOD; the impression of CCSP is that CAFOD places a lot of trust in partners, rather than direct monitoring. CCSP prepares detailed reports to CAFOD but do not receive much feedback on these reports – they feel this is an opportunity lost to help them improve as they can learn from such feedback.

Some CCSP staff has attended training on the newer monitoring tools introduced by CAFOD such as the Voice & Accountability Tool (VAT) and the Vulnerability and Inequality Analysis (VIA) but they have not yet integrated these tools into their monitoring system.

No external evaluations of CCSP have been conducted during the period under review.

CCSP produces annual reports for donors (and more frequently if required by grant agreements). They also publish their reports on their website (but only in English and without financial information)⁶. Reports are well written and provide quite detailed information as regards activities undertaken but a little less informative as regards impact at outcome level – they provide examples of good outcomes rather than the overall picture.

III.3 Development & Partnership in Action (DPA)

Introduction

Although DPA has become quite a large local NGO since its establishment in 2006, with activities (directly and through partners) spread over many provinces of Cambodia, CAFOD support has been specifically applied to the projects being implemented under the Integrated Community Development (ICD) program in Ratanakiri and Mondulakiri provinces. Since the completion at the end of December 2011 of the EU-NSA project co-funded by CAFOD, DPA has refined its activities, dropping education as a sector but giving greater attention to DRR and CCA. Thus over the last two years, thematically, the work of DPA in these two provinces fits very closely with the key objectives of CAFOD under Goal 1 of the current project framework, with the three main outcomes falling under DRR/CCA, Land & NRM and Livelihoods.

DRR/CCA

As noted in the introduction, DRR and CCA have only become a focus of DPA in Ratanakiri and Mondulakiri since 2012, although they did begin with some training on DRR towards the end of the EU-NSA project in 2011. As these were new topics for DPA, initial focus was on training staff on the concepts and processes. CAFOD staff were active in providing such training and support to DPA. Since receiving training, DPA staff have been active in rolling out the knowledge – to target communities as well as to Commune Committees for Disaster Management (CCDMs) and Village Disaster Management Teams (VDMTs).

At community level, following introductory meetings on the concepts, HVCA (Hazard, Vulnerability & Capacity Analysis) has been introduced to community leaders and they have been supported by DPA to implement this process in their villages. One of the key outputs of the HVCA process is a Community Action Plan (CAP) which the village leaders then take to integrate into the commune development planning process. It would have been interesting to see the actual outputs of the HVCA produced by the villagers but in the village visited by the evaluator, Sraemeunthang 2, it was not possible to view the actual documents as they had been taken to DPA office to be typed into a report which would be sent back to the village (the evaluator checked later at DPA office to see the original outputs but unfortunately they had already been burned after typing into the computer). It appears that this has been the case for all other villages also.

Unfortunately, although commune councils will include DRR and CCA measures from the CAP in their CIP (Commune Investment Plan), limited commune council budgets means that they have not yet been implemented in their entirety – as infrastructure (mainly roads) projects still receive higher priority for use of the limited funds. But over the last two years, DPA has supported the implementation of a few projects identified in the village CAPs – in the areas of agriculture (crop diversification) and water management (digging ponds for rainwater storage and rehabilitation of dams and canals that had fallen into disuse).

In addition to the above work carried out in DPA target villages, DPA has also been active in promoting DRR/CCA at commune and district level. Training was provided to CCDMs of the DPA target communes. Workshops were organized to discuss the impact of climate change on agriculture in both provinces. Learning forums were held at district and commune level to further orientate and debate on DRR and Climate Change.

⁶ Website not updated as the last Annual Report listed is 2011. Only the JCCI report is published for 2012

Land/NRM

This theme has been a key focus of DPA in both Ratanakiri and Mondulakiri for many years, particularly focusing on land tenure for indigenous communities. It has been quite challenging for DPA but they have persevered and in recent years are reaping the success of their endeavors. The first Communal Land Title (CLT) approved for Ratanakiri (La In village) took over eight years of actions and advocacy before it was finally approved. However the experience gained from this process has now laid down a clearer platform for further CLTs so it is expected that the process will be quicker in future. The project in Mondulakiri is currently finalizing three CLTs. These have all succeeded in passing the first two steps which are recognition of their legal identity from the Ministry of Rural Development and legal entity from the Ministry of Interior. Finalizing these steps allowed them to proceed with the technical work of mapping, development of internal rules and regulations and preparing all the necessary documents in cooperation with the Department of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction (DLMUPC) for registration of the CLTs.

Community Forestry (CF) associations have been in the process of development over the last six years in Ratanakiri province – in Teun, Malik and Trapeang Chres communes, potentially protecting over 6,500 hectares of forest. As with the CLTs, the process has been time consuming but now also reaping success. Although the final approval by the Forestry Administration Cantonment (FAC) takes time to achieve, DPA has been able to support these communities to complete all the steps towards registration of their CF associations.

Livelihoods

Under the EU-NSA project (2009-2011), DPA implemented an integrated approach to improved livelihoods in their target villages, with a combination of agriculture technical training and inputs, income generation, health and education. During 2012 and 2013, education was dropped as a component but agriculture support increased with more focus on techniques to mitigate against disasters and climate change.

For agriculture support, DPA trained (in cooperation with the Provincial Department of Agriculture) over 2,000 farmers on lowland and upland rice production, vegetable production using less water, cash crops (diversification into cassava, soybeans, corn, etc.), animal raising and fish culture. Based on DPA follow up, about 80% of these farmers were able to apply the technical knowledge they received and have increased outputs and income as a result.

Off-farm income generation has included supporting one resin association (established under a previous project), two new honey production groups and two bamboo shoot groups. Training of these groups included production, management and marketing skills, including processing the products, packaging and storage. Although the honey and bamboo shoot groups benefit only a few families to date (5 families per group so 20 families in total), and they are still relatively new, success shown by them can encourage other families to try such activities in the future.

Through additional CAFOD support in 2013, DPA has been able to continue to support Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) activities to further improve livelihoods. Even after the support from DPA under the EU-NSA project, many villages still lacked sufficient drinking water supply and there was still need for training on good health and sanitation practices. Although this component is relatively new (and will continue up to 2015), already the project has conducted hygiene and sanitation training in many villages, provided water filters to almost 800 families and is in the process of digging hand dug wells to increase drinking water supply.

Advocacy and networking

It is clear from the preceding paragraphs that DPA has played a strong role in advocacy on issues of DRR/CCA and land/NRM, particularly at the local level. For DRR/CCA the focus has been on increasing understanding among all stakeholders, incorporating community-identified mitigation measures into the local planning process and advocating for the use of commune funds to implement these measures.

Advocacy on land and NRM has included many actions at village, commune, district and provincial level to increase awareness of the rights of indigenous people under the current land and forestry laws. Another issue which DPA has been strongly advocating is the impact of extractive industries, particularly mining activities in their target provinces. The most important result of these advocacy activities is bringing the issues out into the open for discussion and thus promoting greater transparency as to the management of these national resources.

Evaluation Report on CAFOD Cambodia Program 2010-2013 (Goal #1), February-March 2014

Guiding all DPA advocacy work is their overall advocacy strategy, under the guidance of DEAP (Development Education and Advocacy Program). This strategy lays the framework for all DPA programs in the areas of gender, land/forests, extractive industries, climate change and DRR. DPA strategy is not only to advocate on behalf of vulnerable groups but to build the capacity of communities to advocate for themselves. Thus DPA had conducted training on advocacy for the VDAs (Village Development Associations) in their target villages.

DPA's local level experience of the impact of these issues (land/forests, extractive industries, climate change, etc.) strengthens its position when advocating with national authorities about actions which can have impact at community level. This local knowledge provides the materials for "evidence-based" advocacy which is more difficult for external bodies to refute. DPA has been particularly active as a member of the EISEI secretariat and participates actively as a member of NGO Forum in issues related to land and forestry.

Beneficiaries

Based on DPA reports and discussions during the evaluation, the table below presents an estimate of the total beneficiaries of the projects supported by CAFOD over the last few years.

Theme	Actions	EU-NSA 2009-2011			CAFOD 2012-2013			ALL YEARS	
		HHs	Pers	Fem	HHs	Pers	Fem	Pers	Fem
<u>Land/NRM</u>	Community Forestry	1,469	2,224	1,052	1,469	4,387	2,106	6,611	3,158
	Communal Land Titles	288	1,244	618	288	1,244	618	1,244	618
	W'shops & forums - Land/Forestry		204	88				204	88
	W'shops & forums - Extractive activities		607	254				607	254
	Commune council/CSO cooperation activities		553	158				553	158
	Trainings on land laws and IP rights					107	37	107	37
<u>Livelihood</u>	Training/inputs on rice production		261	119		150	77	411	196
	Training/inputs on veg production		627	310		90	22	717	332
	Training/inputs on cash crop production		118	43		232	115	350	158
	Training/inputs on animal raising		199	129		77	37	276	166
	Training/inputs on fish culture		134	15		24	7	158	22
	Training on organic pesticides					241	144	241	144
	VVV refresher training		60	3				60	3
	Strengthening cow/buffalo bank committees		92	5				92	5
	Support to Resin Cooperatives	110	440	220				440	220
	Support to Agriculture Cooperatives	267	1,068	534				1,068	534
	Advocacy on marketing/food security		215	74				215	74
	VDA cap build		471	129				471	129
	Gender, D&D, n'working		187	114				187	114
	Provision of filters and drinking water supply				780	3,120	1,498	3,120	1,498
<u>DRR/CCA</u>	DRR training/HVCA/CAPs		103	48		559	272	662	320
	Agro-forestry tree nurseries					24	2	24	2
	Training on DRR/CCA at village level					72	31	72	31
	Training on DRR/CCA to CCDMs and DCDMs					64	19	64	19
	Workshops on impact on agriculture from CC					79	32	79	32
	Learning forums on DRR/CCA (dist/comm level)					81	35	81	35
	Learning forums on DRR/CCA (village level)					493	222	493	222
	Small scale irrigation (ponds, canal repair etc.)					214	105	214	105
	TOTALS		8,807	3,913		11,258	5,379	18,821	8,674
Adjust for possible overlap in beneficiaries					-2,814	-1,345	-2,814	-1,345	
Adjusted Totals					8,443	6,689	26,972	12,227	

The figures for the EU-NSA project are cumulative for the three years of the project and extracted from the final report (supplemented by the external evaluation report on that project). These extend back a little further than the period under review for this evaluation but it appears that the majority of benefits were achieved in the later years of the project so the evaluator feels these are acceptable beneficiary figures for the period under review.

Beneficiaries under the land/NRM sector have remained mostly the same as DPA continued to support the establishment of the CLTs and CF associations which had not achieved official recognition at the end of the EU-NSA project. In fact many time consuming tasks were done during 2012 and 2013. The figures presented by the EU-NSA report for the CF associations gave only the total members, rather than the number of persons benefiting from the CF area. Therefore the additional figures shown for 2012/2013 add in those missing persons.

Finally at the end of the table, the evaluator has made an assumption (from review of the geographical locations) that there are about 25% of beneficiaries who have taken part in more than one activity mentioned so an adjustment has been made in order not to overstate the actual number of beneficiaries.

Monitoring, evaluation & reporting

DPA puts strong emphasis on monitoring the implementation of all its projects and programs. The structure of DPA ensures that there are clear lines of reporting and they have a designated person to act as Monitoring Officer. Field visits are conducted frequently by line managers and by the Executive Director. Baseline data however concentrates on overall village situation rather than individual beneficiaries; adding an extra component to the baseline to track changes in the lives of individual beneficiaries would complement the current information system.

There have been visits by CAFOD staff over the years, originally from outside Cambodia (about twice a year) but more frequently now that CAFOD has an office in Phnom Penh. DPA appreciates the support of CAFOD through these visits. A review of some of these visit reports included a report from Sarah Bennet on a meeting with DPA in Phnom Penh (March 2012) on their use of the V&A tool. In that report, Sarah was impressed by the use of the V&A tool by DPA, and especially their sense of ownership of the use of the tool (i.e. that it was not only done for CAFOD but that DPA genuinely found it useful in assessing the progress of their advocacy work). She also noted though that the process of completing the V&A tools is still internal within DPA staff, there are not yet any community or other stakeholders involved in assessing the stage of progress. Discussions with DPA about the use of this tool noted that even among DPA staff it is difficult to find a consensus as to what stage to place the organization on some issues – as they are very broad. For example working with government could be broken down into sub-groups as the stage of progress can differ. DPA has not yet made use of the VIA tool or the Battery tool.

DPA has conducted a number of external evaluations of its work over the last number of years, the most recent (of relevance to the CAFOD supported work) was the external evaluation of the EU-NSA project completed in 2011. That evaluation was generally positive about the work carried out by DPA and there were not so many recommendations. Those that relate to the issues pertinent to this evaluation were:

- Inclusion of reforestation and agro forestry as part of the NRM component
- Re-orient the Agriculture and Livelihood Development component from supply-driven mode to demand-driven mode – i.e. produce what is needed by the market
- ICD Program to establish more community forestry and communal land titling areas as core strategies for Natural Resource Management

Since this evaluation in 2011, DPA has in fact taken these recommendations on board to some extent. Tree nurseries (for fruit trees and hard wood) have been established in many target villages and it is intended (at least for some of the villages) to plant trees in deforested areas within their community forest protected areas. It is not so clear that agriculture has been re-orientated completely to a market-driven approach but perhaps an indication that farmers do in fact adapt to markets can be seen in the increase in the numbers of farmers growing cassava (certainly market driven, as people don't eat this crop). ICD is committed to continuing CF and CLT and is fact currently working on new areas.

DPA monitoring system results in relevant reports produced by all levels of staff to the next level in a timely manner (as per their agreed timeframes). Reporting to donors has been of very high quality. However, while there is extensive detail on activities carried out, current annual report format to CAFOD (using 2012 as an example as 2013 was not yet available at the time of writing) would benefit from a few minor changes such as:

- a) Add a table of contents
- b) Add a summary, in table form, of achievements compared to outputs (combined for both provinces to show overall picture of where the project stands)
- c) Add a table on direct and indirect beneficiaries (although it can be assumed that the list of target villages listed in the first section could be considered indirect, it is important to note direct beneficiaries).

In addition to bi-annual reporting to donors, CAFOD requires some additional reports from DPA under the PPA (Partnership Program Agreement) with DFID⁷. These reports are thematic and DPA completes reports on DRR/CCA and Livelihoods. The information in these reports overlaps with that already included in their bi-annual reports, extracting the issues which relate to the relevant theme. These PPA reports are produced on an annual basis (since 2012 only).

DPA publishes its reports on its website, thus allowing access to stakeholders other than donors. These are published in both Khmer and English thus allowing access to a wider audience in Cambodia (e.g. Government and CSOs). Financial information is also included but expenditure is shown by project only; it is not possible to distinguish percentages spent on direct or indirect costs.

III.4 Banteay Srei (BS)

Introduction

Banteay Srei's broad aim is women's empowerment which is reflected in the project goal of the CAFOD-supported project (and which has remained the same over the years), namely "vulnerable women in Banteay Srei target areas will be empowered to improve their political, economic and psycho-social status". Within this goal, the first two outcomes contribute to Goal 1 of the CAFOD program – women's right to participate in the decentralization process and improving livelihoods (through enhancing skills in agriculture, micro-enterprise and NRM).

The number of target villages of BS has expanded over the years to its current number of 53, of which 21 are in Battambang (BTB) province and 32 in Siem Reap (SRP). The strategy of BS (which has been refined over the years) is to phase out direct involvement in villages after a period of 10 years – broken down into two years of start-up phase, five to six years of development phase and the final two to three years building up a CBO (Community-Based Organization) comprising the leaders of various groups formed during the development phase to continue to support the village development.

Support by CAFOD to BS has been about STG 25,000 over the last few years but this reduced a bit in 2013 (to STG 20,000). However, as with DPA discussed above, in addition to overall support to BS annual program, CAFOD approved an additional grant in 2013 for WASH activities of STG 30,000. BS feels that CAFOD is become more thematic-orientated than in the past – in earlier years, CAFOD supported funding of a more general nature but now concentrates more on specific issues. CAFOD contribution to BS to date (excluding the latest specific WASH project) is less than 10% of their whole program, as their program funds average about \$500,000 per year.

DRR/CCA

BS only began to focus on disaster risk reduction in 2012 so it is still a relatively new topic for them. They received training from CAFOD staff to help them develop their DRR capacity. They have not yet developed strong links with the National Committee for Disaster Management (NCDM) or with the Provincial Committees (PCDMs) in either Battambang or Siem Reap but do link with the Commune Committees (CCDMs) a little (but more with the commune council members of these committees).

After training, BS conducted DRR training to district, commune and village officials in preparation for conducting HVCA and preparing village DRR plans. Over the last two years, plans have been developed for 23 of the BS target villages. Plans that were not supported by BS have been incorporated into the commune investment plans. The plans supported by BS were mainly related to improving water management – rehabilitating canals for water supply and drainage and digging wells. BS did not contact directly with staff of the Departments of Water Resources and Meteorology but (in BTB) made use of ex-staff from this Department as a technical advisor. DRR has also been incorporated into their livelihood strategies whereby agriculture groups adopt water saving strategies for crop growing. BS has also developed two farms to demonstrate agriculture practices which incorporate DRR strategies – one for drought affected area and one for flood affected.

⁷ The British Government Department for International Development

BS has also organized a technical working group on climate change in Kralanh district of SRP province. This working group includes the district and commune committees for disaster management as well as the community facilitators from BS target villages. During 2013 they held two meetings to share ideas on agriculture practices in the face of climate change, as well as discussing issues related to water and soil conservation.

Land/NRM

For BS target villages, land issues are more prevalent in SRP province than in BTB. The issues in SRP mainly arise between the APSARA Authority⁸ and the people who live within the designated zones assigned to the Authority. The reasons for disputes could be broken down into two separate aspects – firstly, the lack of understanding by the people living in these zones of their rights under the laws governing the management of the area and, secondly, some issues of deliberate misapplication of these rules by individuals purporting to represent the Authority.

To address these causes, BS has been active in promoting better understanding of the laws among the affected villages. Community Facilitators have now a better understanding of the APSARA land management policy and thus can better advocate with Authority officials in cases of dispute.

On the wider issues of land management BS supported community facilitators from nine of its target villages to participate in a network meeting in Phnom Penh organized by the Coalition of Cambodian Farmers Community to discuss the draft law on agriculture land management. This was an excellent opportunity to allow the voices of these rural women to be heard at the national level and it also built their confidence to be advocates on behalf of their villages as they actively involved in debating some key articles in the draft law.

Livelihoods

Through the formation and training of IG (Income Generation) groups in all target villages, BS has supported many over 2,000 group members, mostly women, to expand or diversify their income sources. Various types of activities have been undertaken by these groups such as rice production (organic and non-organic), chicken raising, mushroom growing, fish sauce and fish paste production.

Support from BS to these groups has not only been material or financial support. BS provides support over a number of years to each group covering a wide range of topics designed to build the capacity of the group members.

Assessing these income generation activities during the evaluation of the BS Strategic Plan in mid-2013⁹, the evaluator noted that while income generated was modest, an important factor was the sense of control of family finances that the income provided to the women. However, as it takes time to achieve benefits from their IG activities, many families still use economic migration as a means of survival. To partly address this issue, BS plans to set up farms for landless women to work on, producing organic produce, and link these with stalls in the markets to sell these products.

Advocacy and networking

BS has developed a tool for its organizational advocacy work. It is a nice simple paper that describes the key steps that should be followed in order to help address an emerging issue. These steps – issue identification, context research, evidence gathering, planning the strategy and monitoring progress – can help guide staff in their support to communities facing issues that require advocacy support from BS.

In their two target provinces, BS is considered a strong advocate for women's empowerment, in particular encouraging increased participation of women on elected councils and building capacity of women in leadership positions within their community. The latter is often the first step to women being recognized as potential candidates for possible election as commune councilors.

⁸ The Authority for the Protection and Management of Angkor and the Region of Siem Reap, created by the Royal Government of Cambodia to be in charge of research, protection and conservation of cultural heritage, as well as urban and tourist development

⁹ Evaluation of Banteay Srei Strategic Plan 2010-2013, July 2013, Carol Strickler, consultant

BS supports communities to advocate for their rights in many areas. As mentioned earlier under land issues, BS has helped people to understand their rights as residents within the APSARA Authority designated area. This has led to successful advocacy by some residents which resulted in compensation by the Authority. BS strongly supports community people's advocacy in many other areas such as demanding transparency and accountability by health centers regarding fees they charge for services¹⁰.

Regarding DRR/CCA, their key focus has been on ensuring village mitigation measures identified through the HVCA process and included in village disaster risk reduction plans are taken on board by commune councils, first by integrating these into the commune development plans and later by allocating commune funds for their implementation.

Beneficiaries

As noted above, BS works with villages over a period of 10 years, with the intention to build up the leadership capacity of the various development groups (normally led by women) established over the development phase into a CBO to continue to support development after phase out. Of the 53 target villages, 27 have reached the phase out stage (PPH) and the remaining 26 are in the development phase (DE). The table below shows the number of groups and membership formed to date.

Status	Province	District	Commune	# Villages	Total pop	# fem	BS beneficiaries		
							# groups	# memb	# fem
PPH	Battambang	Battambang	O Mal	3 vill	3,788	1,970	18	408	265
PPH	Battambang	Battambang	Wat Kor	2 vill	5,487	2,789	10	107	94
PPH	Battambang	Bavel	Bavel	3 vill	4,168	2,156	23	442	378
PPH	Battambang	Bavel	Khnach Romeas	4 vill	8,812	4,515	21	444	394
PPH	Battambang	Thmar Kol	Bansay Treng	2 vill	1,840	947	15	164	139
PPH	Siem Reap	Angkor Thom	Leang Dai	5 vill	7,561	3,363	26	855	738
PPH	Siem Reap	Kralanh	Kampong Tkov	4 vill	2,562	1,327	26	358	309
PPH	Siem Reap	Pourk	Pourk	2 vill	3,058	1,549	7	87	77
PPH	Siem Reap	Pourk	Roelul	2 vill	1,889	916	11	236	232
DE	Battambang	Battambang	O Mal	2 vill	1,973	1,036	15	303	274
DE	Battambang	Battambang	Wat Kor	2 vill	5,497	2,172	15	1,183	533
DE	Battambang	Bavel	Bavel	2 vill	2,549	1,444	14	993	557
DE	Battambang	Thmar Kol	Bansay Treng	1 vill	1,933	994	5	92	57
DE	Siem Reap	Angkor Thom	Leang Dai	2 vill	2,130	1,094	5	174	151
DE	Siem Reap	Kralanh	Kampong Tkov	2 vill	1,957	1,025	5	77	63
DE	Siem Reap	Pourk	Roelul	2 vill	2,096	1,013	6	121	90
DE-D	Siem Reap	Puok	Don Keo	13 vill	19,433	9,726	31	5,951	2,961
Totals				53 vill	76,733	38,036	253	11,995	7,312

The above are the core beneficiaries of the BS program. However, many activities, especially DRR mitigation measures undertaken benefit the whole community and there is also "spill-over" effects as non members of BS groups replicate activities undertaken by BS group members. A conservative estimate would be an additional 15% of the total population, bringing the total beneficiaries to approximately 24,000 persons.

Monitoring, evaluation & reporting

BS uses a variety of tools in its monitoring process. Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) is one of their key tools for recording a village situation at outset and at later stages during their interaction with the village. For monitoring change at individual level, they use "stories of change" as a means of documenting this change. BS received orientation on some new CAFOD tools such as V&A and the Battery Tool but have not yet integrated these into their monitoring system. BS feels that monitoring tools should not be segregated into sectors or themes but that it is better to measure overall community change as all issues are integrated. They feel this holistic approach is best measured by updating the PRA process to compare changes.

¹⁰ See interesting case study in Appendix 4 of BS Annual Report 2013

Two external evaluations of BS work have been conducted in the last year. The first was an evaluation of their Strategic Plan 2010-2013 and was conducted in July 2013 to provide input to the preparation of the new Strategic Plan. The second evaluation was a Joint Partner Assessment of the work in Siem Reap province conducted in January 2014 by CAFOD, NPA and DIAKONIA. As the second evaluation concentrated on BS work in Siem Reap only, the recommendations were quite specific to that program but could also have relevance for the work in BTB province, considering the similarities in operational strategy between the two provinces. One key issue was the coherence of the village structures established by the project. The JAT (Joint Assessment Team) felt that while there are many small groups in the villages, there are limited linkages between them. Another issue raised by the JAT was the lack of networking at provincial level on relevant issues such as women's affairs, agriculture and DRR. From discussions with BS during the course of the current evaluation, the evaluator would suggest that this is particularly an issue for SRP rather than BTB as the BS team in BTB seems to have developed stronger working relations with other NGOs and with Provincial Government. Some strategic recommendations from the evaluation of BS Strategic Plan included:

- more engagement with men in the promotion of women's empowerment (BS works almost exclusively with women and this often means that men do not participate in activities which results in a lost opportunity for constructive engagement)
- resulting from high turnover of CFs (Community Facilitators), there is a need to encourage more younger people to become CFs
- need to develop more strategic partnership with the PDA (Provincial Department of Agriculture) in order to promote sustainable livelihoods in agriculture
- BS need to assess its phase out policy; in particular the CBO model which takes over from BS (as the evaluator found that only about 37% of CBOs functioned effectively in villages which had phased out)

From discussions with CFs in one of BS target villages during the course of this current evaluation, the current evaluator would concur with the relevance of the four recommendations mentioned above. BS is seen (by its name and its mode of operations) to be a women's organization; this makes many men unwilling to join activities as they feel they are not relevant to them. The CFs in the village visited also noted the high turnover of community leaders but also the difficulty in encouraging younger people to take up these roles as they are more interested in their own income generation (and often want to move away from the village to work).

As regards reporting, to date BS has been able to produce one annual report acceptable to all donors for the calendar year January to December. As the new CAFOD funding agreements will now change to April-March, they worry about the impact of this change on reporting (will they have to write separate reports in future?). Like DPA discussed above, BS also has to produce separate thematic PPA reports on DRR and livelihoods. BS has a very informative website about its projects (but only in English) and they publish their annual reports on this website. However, although the reports refer to annexes with financial information, the annexes are not uploaded so their financial information is not shared through this medium.

III.5 NGO Forum

Introduction

CAFOD is one of many donors to the NGO Forum, contributing approximately US 40,000 per year to their program which has had average expenditure of about US\$ 900,000 per year over the last four years (a contribution from CAFOD of about 5% of total income of the Forum). The NGO Forum uses these funds to cover three key programs – Development Issues Program, Environment Program and Land & Livelihoods program. Two other programs – the Core Program (for organizational development) and the Research & Information Center (supports research into, and publication of information related to, the three key programs mentioned above) – can be considered supportive to the overall goal. From a look at the titles of the three main programs, it is obvious that they have direct relation to CAFOD goals.

However, although unlike some other donors, CAFOD support is not directly linked to any of the NGO Forum programs mentioned above, since 2012 certain expected outcomes have been linked to the annual Grant Agreements (prior to 2012, there were no specific conditions attached). The expected outcomes for 2012 and 2013 were similar and already described in the summary of grant agreements earlier in this chapter. They can be summarized as follows:

1. The human resource and organization development are effectively functioning
2. Gender is mainstreamed into all aspects of the organization's work

3. NGOs, affected communities, DPs, and the government are actively engaged in policy consultation and dialogue promoting land and housing rights
4. Effective advocacy strategy brings issues of land disputes, land registration and land allocation to the attention by decision makers
5. NGO network members have strengthened capacity and skills to effective advocacy on environmental issues and climate change policy
6. Climate change policy and practices effectively influenced by NGOs/CSOs to ensure that the best practice of CC policy for CCA benefit the poor and vulnerable

It is clear from these expected outcomes that the effective functioning of the NGO Forum is considered of prime importance to CAFOD as much as the results achieved. In fact the NGO Forum continues to place key importance on developing its human resources, mainstreaming gender in its programs and refining its advocacy strategies. Although faced with an ever-present constraint of attracting and retaining skilled human resources, the NGO Forum management have conducted trainings each year to upgrade the skills of their staff and having developed a gender policy in 2012 were able to roll this out in 2013 through training courses to all staff and through discussions at internal meetings.

The achievements of the NGO Forum over the last three years are extensive and already well laid out in their annual reports. While it would be superfluous to outline them all again here, the following paragraphs under DRR/CCA, land/NRM and livelihoods extract some of the key highlights from these reports which give a flavor of the progress made as a result of their advocacy work.

DRR/CCA

Although DRR is not specifically mentioned much in NGO Forum strategies, climate change is one of the key issues being addressed by the NGO Forum. As with its work on other themes, the NGO Forum role focuses on ensuring the voice of civil society (on behalf of the people) is incorporated into policy making on climate change. The following are some key achievements over the last few years in that regard:

- By patient networking over the last number of years, the NGO Forum has now established a good level of cooperation with key ministries that can influence policy making on issues related to climate change – such as the Ministry of Environment (MoE), the Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology (MoWRAM), the Ministry of Rural Development (MRD), the National Committee for Disaster Management (NCDM), National Mekong River Commission (CMRC) and Council for Agriculture and Rural Development (CARD). An example of such cooperation in practice was the NGO Forum support to the National Climate Change Department of the Ministry of Environment, who praised the NGO Forum for their financial support in organizing the third National Forum on Climate Change in November 2013 in Phnom Penh.
- NGOs network members and key NGO partners were fully engaged to provide input and recommendations on Cambodia Climate Change Strategic Plan 2013-2023 (CCCSP) and the EIA draft law. Most comments of CSOs were accepted and incorporated into the final CCCSP
- The many workshops and conferences organized by the NGO Forum over the last number of years has enabled national and international NGOs working on climate change in Cambodia to significantly increase their understanding of climate change issues and to build their advocacy capacity. Led by the NGO Forum, they have committed to work together to establish a joint climate change advocacy strategy both at the national and international level and then jointly implement the activities listed in the strategy
- NGO Forum has established strong ties with regional NGOs to co-organize thematic workshops during the ASEAN People's Forum – one on Climate Change and REDD+ and another on Rivers and Hydropower: Experiences from the Mekong and Sesan Rivers. The joint statements of the workshops were sent to the ASEAN Secretariat.
- As a result of NGO Forum networking with members, the position of the NGOs/CSOs on climate change was well prepared and raised at the COP 18 in Doha. A press conference contributed to increased knowledge of the Cambodian public on the position of NGOs/CSO on climate change issues.
- Gradually, the role of CSOs is recognized by government as a crucial part of the climate change solution in Cambodia.

Land/NRM

A lot of work has been carried out over the last few years related to land security and advocating on fair and transparent management of natural resources – such as forests, mineral resources and water (especially issues related to hydro-power). The following are some key success to date:

Linkages:

- Invitations by the government for the NGO Forum to participate in the Technical Working Group on Land, the Technical Working Group on Forestry and the Environment indicate a growing appreciation of the role the NGO Forum can play in such working groups.
- There is increased openness of the Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy (MIME) to dialogue with NGOs on issues related to transparency in extractive industry.
- Linked to transparency regarding the extractive industries (and all public finances), the Ministry of Economy and Finance (MEF)'s acknowledgment of the credibility of the NGO Forum's work was demonstrated by its willingness to engage in a dialogue with the NGO Forum on budget transparency issues and to publish an executive summary of the Strategic Paper on Debt Management 2011-2018 on its website.
- The Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction (MLMUPC) has expressed their commitment to have better cooperation and collaboration with Civil Society Organizations to address problems regarding land registration as they arise.

Hydropower:

- NGO Forum conducted a major press conference on Xayaburi Hydropower Dam matter, to publicize concerns over Laos' decision to proceed with the plan without proper environmental agreement. The RGC strongly opposes the construction of Xayaburi dam which is the same position of CSOs and local communities. The position of the RGC indicates that the advocacy activities NGO Forum members and communities have contributed to this position as the government is now more vocal in its opposition to the dam.
- Two press conferences were also held on the issue of the Lower Sesan 2 (LS2) Hydropower Dam, to raise voices of villagers who will be relocated by the Dam and to lobby government in improving and enforcing the appropriate compensation. Such conferences have helped to keep the debate open on the issue of the impact of the dam on the lives of the affected people. This issue is still a "live" one and the NGO Forum continues to work on it.
- NGO Forum member activities have helped empower communities affected by LS2 dam. As a result, these communities are now taking the initiative to organize their own advocacy activities on LS2.

Land:

- In the past, the RGC reclassified large areas of State Public Land to State Private land in order to grant concessions, as only state private land can be subject to alienation. NGO Forum observed that the reclassified areas were often prime forest areas, and that the reclassifications were done via the issuing of Sub Decrees. Focusing on the process of reclassification, the project co-organized a workshop with network members and partners, discussing legal requirements, challenges and experiences of the re-classification processes. As a result, NGOs assessed that the current process of reclassification does not meet legal requirements and that it does require a specific law on reclassification. CSOs expressed their intention to advocate for a law on the reclassification of land in the upcoming years and identified an advocacy strategy for future action.
- With the NGO Forum and other NGOs report "*Access to Land Title in Cambodia – A Study of Systematic Land Registration in Three Cambodian Provinces and the Capital*", the project contributed to an increased awareness of the RGC and development partners on the issues of exclusion both in rural and urban areas. The report's key findings and recommendations for better access to land title under the Systematic Land Registration (SLR) have been discussed with both the MLMUPC and the development partners. As a result, the MLMUPC will pilot "inclusive" (=avoiding exclusions) systematic land registration projects in Phnom Penh, Battambang and Kampong Cham.
- As a result of strong advocacy by NGO Forum members, the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) issued a directive placing a moratorium on the granting of Economic Land Concessions (ELCs).
- The Land & Livelihoods Program continues to contribute to improving access to land through the empowerment of local communities. For example, in Banteay Meanchey, NGO Forum supported residents affected by a long running land dispute and they were able to advocate for tenure security on their own. As a result, 774 households received land in the framework of the new scheme land titling. In addition, 30 families involved in a land dispute

between Sopheak Nika company and villagers in Kbal Romeas commune, Sesan district, Steung Treng province had their land returned to them.

- The Housing Rights network continued its engagement in implementing Circular 03¹¹ in Battambang and helped **securing access to land and sustainable livelihoods** for the target community. After start of the implementation, local authorities announced unofficially after that they will not evict people living on claimed public state land, and no evictions occurred in Battambang since then.
- NGO Forum organized a main media conference over land rights issues, with other four NGOs to bring attention of the government and media to the **situation of the land-poor** in Cambodia,

Livelihoods

As the NGO Forum combines one program on Land and Livelihoods, there is a lot of overlap between these two themes and the success on land advocacy described in the previous section contribute to the sustainability of people's livelihoods. In addition to issues of land, the NGO Forum has engaged with policy makers on other important issues such as consultations on the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP), food security and agriculture policies. A few important achievements are highlighted below:

Linkages:

- The engagement of NGO Forum with the government has greatly improved over the last few years and an example of this was the invitation for NGO Forum staff to attend two training courses organized by the Cambodian government on Aid Management and Social Safety Nets focusing on the Food Security & Nutrition strategy plan. Such improved engagement has also resulted in the NGO Forum receiving more invitations to attend government meetings, workshops, and others events
- Another indication that the NGO Forum's good reputation is still well-recognized by the government and development partners was the invitation to participate the Technical Working Group on Planning and Poverty Reduction
- As a result of our good relationship and mutual understanding, CARD has agreed with the NGO Forum's request to be a representative NGO on the Technical Working Group of Food Security and Nutrition.

The NSDP:

- The key content of the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) Update 2009-2013 has been reviewed in order to advocate for a clearer accountability mechanism to prioritize development policies of the NSDP 2014-2018
- CSO/NGO perspectives have been raised through the preparation and production of sector-based papers on key aspects of the NSDP 2014-2018

Agriculture:

- A key success for the NGO Forum was organizing Annual Farmer Forums attended by large numbers of participants including, farmers, government representatives, media and CSOs to discuss the farmers' challenging issues in term of climate change, food security and land dispute cases,
- The NGO Forum assisted with raising awareness to farmers about the negative impacts of the chemical pesticide through the national No Pesticide Use Day which was attended by hundreds of people.

Health and Education:

- MEDiCAM and NGO Education Partnership (NEP) have expressed increasing interest in budget monitoring work and started working more closely with the NGO Forum, specifically in commenting on the report on Budget Mapping in Health and Education Sector, which was uploaded on the Cambodian budget website.
- Likewise, Save the Children sought support and cooperation from the NGO Forum to strengthen its partners' knowledge on the budget process and advocacy capacity for more budget and better investment in children

¹¹ Circular on Resolution of the Temporary Settlement on State Land Illegally Occupied in the Capital, Municipal and Urban Areas

Beneficiaries

For a program such as that of the NGO Forum, it is not realistic to try to estimate the number of beneficiaries. Ultimately, the success of their advocacy work under the various themes described above will benefit all the people of Cambodia. Currently, as their work relies much on changing attitudes and understanding on key policy issues, it is not useful to try to estimate the numbers that have benefited to date.

Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

Being a relatively small contributor to the NGO Forum, CAFOD does not undertake much monitoring but relies on the systems in place to be assured that funds are being used properly administered. In that context it is important to appreciate that the NGO Forum has an excellent governance system in place under which members elect a Management Committee at their Annual General Meetings. The NGO Forum also conducts annual audits by a professional auditing firm. They have also received the CCC Certification of Good Practice which assures supporters that their systems are reliable.

An external evaluation conducted in 2011 as part of the process of developing their current strategic plan was generally very positive about the achievements of the NGO Forum. In their concluding remarks the evaluation team noted: *"The last five years of 2008-2011 implementation of action plan, NGO Forum on Cambodia have seen a talented and committed team of people create a unique membership organization that has established itself as a leader in tackling policy change and a bridge between decision makers, implementers and poor and affected population. As a direct result of careful advocacy and lobbying, the period ended with clear evidence of policy debate, representation, coordination, advocacy, information sharing and face to face lobbying"*. There were a number of recommendations made by this evaluation team and these have largely been taken on board and built into the current strategic plan.

NGO Forum annual reports are very informative and written to a very high standard. These reports are shared with all members and also published on their website. But seems the website needs a bit more attention as there is no specific depository for annual reports; they are mixed up with minutes of meetings and magazine publications and also don't seem to be organized in chronological order. There also does not appear to be any financial or audit reports published on the website. The Khmer version does not seem to be functioning as clicking this version only shows the headings of pages in Khmer, the content is still in English.

IV. Discussion in relation to TOR objectives

IV.1 Relevance of the program

Relevance of the CAFOD program can be considered from a number of perspectives – relevance to the overall CAFOD international strategy, relevance to Cambodia and relevance to CAFOD's partners and their target groups.

Relevance to CAFOD strategy

CAFOD strategy is outlined in its core document, "Just One World". This document sets out four main aims:

- AIM 1 – Increasing Power and Influence: **so that** –Women and men in the poorest and most disadvantaged communities are able to influence the systems, decisions and resources affecting them, living under governments, institutions and global structures that are just and accountable
- AIM 2 – Promoting Sustainable Development: **so that** –Women and men in the poorest and most disadvantaged communities have access to the essential services and resources they need to live sustainably, with dignity
- AIM 3 – Achieving peace, security and recovery: **so that** –Women and men in the poorest and most disadvantaged communities live in a safe and secure environment and are able to minimize, survive and recover from crises
- AIM 4 – Building our partnerships in the Catholic community: **so that** – Catholics in England and Wales are inspired to challenge global poverty through prayer, action and giving, so transforming their own lives

While Aim 4 is aimed only at the constituency in England and Wales, Goal 1 of the Cambodia Framework clearly addresses the other three Aims of Just One World. This Goal aims for "*Reduced vulnerability and greater environmental and livelihood stability for communities through more sustainable management of natural resources and effective engagement with local government and other stakeholders*". The latter point of "effective engagement" is an essential prerequisite to "increasing power and influence" (Aim 1). Livelihood stability through sustainable management of natural resources directly addresses Aim 2 (Promoting Sustainable Development). Reduced vulnerability (for example through outcomes such as disaster risk reduction) contributes partly to Aim 3 through ensuring communities live in an environment that is safer as they are better prepared in the face of potential hazards.

Relevance to Cambodia

The preparation of the current CAFOD Country Strategy paper concurred with the development of the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) 2009-2013. The selection of partners was highly relevant as the four partners implementing activities under Goal 1 of the CAFOD program have clear alignment with some key issues perceived as priorities in the NSDP 2009-2013 as can be seen from a few extracts below.

CCSP – key focus is on decentralization and de-concentration reforms

NSDP Article 52: The long-term development objective of the Royal Government's decentralization and de-concentration reform program is to achieve broad-based and sustainable development and strengthen vibrant local economic foundations so that every citizen has equal opportunity to participate in local development, effective environment and natural resource management and delivery of quality public services to meet the needs of citizen and poverty reduction by focusing on vulnerable groups, indigenous minorities, women and children.

Banteay Srei – key focus on women's empowerment.

257. RGC appreciates the support provided by development partners and national and international NGOs in the implementation of Neary Rattanak II. The Neary Rattanak II focused on the following priority areas:

- Economic empowerment of women;
- Enhancing women's and girls' education;
- Legal protection of women and girls;
- Promotion of health of women and girls;
- Promotion of women in decision-making; and
- Gender mainstreaming in national policies and programs

DPA – focus on integrated community development (especially related to agriculture, land use and the environment)

NSDP Article 96: The four sides of this [Enhancement of the Agriculture sector] rectangle are:

(i) Improving agricultural productivity and diversification (including animal husbandry, food security and nutrition, and rural development); (ii) land reform and de-mining; (iii) fisheries reform; and (iv) forestry reform (including environment protection and conservation).

NGO Forum – creating space for civil society engagement in policy making:

NSDP Article 93: The three aspects of partnership between RGC and other stakeholders comprise relations with (i) civil society; (ii) private sector; and (iii) external development partners. In regard to the first one:

- Active efforts continue to involve and associate all sections of the civil society in all appropriate aspects of RGC's planning and decision-making processes for taking Cambodia forward. Civil society is an important partner and many NGOs, both national and international, play an active and vigilant role in social and economic development efforts as well as in promotion of democracy and human rights.

Not only are the partner overall strategies in line with priorities of the RGC, the three key themes under Goal 1 are specific priorities also. Agriculture livelihood activities, land and NRM have already been mentioned under Article 96 above. The other theme of DRR/CCA is also included in the NSDP:

NSDP Article 134: Natural disasters such as floods, droughts, typhoons and epidemic diseases that Cambodia suffered, caused some loss of human lives, damage to crops, properties as well as affected national economy. As part of preparedness for the prevention of natural disasters, in 1995 the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) established the National Committee for Disaster Management (NCDM) with its vertical line from national to sub-national levels in 2002. At the same time, the RGC developed legal frameworks and regulations in order to **effectively prevent, mitigate and respond to risks** of these disasters.

NSDP Article 131: The MOE, as the Secretariat of the National Climate Change Management Committee, has been carrying out many activities to coordinate works on climate change. The Ministry prepared a Second National Report under the United Nations Convention on Climate Change as well as National **Strategy and Action Plan Responsive to Climate Change**.

Relevance to CAFOD's partners and their target groups

From the findings discussed in the previous chapter, it is clear from the way that the partners have implemented actions under the themes of DRR/CCA, Land/NRM and Sustainable Livelihoods that they are highly relevant to the partners and to their target groups. There is sufficient room within the wording of Goal 1 (*Reduced vulnerability and greater environmental and livelihood stability for communities through more sustainable management of natural resources and effective engagement with local government and other stakeholders*) to align with the programs of the partners.

What the evaluator would question here is whether they are the "most" relevant to their overall strategies. Some partners mentioned that CAFOD support appears to have changed over the years – from general support to the partners to more emphasis on "themes". Also, while the Goal is quite general, the wording of the outcomes seems to digress a bit from the focus of some of the partners.

This is not really an issue for the NGO Forum as their focus on advocacy, and in particular promoting a stronger civil society voice in the governance of the country, gives them a very broad mandate. In addition to this, CAFOD support is only one small amount within their total annual budget. It is also not so much an issue for DPA as the outcomes of the CAFOD program are very closely linked to DPAs community-led integrated community development approach.

But for the other two partners (Banteay Srei and CCSP), it is a little bit more difficult to see the relevance of outcome 1 under Goal 1 as being the most appropriate way of describing what they stand for. To recap, the two main outcomes under Goal 1 are:

1. **Sustainable land use plans at village and commune level in place and clarity of roles & responsibilities for implementation by identified stakeholders**
2. **National level advocacy positions are influencing legislation relating to sustainable land use, livelihoods & NRM are informed by good practice and challenges at local level**

Neither Banteay Srei nor CCSP have been involved in developing land use plans. For BS the focus has been on village development plans (building from a process of engagement with communities and using participatory tools such as PRA). Naturally these development plans include village maps but it would be a misuse of terminology to call these land use plans. CCSP has only recently started working at village level (through local partners – PVT and GVO) and there is no indication yet that these local partners will go through the technical process needed to develop land use

plans in their target villages and communes (so far each local partner of CCSP only works in one target commune each). It should be appreciated that such work requires close collaboration with the Government technical services to carry out such work effectively – most importantly collaboration with the Departments of Land Management in the relevant provinces.

Outcome 2 on the other hand is relevant to all partners if it is interpreted that not all partners need to contribute good practice and challenges in all the three areas mentioned (sustainable land use, livelihoods and NRM). National advocacy positions influencing legislation in these areas is clearly relevant to the work of the NGO Forum and other CAFOD partners (especially DPA) have used their community-based experiences to provide evidence to inform this advocacy work.

Conclusion on relevance

The program can be considered highly relevant as it meets the aims of CAFOD's international strategy, clearly aligns with the priorities of the country and to a large extent with the priorities of the partners and their target groups. To enhance relevance to partners in the future, CAFOD could consider reforming the wording of the outcome 1. Outcomes could be formulated to recognize CCSP's main focus (D&D, which fits clearly under the goal as part of "effective engagement") and BS's focus on women's empowerment. Considering CAFOD's own recognition of the importance of gender (quote from CAFOD policy on Promoting Gender Equality: *"We will develop positive action to promote full participation of women and men in our overseas programs, in such a way that women are empowered along with men"*), it would be a logical addition to the outcomes to reflect this commitment. Such changes in the outcomes would make a clear statement that the partners are at least as important as (or more than) the thematic areas.

IV.2 Effectiveness: successes to date compared to CAFOD Program Framework

From the discussions in the previous chapter on findings, it is clear that the partners have achieved many successes over the last few years and these have had positive impact on their target beneficiaries. In this section the evaluator brings these together to assess the effectiveness of the CAFOD program as a whole, using CAFOD's own Program Framework as the basis for measurement.

The CAFOD Program Framework sets out a number of indicators for the achievement of the three outcomes under Goal 1. These indicators differ slightly from year to year, using CAFOD reporting year (ending 31st March). For this analysis the evaluator has chosen the indicators for the year ended 31st March 2014 as being the most relevant to the period under evaluation (ending 31 December 2013) as there should have been considerable progress towards these indicators by this stage.

Using the findings from the previous chapter, the tables below present the assessment of the evaluator on the degree of progress for each indicator set per outcome. In the few areas where the evaluator judges that there has been little or no progress towards the achievement of the indicator, this indicator and the comments are shown in red color text. A few indicators that the evaluator felt were ambiguously worded and thus difficult to assess are shown in blue color text. Otherwise all comments in normal color text can be considered to have made significant progress towards achievement or are on track to be achieved.

Outcome 1	Progress towards achievement of 2013/14 indicators
Sustainable land use plans at village and commune level in place and clarity of roles & responsibilities for implementation by identified stakeholders	
<p><u>Monitoring indicators 2013/14:</u></p> <p>1. Evidence of hazard assessment and community action planning techniques being incorporated into program design and implementation</p>	<p>1. HVCA's have been conducted in 62 villages (29 by DPA and 33 by BS) and CAPs produced. Measures included in all these CAPs have been included in CAFOD partner program designs as well as being integrated into the CDPs of the relevant communes. The extent of implementation of these measures depends on the cost of the actions proposed. Many small-scale projects proposed in the CAPs have been implemented by partners (and some by commune council funds) but bigger projects await further donor support.</p>

Evaluation Report on CAFOD Cambodia Program 2010-2013 (Goal #1), February-March 2014

Outcome 1	Progress towards achievement of 2013/14 indicators
<p>2. Content of community action plans evidence integration of DRR, CC adaptation and livelihood initiatives</p> <p>3. Mechanisms for identification and selection of appropriate DRR actions and livelihoods initiatives in place. Indicators developed to monitor effectiveness and success of selected options</p> <p>4. No. of community action plans developed and integrated into local government plans (Village Development plans/ Commune Investment Plans)</p> <p>5. No. of land use plans in place that effectively integrate DRR, CC and livelihoods (Village Development Plans, Participatory Land Use Plans and Commune Land Use Plans)</p> <p>6. Partners linking up to other resources and expertise in land use planning (GIS, CC adaptation, conservation) and diversified livelihoods</p> <p>7. 2 Partners are supporting strategies for enhancing small scale livelihoods and access to markets</p> <p>8. Further development of strategies for engaging local and national government on NRM, DRR and CC issues</p>	<p>2. All CAPs include extensive livelihood measures (mainly agriculture-related) which in some cases are also DRR mitigation measures (e.g. rehabilitating canals – this increases water supply for extending crop growing season and is also a mitigation measure against drought).</p> <p>3. For all partners, identification and selection of appropriate DRR and livelihood initiatives are very much focused on participatory methods, whereby the communities identify what is needed based on their risk analysis and through discussion prioritize the most appropriate measures – for DPA, this is done through the facilitation of the VDAs (comprising VDCs and other project groups); for BS, the CFs are the key facilitators. There is no clear evidence of the development of indicators to monitor effectiveness of selected options but both DPA and BS conduct annual reflection meetings with their target groups where any issues of concern can be raised.</p> <p>4. As noted under #1 above, all CAPs have been integrated into the CDPs/CIPs</p> <p>5. It appears that land use planning has not yet been really integrated with DRR, CCA and livelihoods (with the exception of the identification of agriculture and forestry land). There is still some work to do to develop comprehensive land use plans for all target villages that incorporate current and future land use patterns and include all mitigation measures needed to reduce risks from hazards (including those that could be exacerbated by climate change).</p> <p>6. DPA is the main partner implementing land use planning and they have developed linkages with the main technical department (Dept. of Land Management) responsible for supporting this work. Through them they have access to the relevant technology (GIS and GPS/ Total Station equipment) to produce appropriate maps. All partners have developed linkages on CCA and livelihoods – e.g. DPA works closely with the Provincial Dept. of Agriculture in RAT and MDK provinces, BS links with the CCDMs and DCDMs in their target districts of SRP.</p> <p>7. There are in fact three partners directly supporting small-scale livelihoods (DPA, BS and CCSP) – and four if the NGO Forum indirect support through advocacy is considered. Both DPA and BS have taken actions to link producers to markets but there is still a lot more work to be done on this aspect of sustainable livelihoods.</p> <p>8. All partners have made considerable progress over the last few years in engaging government at all levels on NRM, DRR and CC issues (see discussions under each partner in Chapter III above)</p>

Outcome 2	Progress towards achievement of 2013/14 indicators
<p>National level advocacy positions are influencing legislation relating to sustainable land use, livelihoods & NRM are informed by good practice and challenges at local level</p>	
<p><u>Monitoring indicators 2013/14:</u></p> <p>1. Partner advocacy strategies/ approaches relating to land/ land use refined as a result of input from advocacy companioner on policy monitoring.</p> <p>2. Evidence that partners are utilizing findings from community level work on DRR/livelihoods/ land use planning to inform national level advocacy positions on land related issues/ legislation</p>	<p>1. Of the four partners, only DPA and NGO Forum have specific strategies developed for advocacy on land issues. Both of these partners (in particular, DPA) have noted the improvement to their strategies based on advice and support from CAFOD staff. BS has a general strategy for advocacy which they apply to all issues and they also acknowledge that discussions with CAFOD staff were of value in drafting this policy.</p> <p>2. Among CAFOD partners, the clearest link between local level experiences and influence on national level positions comes via DPA as an active member of the NGO Forum. Their local knowledge of the impact on Economic Land Concessions (ELCs) on the livelihoods of indigenous</p>

Outcome 2	Progress towards achievement of 2013/14 indicators
<p>3. Existing advocacy relating to land use implemented at local, provincial and national level and strategies adapted according to monitoring findings in relation to land use/ NRM work of partners. DRR work can increase evidence based advocacy in relation to land use and CC</p> <p>4. Partners are undertaking security risk assessments and have security procedures in place to protect staff and community members engaging in advocacy.</p> <p>5. CAFOD and partner staff have a better understanding of Land related policies (and other NRM/IP issues such as REDD and Climate Investment Funds, FPIC) and implications for partners programs and NRM in Cambodia</p> <p>6. Partners have a better understanding of local and national policies impacting on small scale livelihoods</p> <p>7. Evidence of more effective monitoring/ tracking of village and commune level development plans</p> <p>8. Advocacy at local and national level are being supported by international advocacy through more strategic engagement with EC and CIDSE MOs on land use issues.</p>	<p>communities has helped NGO Forum in its advocacy which contributed to the government moratorium on ELCs. Likewise DPA research into impacts of mining in their target areas have led to a more open approach to discussion on extractive industries (EIs) by MIME and has helped to encourage the debate into transparency of revenues from EIs and the need for better EIAs prior to granting mining rights.</p> <p>3. The first part of this indicator is quite ambiguous as to whose advocacy strategies it refers to (and also possible overlaps with indicator #2). Regarding the second part, DRR work of partners to date has included conducting HVCA which is an in depth, participatory, analysis which explores all hazards and vulnerabilities faced by the assessing community. This process therefore will ultimately identify any land use and CC issues that are affecting the community. Thus the outputs of the HVCA are key evidence that can be used in advocacy efforts to address the issues raised. As the use of this HVCA process is still relatively new to partners (only about 2 years), there is not yet any specific evidence of using these results for any particular advocacy issue.</p> <p>4. Partners appear to have good understanding of possible security risks of engaging in advocacy issues and their main strategy for protection is to use direct, irrefutable evidence to back up their advocacy claims. Thus partner advocacy strategies stress deep research and triangulation of information.</p> <p>5. While it is clear that certain key staff of each partner have clear understanding on these topics, it would take a more detailed evaluation of each organization's staff at all levels to assess their understanding – or to what extent it is "better" than before.</p> <p>6. As for #5 above.</p> <p>7. Assuming this indicator means monitoring/tracking by partners (as opposed to local authorities or elected councils), there is clear evidence that the monitoring of village development plans (and CAPs) is taken seriously by those partners who work at village level (DPA, BS and CCSP) and plans are reviewed and updated (at least annually).</p> <p>8. Through their support to NGO Forum, both the EU and some of CIDSE MOs have enabled staff of the NGO Forum to bring issues on land and NRM to regional and international conferences. Interactions at such conferences are an excellent means of sharing ideas on advocacy strategies.</p>

Outcome 3	Progress towards achievement of 2013/14 indicators
NRM and governance program is consolidated and strengthened	
<p><u>Monitoring indicators 2013/14:</u></p> <p>1. Review of CSP supports strengthened & consolidated NRM/ Land/ Livelihoods program</p> <p>2. Engagement and collaboration at regional/ interregional level – strengthening Cambodia program and contributing to development of sub-regional thematic program framework.</p> <p>3. Strengthened support to partners on Climate Change advocacy and program strategies</p>	<p>1. The annual CSP reviews, being participatory processes that allow all partners to reflect on achievements and constraints, have been excellent opportunities to refine the programs.</p> <p>2. As CAFOD has many partners in the region, there have been many opportunities over the last few years for inter-linkages between them on key thematic areas. While CAFOD recognizes that Cambodian partners have higher capacity than their counterparts in other countries, there have still been many opportunities for learning, especially on some specific thematic areas – especially DRR/CCA which is still a relatively new topic for partners.</p> <p>3. Over the years, CAFOD has continued to support partners through regular visits. Since the opening of CAFOD office in PNP, there have been even greater support to partners. For example one of the key issues related to Climate Change is the need for a better understanding on water management in general. CAFOD provided training to some partners on this</p>

Outcome 3	Progress towards achievement of 2013/14 indicators
<p>4. 3 Partners have strengthened accountability and child protection mechanisms with CAFOD support</p> <p>5. Community baseline and monitoring mechanism established (incorporating PPA data) to monitor effectiveness of livelihoods and DRR related work within communities</p> <p>6. Identification of appropriate technical support and resources to inform and improve quality of input to VDPs, CDPs and CAPs (environmental rehabilitation, climate change adaptation and livelihoods strategies)</p>	<p>topic and supported additional funding to put into practice some measures identified through their HVCA processes at village level.</p> <p>4. Accountability is of key concern to all 4 partners and they address it from various dimensions. NGO Forum focuses on accountability of government to its citizens; other partners working at sub-national level encourage accountability and transparency with their CSOs and support their demands for accountability of public servants. Key to achieving accountability is transparency of actions and use of resources. The evaluator would note here that most partners are not yet fully transparent in their own disclosure of use of resources – not to visitors of their websites nor to their target communities. There is not much evidence yet of child protection mechanisms incorporated into partner policies or strategies.</p> <p>5. Two partners currently use the PPA reporting (DPA and BS) on livelihood and DRR themes. While this allows partners to reflect on specific thematic issues, there is naturally duplication in reporting as the information supplied can be found in other reports of the partners.</p> <p>6. Technical support by CAFOD that was appreciated by partners included support on understanding DRR and conducting HVCA as well as better understanding on water management.</p>

Conclusion on effectiveness

From the analysis in the table above, the evaluator concludes that the program has been quite effective in achieving what it set out to do. Only a few areas (highlighted in red above) still require some attention.

There are still no examples of land use plans that fully integrate all the components mentioned under indicator 5 of outcome 1. Perhaps this indicator was a bit too ambitious to start with and also some elements of the indicator have now become outdated – e.g. PLUPs have now been discarded as a general tool by the MLMUP&C except for specific cases of land dispute (what they call “hot spots”). Mentioning CLUPs as a component also gives the impression that these comprehensive land use plans should be at commune level rather than village level. This is complicated for a few reasons. Firstly, CLUPs lack the detail necessary for full integration of village development plans incorporating DRR, CC and livelihoods. Secondly, some partners do not cover all villages in a specific target commune, thus making the commune level plan less relevant to them than the village planning. The evaluator would suggest that this indicator be reworded to focus on village “development” plans rather than land use plans as land use is only one component of the overall village development plan. Such comprehensive village development plans would therefore be intended to incorporate DRR/CCA analysis conducted under the HVCA process.

The second area where achievement falls short is in linking farmers to markets. There have been successes (e.g. honey producers under the DPA project and vegetable growers under the BS project) but there is still a need for a greater focus on market linkages. The evaluator would recommend CAFOD to support partners to understand more about this subject by organizing some reflection workshops with other organizations who are working more on “social business” or “enterprise development”. Examples of such organizations who could share their experiences are iDE (International Development Enterprises), SNV (Netherlands Development Organization) or ICS (Investing in Children and their Societies).

The last area highlighted in red above comes under outcome 3 which is more related to organizational development. Partners still need support to understand and develop child protection mechanisms. Regarding accountability, the evaluator noted in the table above that most partners do not yet share their own use of resources with other stakeholders. This is an important issue in order to avoid being accused of (to use an Irish phrase) “the pot calling the kettle black”. For example the NGO Forum conducts strong advocacy on Revenue Transparency but, although they publish their annual reports on their public website, financial or audit reports are not included. This could impact on the credibility of the NGO Forum if noted by the government and raised in a public event. DPA is the most transparent of all partners as they publish their reports in both Khmer and English and they also include financial reports. The only criticism of their financial reports is that they list expenditure per project only; it is not possible to identify what they

spend on indirect costs as opposed to direct costs. For all partners working at community level, it is important to give good examples of own transparency as well as encouraging this from others. The evaluator would recommend that CAFOD encourage partners to share relevant financial information to all levels of local government as well as to the community leaders in their target villages.

IV.3 Efficiency of implementation

For a program like this one of CAFOD which works through partners, the efficient implementation can be examined under the following headings:

- Grant management (efficiency in processing partner documentation)
- Process of supporting partners' implementation
- Cost effectiveness of the use of funds (cost/beneficiary)

Grant management

In 2012 CAFOD opened an office in Cambodia as part of the decentralization of its regional operations. Prior to 2012, grants were managed from the regional office. While this evaluation is not examining this decentralization process in detail, many comments were made by partners in relation to the change in relationship with CAFOD since the opening of the country office in Phnom Penh. The unanimous opinion is that it has resulted in a closer relationship which has had a positive impact on the overall grant management process.

While partner proposals are most often submitted for multi-year periods, CAFOD signs grant agreements on an annual basis. However, verbal commitment is generally given for longer periods, normally three years so, unless there are major problems with the implementation of the projects, they partners can be confident of CAFOD's ongoing support. This confidence also comes from the long-term relationship between CAFOD and the Cambodian partners under which a strong degree of trust has been built up over the years.

Processing the annual grant agreements, which is a pre-condition for the release of funds, has generally been completed within the first quarter of the year (for grants covering the calendar year, January to December), with exception of some slight delays in 2012 (possibly related to transition to decentralization?). A summary of the dates of grant signing is shown in the table below:

Partner		2010	2011	2012	2013
Banteay Srei	Date signed	10-Mar-10	25-Mar-11	5-Apr-12	21-Mar-13
	Funding period	Jan to Dec			
CCSP	Date signed	6-Jul-10	4-Aug-11	10-May-12	23-May-13
	Funding period	Apr to Mar	Jul to Jun	Jan to Dec	
DPA	Date signed	22-Mar-10	25-Mar-11	10-Apr-12	27-Mar-13
	Funding period	Jan to Dec			
NGO Forum	Date signed	7-Apr-10	24-Mar-11	4-Apr-12	12-Mar-13
	Funding period	Jan to Dec			

The table above shows that grant signing has been slightly slower for CCSP in most years but also the funding period for this partner has changed a few times. There does not appear to be any significant change in the timing of document processing before or after decentralization. While the partners are generally satisfied with the efficiency of grant processing, the evaluator would consider it more efficient if such grants could be signed off within the first month of the proposed funding period, while understanding that CAFOD requires reports on the previous period to be submitted prior to this process. Encouraging partners to prepare their reports within a shorter timeframe than that currently included in the grant agreements would help – e.g. it should not be necessary to take three months to prepare an annual report.

Regards processing of partner reports, most partners understand that CAFOD is satisfied with their reports as the program staff have indicated as such. However, for some partners, more constructive feedback on layout and content would be appreciated as it would help them to improve the quality of their reporting.

Supporting partners' implementation

The CAFOD office in Phnom Penh which supports the work of these four partners (as well as five other partners implementing projects under Goal 2 of the project) employs a small but specialized team comprising the following positions:

Job title	Gender	Nationality
Program Manager DRR/Livelihood	Female	Irish
Program Accompanier - East Timor	Male	Timor Leste
Program Accompanier – Philippines	Male	Pilipino
Program Officer Cambodia/Philippines	Female	Cambodian
Program Officer Timor Leste/Indonesia	Female	British
Program Officer Myanmar	Female	Australian
Humanitarian Capacity Building Coordinator	Male	Cambodian
Program Administrator	Male	Cambodian
Office Assistant	Female	Cambodian
Finance & Administration Officer	Female	Cambodian

Of the 10 persons listed above, four of these persons work out of the PNP office on other country programs in the region and one other person is in charge of two countries – Cambodia and the Philippines. So the Cambodia program is managed by a very small team. However, there continues to be support from HQ, particularly in issues such as advocacy and gender.

As noted in the previous section on grant management, all partners are unanimous in their opinion that having a CAFOD office in Phnom Penh is very helpful to them. But even before opening the office in Phnom Penh, CAFOD staff from the regional office (and from their HQ in London) has regularly visited the Cambodia program. Such visits included general meetings with all partners, capacity building activities as well as some monitoring visits to the partners in the provinces. Although it was not possible to get a specific figure on number of visits (as the partners could not remember exactly) over the years, all partners now feel there is more interaction since the opening of the Country Office in PNP and they are very satisfied with the support from CAFOD.

In particular, regarding capacity building support, partners noted that centralized training (i.e. where all, or some, partners are invited to PNP) is less useful to them than when CAFOD staff conduct such training (or coaching) with them directly at their projects. One of the reasons is that more staff can attend when the training is partner (or project) specific and theoretical training can be combined with relevant field practice. Recent trainings on water management were given as an example of this kind of effective training in practice.

Cost effectiveness

The nature of a program such as this which focuses a lot of advocacy and capacity building makes it difficult to accurately assess total beneficiaries due to the often long time between conducting such advocacy or capacity building and the benefits being realized. Nevertheless it is clear that, with a relatively small budget, CAFOD, through its partners, has reached out to a large number of people. Under the discussions of each partners work in the previous chapter an attempt was made to quantify the numbers of beneficiaries (with the exception of the NGO Forum). The table below compares these figures to the partner overall budgets and to the CAFOD contribution to these.

SN	Description	CCSP	BS	DPA	
1	Estimated number of direct beneficiaries	6,887	24,000	26,972	<i>Note 1</i>
2	Total budget 2010 to 2013 (rounded)	US\$ 600,000	US\$ 2,200,000	US\$ 1,400,000	<i>Notes 2 & 3</i>
3	CAFOD support (2010 to 2013)	US\$ 203,293	US\$ 197,385	US\$ 729,351	<i>Note 4</i>
4	% of budget supported by CAFOD	34%	9%	52%	
<p><i>Note 1:</i> BS beneficiaries include only group members, some projects benefited whole village <i>Note 2:</i> DPA budget from 2009 to reflect the EU-NSA 3-year project <i>Note 3:</i> DPA total budget only includes the two provinces supported by CAFOD <i>Note 4:</i> Includes CAFOD co-funding of the EU-NSA project</p>					
5	Cost per beneficiary (total)	87	92	52	
6	Cost per beneficiary (CAFOD fund only)	30	8	27	

The evaluator would consider the above costs per beneficiary to be very reasonable considering the nature of the program and also considering the conservative measurement used for the numbers of beneficiaries.

Conducting an indirect versus direct cost comparison is not very helpful for the overall program due to the variety of financial policies used by different partners in the designation of direct and indirect costs. It is also the opinion of the evaluator that such a comparison would not give any meaningful result as the nature of the work carried out (focus on "soft" actions like advocacy and capacity building) normally absorb a high proportion of personnel cost that cannot always be specifically attributable to results and is often wrongly allocated as indirect cost.

Conclusion on efficiency

The evaluator would conclude that the project has been very efficiently administered overall, with a small but efficient number of personnel and at a low cost compared to the benefits achieved.

IV.4 Monitoring and reporting (including use of CAFOD tools)

As noted under efficiency above, CAFOD has assigned a specific staff member to monitor the work of partners. However this officer is also in charge of another country as well so only about half of her time can be spent on Cambodian partners. Therefore the number of visits to partners per year is limited, considering there are five partners working on Goal 2 as well as the four partners working on Goal 1 – but there is really only three partners to monitor under Goal 2 as CAFOD does not really "monitor" the work of the NGO Forum as they have their own monitoring and governance structure. Also, in addition to the work of the program officer, there are other monitoring visits conducted on thematic areas such as DRR/livelihoods, advocacy and gender.

Apart from direct visits to partners, the main process used by CAFOD for monitoring partners is via the partner reports. As per the grant agreements, all partners submit bi-annual reports – a six-month report within one month of the first half of the year and an annual report within three months of the end of the year. As discussed above under grant management, the evaluator would suggest that CAFOD reduce the number of months allowed to prepare the annual report as it drags the process too far into the new implementation period, thus distracting them from the current implementation. For the scale of operations of partners, it should be possible to prepare all reports within one month of the completion date of the reporting period. If partners require more than one month to prepare, they should be encouraged to begin the process before the end of the implementation period – as not everything should change in the last month of the project.

It was noted earlier above that partners felt that they get little feedback on their reports. It would be helpful to partners to get specific written feedback on their reports, including any recommendations from CAFOD for improvement. From a review of the partner reports, the evaluator would see a number of areas where CAFOD could assist them. Although the reports are generally very good descriptively in discussing activities, they could improve on quantitative data, and especially accumulating figures from one reporting period to the next as it is not often clear whether the participants of any specific activity are the same ones as participated in previous activities or not. This is especially important when discussing results at the outcome level. In order for partners to have this information easily available at reporting time, CAFOD should ensure that their monitoring systems systematically record the data that will be required at reporting time to avoid extra work at this critical period.

In addition to partner visits and monitoring via reports, CAFOD has also developed some specific monitoring tools to supplement (not replace) existing monitoring tools of partners. These tools include:

- Voice & Accountability Tool (VAT)
- Vulnerability and Inequality Analysis (VIA)
- Battery Tool

As the Battery Tool has been used more by the partners working on HIV/AIDS under Goal 2 (and commented on already in the recent evaluation of that Goal¹²), this evaluation concentrated on the use of the first two tools (VAT and VIA).

¹² REVIEW of CAFOD's HIV and AIDS Program in Cambodia, 1996-2013, Vicente S. Salas, MD, MPH, Nov–Dec 2013

All partners acknowledged that they have been introduced to these tools by CAFOD but none of the partners has yet made any specific use of the VIA tool in practice. However, this tool was only introduced in the last year and partners have been busy with project implementation. The evaluator would add that where partners conduct good quality HVCA, issues of vulnerability and inequality should already have been incorporated into the village analysis and planning so perhaps this tool duplicates some of the work already carried out. The extent of possible duplication would depend on depth of analysis of the "V" in the HVCA that was undertaken – often there is insufficient analysis of root causes and effects, particularly if the HVCA facilitator is relatively new to the process her/himself. CAFOD will need to follow up in the coming months to see if this tool has been put to use and if so, what additional contribution it is making to program effectiveness.

The V&A tool has been used by DPA to conduct an assessment of where they stand on accountability. They found the tool generally easy to understand and to use and they plan to continue to update it in future. The only difficulty was that the four areas are quite broad:

- Involvement in government processes
- Advocacy and strategy development
- Community and constituency building
- Involvement in corporate structures

In particular the first area (involvement in government processes), DPA found it difficult to come to conclusion on where they stand as they work with a wide range of government agencies. The relationship with some of these agencies is quite advanced whereas progress is slower with others. Trying to present an overall picture is therefore a bit diluted and it may be difficult to see when progress occurs. The evaluator would suggest that perhaps CAFOD could help the partners to adapt the tool to sub-divide any of the four broad categories where they face such difficulty. If this sub-division is kept as an Annex, the results can still be presented in the overall summary but progress with different sub-sections (e.g. of government) could be monitored through the more detailed Annex to the tool.

In general, the most important aspect of these tools, as with any tools, is not necessarily their completion but the discussion and analysis that they encourage. But as always one of the main constraints is time so it is important not to introduce too many new tools at the same time.

IV.5 Impact of the program

The discussion on effectiveness above shows that the program has largely been successful. While the full impacts of this success, especially in the areas of advocacy still in progress and ongoing capacity building of community leaders, may not be seen for many years, already there are many stories of immediate impact from the work of CAFOD partners. A few examples are noted here under the key thematic areas:

DRR/CCA:

- Through the actions of this program, climate change has now been brought to the attention of a much wider audience and increased understanding on the topic is leading to direct actions in some communities – such as tree planting on degraded areas or conservation of remaining forest areas.
- There is increased understanding of community leaders and local authorities that it is possible to mitigate against impacts of disasters and climate change. Where previously there was a sense of apathy and acceptance that these things happen, through HVCA training and analysis, they now realize that, with appropriate resources, they can take action at local level to reduce the impact of such hazards.
- Rehabilitation of canals, dams and ponds as small-scale mitigation measures against drought makes farmers feel more secure in planting their rice growing as they know they will have enough water until harvest
- Introduction of crop diversification as a mitigation measure against droughts and floods has not only reduced the risk of crop loss; there are many examples of increased income from these crops (and successful examples are being replicated by other farmers who were not directly targeted by the program)

Land/NRM:

- Indigenous communities in Monduliri who have received CLTs have security over their future land use and can continue to practice their cultural practices without fear of losing the land which is key to these

- Community Forestry patrols in CF areas in Ratanakiri have the confidence to confront people who come to log timber illegally in their protected area
- Advocacy of partners (DPA and NGO Forum) on behalf of indigenous people who were being forced to accept individual land titles under the government Directive 01 succeeded in excluding these land titles in favor of allowing the communities to apply for CLTs
- Advocacy (and wide publicity) on the negative impacts on local communities from ELCs has led to the RGC calling a moratorium on such concessions – while some may still be granted on a small scale, the cooperation of civil society “watchdogs” can ensure that concessionaires respect the rules of their concession
- The admission of NGO Forum to the TWGs on land and NRM has opened the door for greater civil society participation in policy making regarding land and the use of natural resources
- The impartiality of the EISEI, through its focus on evidence-based advocacy strategy, has strengthened its credibility with the government which provides greater opportunities for dialogue on emerging issues particularly related to impacts of planned hydro-power projects

Livelihoods:

- Through training provided by DPA in cooperation with the Provincial Departments of Agriculture, many indigenous community members in Ratanakiri and Monduliri have diversified their agriculture practices, thus increasing their family income
- As noted under DRR/CCA above, crop diversification in all target communities has led to increased income – this has had wider impact such as those families now say they can send their children to school and can afford medical treatment in cases of illness in the family
- For BS target communities in Siem Reap and Battambang, where economic migration has been one of the main coping mechanisms, increased agriculture opportunities and small micro-enterprises have resulted in a number of families ceasing this migration practice as they can now earn enough at home
- Focus of partners on accountability and transparency of public services has had some successes such as one case in BS target community in Battambang where such advocacy resulted in a health center which had been overcharging patients reducing their charges to more generally acceptable levels

IV.6 Sustainability and replicability of the program

The potential sustainability of the overall program depends on the individual sustainability of each of the partners' work. The sustainability of each partner in turn depends on their overall focus, the stage of implementation and of course the resources available to them to achieve their goals.

NGO Forum focuses on a wide range of subjects and many of these are ongoing tasks that will take a long time to fully achieve. However, the Forum has a wide range of donors who appear to be committed to supporting this work. They also have developed effective organizational systems to ensure that good quality work continues to be carried out. The combination of these factors should ensure that the NGO Forum can continue to function for as long as the members deem it necessary. Replicability (in country) is not an issue for such a program as it would be a dilution of the collaboration efforts to create another such forum. But the work of the NGO Forum in creating space for civil society participation in policy making and monitoring could be an example that CAFOD could promote in other countries of operation if the socio-political environment offered opportunities for such a forum (and if no such forums already existed or if they lacked capacity).

DPA program in Cambodia has become very well established since they localized from CIDSE in 2006. They have acquired an excellent reputation for quality programs and have accumulated a pool of donors committed to supporting their work. However some donors are project-specific which reduces DPA flexibility in the use of the overall pool of funds. Like the majority of local NGOs in Cambodia, DPA does not have own fundraising activities so is dependent on donor support. DPA has not applied for institutional donor funding in its own name but has implemented projects funded by institutional donors as the implementing partner (e.g. the 2009-2011 EU-NSA project co-funded by CAFOD). DPA could take an important step towards financial sustainability by applying in its own name for such funding in the future, using other donor funds as the co-funding percentage required.

The work of DPA supported by CAFOD to date focuses on the Northeast of Cambodia in the provinces of Ratanakiri and Monduliri, in a total of 29 target villages. Although the specific activities vary from village to village, depending on the identified needs, the general model of the ICD program is to develop leadership capacity such that a local CBO

could continue the development process after DPA moves on to other areas. No specific timeframe is envisaged so far for handing over the work in the 29 villages supported by CAFOD but some of these villages are more developed than others as DPA has been working there for many years whereas others only became target villages during the last two years. However, from the experience of the evaluator (who has evaluated other projects of DPA over the last few years), the model of developing CBOs as a phase out strategy has proved to be very sustainable as many CBOs in other provinces where DPA has worked in the past are now functioning very well.

Regarding the thematic areas of intervention, under land and NRM, the work carried out by DPA to support communities with CLTs and CF associations can be considered sustainable once the government has granted the necessary approvals. Such processes are highly replicable if the conditions exist where they can be implemented (e.g. presence of indigenous communities for CLTs) as there are clear guidelines that can be followed. DPA interventions to date on DRR and CCA at local level are still in the early stages and the review of HVCA plans has not yet been institutionalized in the processes of the community planning; there is still a need for DPA facilitation. A danger that must be overcome is taking shortcuts with the review process. Many communities (and NGOs) review only the action plan on an annual basis – excluding things that have been achieved and adding new activities where appropriate. DPA should encourage an annual review of the analysis that led to the action plan. Hazards faced by the people can change (especially if they are driven by climate change); vulnerabilities may not remain the same; and it would be hoped that there would be some positive change in capacities over time. Skipping this analysis and just reviewing the CAP could gradually alienate the action plan from its underlying factors. A minor point related to this is that DPA does not keep the original documents produced by the villagers during the HVCA; they type these up and then burn the large papers. From the experience of the evaluator, villagers more easily recognize what they produced themselves; once it gets typed up, it is no longer “their” outputs. Keeping the large papers which the villagers worked on during their analysis is very important; they can be used again during reviews and can also be used for presentations to visitors to their village. Regarding replicability of the work on DRR/CCA, the process followed by DPA is similar to that of the many other NGOs conducting HVCA and developing CAPs so can easily be replicated in any other villages. However, while it takes minimal resources to conduct the HVCA and develop the CAP, finding resources to implement the CAP continues to be a challenge. Commune development funds are still inadequate to meet the needs of all the villages in their commune and priorities continue to be roads infrastructure rather than CCA or other livelihood projects.

Banteay Srei situation is similar to DPA in that they have some committed donors to continue their work and they also use a phase out process that involves developing CBOs. There are however some differences between them regarding the composition of the CBOs. BS community leaders – Community Facilitators (CFs) and leaders of other project groups – are mostly women. While men are not excluded, there seems to be a reluctance on their part to join BS projects as they are perceived to be only for women. As mentioned earlier in this report, the recent evaluation of BS Strategic Plan also questioned the potential sustainability of these CBOs as the evaluation found only 37% of them were functioning effectively after hand over. The current evaluator would recommend exchange visits by BS staff to the DPA projects to learn from their experiences and then review their CBO development process. BS may also have to consider whether a more inclusive project (i.e. encouraging more involvement from men) would be an influencing factor towards more sustainable CBOs. On the thematic aspect of DRR/CCA, the same comments apply to BS as to DPA. In addition BS will need to develop better linkages between their village committees and the institutional DRM structures (CCDMs, DCDMs and PCDMs) in order to ensure they receive the recognition and support from these institutions.

CCSP is relatively smaller than the other partners discussed above. While, through their WGPD project, they continue some of their earlier focus on supporting provincial D&D networks and the NGO Liaison Office, their current strategy being supported by CAFOD is very new for them – i.e. working in partnership with smaller community-based NGOs on integrating DRR/CCA into the D&D process at community level. The evaluator would question the added value (to CAFOD) of having another partner working at this level, especially considering the limited geographical coverage. CCSP was quite unique in its activities since inception (before and after becoming an NGO). The CCSP project activities supported prior to 2013 were already making a significant contribution to Goal 1 of the CAFOD program through its “engagement with local government and other stakeholders” which, although not specifically addressing the themes of the CAFOD program, laid the foundations for the structures through which these themes could be addressed in a decentralized setting. Since the change in CAFOD support, there seems to be less activities now being carried on under the D&D processes established in the earlier years, in particular capacity building support to the Provincial D&D networks, the CRR (Citizens Rating Report), BPA (Best Practice Awards) and the publication of the D&D bulletins. The evaluator would suggest that CCSP could add more to the overall sustainability of the CAFOD program by returning to

these issues and especially by expanding the provincial D&D networks to provinces not already covered – in particular to provinces supported by the CAFOD program that do not yet have this network (e.g. Ratanakiri and Mondulakiri).

Conclusions on sustainability

Due to lack of dependency on any one donor by partners, there are good indications that these partners will continue to function well into the future. The NGO Forum will continue (as per its current strategic plan) to mobilize and represent the voice of civil society and the thematic areas of interest to CAFOD are well integrated into their planning process. DPA is committed to the target communities in Ratanakiri and Mondulakiri where the natural environment is central to the livelihoods of the people. Thus they will continue to focus on issues that can affect this environment, such as sustainable land use plans and CLTs, advocating for EIAs to recognize and reduce impacts from large development projects as well as integrating DRR and CCA into development planning to ensure more sustainable livelihoods of the people. For Banteay Srei, it is not sure whether focus on DRR/CCA would remain a key element of the project if CAFOD funding stopped as it has not been a core part of their project to date – their main focus being women's empowerment. There is no contradiction between the two however; they can be complementary and, once the target communities understand the value of such projects, they are likely to continue to demand such interventions. Thus BS's community-led approach would ensure that these themes continue to be addressed. As discussed above, the evaluator would suggest that CAFOD consider broadening the support to CCSP to expand some of their earlier activities on D&D in order to add to the overall sustainability of the program as such activities build up a strong civil society voice that can advocate on the themes of interest to CAFOD.

IV.7 Lessons learnt and best practices to take forward

From the preceding analysis and discussions, the evaluator would consider the following as the key lessons learnt from the implementation of the CAFOD program:

- Partnership is central to CAFOD's operational strategy. This means that the program is build around the work of the partners, rather than opening a call for proposals for partners to implement a CAFOD program. The result is a diverse program that addresses the thematic issues from different perspectives.
- The program design and implementation has enabled CAFOD to achieve extensive results with a small team and a relatively small budget
- The mixture of community level actions and national level advocacy complement each other very well – in that partners at community level can share real-life experiences from their communities to give credence to issues being discussed at national level
- Wide participation in the activities of all partners demonstrates the relevance of the project. In particular, it is clear that water management is becoming an increasingly important issue to the Cambodia people (and thus the government)
- The opening of a CAFOD office in Cambodia has resulted in a closer working relationship between CAFOD and its partners and offered more opportunities for dialogue and capacity building support when needed.
- Partners working at community level take an integrated approach in their work. This enhances the effectiveness of actions under each theme as the issues are closely inter-linked.
- Actions of the NGO Forum and its members have demonstrated that it is possible to engage with government institutions to foster greater cooperation and openness to dialogue but it takes time and patience to achieve this. Results include the invitations by various Ministries to the NGO Forum to join their Technical Working Groups and the change in government practice to gradually publish more information on public finances.
- Land related projects such as CLTs and CFAs take a long time to work through the regulatory processes. Thus donors must be willing to stick with the process until completion.

Regarding best practices, some partner reports offer case studies of good practice in many areas of livelihoods and DRR/CCA mitigation. However, from the experience of the evaluator, none of the examples show anything innovative as most of what has been done has already been tried and tested by other organizations over the last few years. Such examples are the benefits of small-scale irrigation, agriculture diversification and drought resistant agriculture

techniques. While they are given as good examples of impact on the lives of the beneficiaries, they could not be promoted as best practices from this project as they have already been shown as such by others.

Similarly, regarding the DRR/CCA theme, HVCA, although new to many CAFOD partners, has been implemented in hundreds of communities by quite a number of NGOs over the last decade and plans resulting from this have been successfully integrated into the decentralized local planning process. There is nothing new at community level of CAFOD partners that adds to previous best practices. Rather the evaluator would recommend that CAFOD partners conduct some exchange visits to other organizations working on this theme to share experiences with them. Organizations which the evaluator would recommend as having good practices to share are Action Aid Cambodia (AAC) and Life With Dignity (LWD). Another organization in Pursat, People in Need (PIN) has relatively less experience but has some innovative ideas for making better use of modern technology in DRR projects.

Nevertheless, each partner has some key strength which is somehow unique and can be considered a best practice that could be promoted among other development partners in country (or in some cases outside of Cambodia). The evaluator would suggest the following as being the key best practices of each partner:

- NGO Forum's actions towards advocating for civil society participation in policy development and budget transparency are gradually resulting in more dialogue and information sharing. Other CAFOD target countries facing similar situations may be able to learn from the NGO Forum
 - DPA's process of community organization (building up effective CBOs) has proven to be a very effective model from which other partners (and other NGOs) can learn
 - BS's work on advocating for women representation on elected councils, while not exactly unique (e.g. other organizations, like AMARA in BTB, are also doing this) has resulted in more women being elected to these councils. Their capacity building of women in leadership at village level contributes to the pool of women who can be considered by political parties for nomination
 - CCSP's capacity building of provincial D&D networks could be promoted with other interested development organizations to ensure nation-wide coverage (if CCSP does not have the possibility to do this themselves)
-

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary remarks

The CAFOD Cambodia program is characterized by a group of strong and diversified partners who are highly committed to their core goals. These are strongly in line with the goal of the CAFOD program. The analysis in the previous chapter shows that the program has been highly relevant to the various stakeholders and has been effective in achieving its stated outcomes. The program was efficiently managed in that partner grants were managed with minimal human resources while the same time satisfying the needs of these partners. A lot of impact was achieved at a very low cost. These impacts are expected to be sustained due to the commitment of, and resources available to, partners and some good lessons have been learnt during the implementation process, some of which can be shared as best practices with others.

Recommendations

While the recommendations noted throughout this report are mainly intended for CAFOD, and this was not an evaluation of the implementing partners, a number of small issues arose which related on one or more partners. These are listed here prior to summarizing the main recommendations for CAFOD:

NGO Forum (and all partners):

- Publish transparent financial reports on website, preferably in Khmer language

DPA:

- Conduct refresher training for staff and communities on HVCA
- Ensure that HVCA annual reviews follow the original process, not just updating the CAPs
- Return all HVCA outputs (maps, flip charts, etc.) to the villages for safe keeping
- Develop more detailed monitoring of socio-economic status of beneficiaries at household level (use simple form of key indicators to collect information at outset of any intervention and update regularly)

Banteay Srei:

- Regarding HVCA, same as for DPA above
- Encourage the participation of more men in village activities
- Organize exchange visit to DPA to share experiences on CBO formation and capacity building

CCSP:

- Consider expansion of Provincial D&D Networks and CRR in next proposal to CAFOD

Recommendations to CAFOD in developing next strategic phase

Most of the recommendations have already been mentioned earlier in the report. As the findings and analysis above were generally very positive about the program there are not too many recommendations for change and they are divided here into two sub-sections – program issues and capacity building of partners:

Program Issues

1. **Program content:** The analysis above showed that CAFOD program is already highly relevant. Therefore CAFOD should continue with its current strategies. The evaluator would recommend placing **greater emphasis on two of the issues – water management and corruption.**
 - Cambodia has taken water for granted for many years but there is increasing pressure on drinking water supply, water for agriculture and fishery zones. Climate Change, de-forestation, an increasing population and possible diversion of water for energy are the key drivers of this pressure. CAFOD should link with the Ministry of Water Resources & Meteorology as they have already developed a comprehensive strategy for water management but not much has yet been implemented at sub-national level.
 - Corruption is currently being addressed indirectly, through advocacy on accountability and transparency but the scope could be more focused on the moral scourge of corruption (how “greed” drives it). This needs to be

addressed at all levels of society, from community to national level and activities could be integrated into the work of all partners. As long as corruption thrives in Cambodia, advocacy on all other issues will not result in a more just distribution of the countries resources or sustainable livelihoods for the people. See a short reflection on corruption in Annex 3.

2. **Partner focus:** CAFOD strategic plan "Just One World" recognizes that working in partnership is an essential part of CAFOD identity. It is clear that this is the case in Cambodia as CAFOD has worked with the same partners for a long time. Therefore in developing its strategic plans, CAFOD should ensure that the program is build around the partners and not try to fit the partners into a CAFOD plan. The evaluator understands that CAFOD also has back donors and certain issues may have to be included in plans to suit such funding agreements. However, there should be flexibility in the program to allow other core issues of partners to be included and also no pressure on partners to work on all outcomes if they are not specifically relevant to them.
3. In line with the above, CAFOD should consider re-wording outcome one under Goal 1 to align it more with the work currently being carried out by partners (refer to discussion under "effectiveness", section IV.2 above).
4. Consider extending the scope of support to CCSP to allow them to expand the Provincial D&D Networks and promotion of Citizens Rating Reports (CRR) to all provinces in Cambodia – in the short term, at least to ensure all target provinces of CAFOD are covered.
5. In the Program Framework, CAFOD should make indicators more SMART. Some of the current indicators are too lengthy and the working is rather ambiguous.

Capacity Building Support

6. Conduct refresher training on the HVCA process (especially how to conduct annual reviews to ensure as much details assessment of hazards and vulnerabilities)
7. Support partners engaged in DRR at community level to undertake exchange visits to other organizations who have longer experience with this (e.g. AAC, LWD)
8. Continue building partners understanding on water issues – including the wider picture of watershed management
9. Assist partners using the V&A tool to develop sub-sections for any of the four main categories where they work with diversified groups (with whom the advocacy may be at different stages). These could be appendices to the main report.
10. CAFOD should re-asses the added value of the VIA tool in light of the vulnerability analysis that partners already undertake as part of the HVCA process. If still considered of value to partners, conduct refresher training on the tool to all partners.
11. Consider request from partners for more holistic tool to measure overall village development (is PRA tool the best way or does CAFOD have other tools to help?)
12. Organize exposure visits for partners to other organizations who take a more market orientated approach to income generation (e.g. iDE, SNV, ICS)
13. Conduct further coaching of partners on reporting. Current reports of some partners have excessive descriptive detail on activities but lack concrete quantitative (cumulative) data at outcome level.
14. In order to assist partners to improve their reporting, CAFOD should give written feedback on all reports.

Final comment

In conclusion, the evaluator would like to thank all those who gave up their valuable time to share information and suggestions during the course of this evaluation. Congratulations to CAFOD and partners for all the hard work and the resulting successes. Such work is of great importance to the ongoing development of Cambodia. The evaluator wishes you all further success with this work in the years to come.

Annex 1 – TOR for evaluation

Terms of Reference

Job Title:	Consultant for Evaluation of CAFOD' Cambodia Program
Contractual Reporting:	Mr. Francis Perez – SEA Regional Representative
Duration of the post:	Mid January 2014 – March 2014
Budget:	To be agreed.

Background of CAFOD work in Cambodia:

CAFOD joined CIDSE in 1980, as one of the 13 members' agencies. CIDSE extended its activities to include Cambodia in 1979. Through CIDSE 'support the program have focused on community development and partnership program (where the support focused on strengthening the capacity of local organizations). Lately, the supporting members provided direct support in order to formulation of the local organization called "Development Partnership in Action " (DPA) which was launched in 2006. After DPA have been formed , CAFOD has continued to support the program with focusing in 2 provinces in North-East of Cambodia , Rattanakiri and Mondulkiri. CAFOD has been supporting an integrated community development response to the need of the rural poor in Cambodian since 1994 under the implementation partners of DPA and Banteay Srei.

CAFOD began supporting NGOs Forum in 1990. The NGOs Forum Cambodia was established in 1986 by a small group of international organization operating in Cambodia. The focus of the forum's concern in the early was the issue of the international isolation of this country when the open up of Cambodian in 1991. NGOs Forum have mandate to advocate the issue relate to the Cambodian's concerns. In particular, NGOs forum work to highlight the impact of development process and economic, social and political change in the country.

With rapidly increasing rates of the infection (which remain the highest in South East Asia) and illness, and following on the Cambodia Government 's establishment of the Nation AIDs program in 1993, CAFOD and other catholic agencies working in Cambodia began to assess the HIV/AIDs situation in the country from 1996. From the assessment it became clear that there was a need for the provision of care services for the people living with HIV/AIDs , which was not that time covered by Cambodia's public health service. In response to the need , CAFOD and other agencies funded Maryknoll and American Catholic Order working in Cambodia, to set up HIV/AIDs project to implement a programme of training and outreach to increase and provide better quality service to people living with HIV and AIDs.

In November 1996, CAFOD made provided support toward the establishment of a multi-purpose centre called "seed of Hope ". The centre was fully operational by June 1998 and provided service to the PLHA , training to social workers and involved their families and neighborhood in home-based care. The centre also set up a referral process to link people living with HIV/AIDs to clinical care or other services such as counseling.

Annex 1 – TOR for evaluation

CAFOD has subsequently expanded its portfolio of partners working on HIV to include Karol & Setha, which comes under the overall Maryknoll HIV programme and focuses on behaviour change; the Cambodian HIV Education Centre (CHEC) providing education and training to government, health workers, home based care providers and volunteers. It also generates some income from providing training packages to NGOs. CAFOD began working with the Salvation Centre Cambodia in 1999, five years after its establishment. It works through the Buddhist Pagoda network with monks and nuns providing community sensitisation, counselling, care and support to local communities. SCC has expanded rapidly over the past five years. CAFOD also supports the HIV/AIDS Coordination Committee (HACC), a membership organisation focused on advocacy and networking. All of the partners focused on HIV have forged strong working relationships with the relevant government authorities.

Current CAFOD program in Cambodia:

In 2006 CAFOD conducted the project assessment which the set of questionnaires have been sent to all the partner and external stakeholders to elicit their feedback relating to the overall development context in Cambodia. After the feedback have been gathered and feed back for Cambodia CSP's reference group recommendation, in 2010 CAFOD's program have been narrow down to focus on the area of HIV/AIDs and Economic Justice& Sustainable Livelihoods and Disaster Risk Reduction have been piloted which integrated into livelihood project. CAFOD 2010 program framework prioritized the sectors of Livelihoods, HIV/AIDS, Economic Justice and Peace and Conflict for 80% of our work. Humanitarian considerations are a priority across all country programmes. Advocacy is a significant component across all our work and Gender is identified as a cross cutting issue. The 2010 framework emphasises strengthening partnerships and considering a local presence in countries as a means to achieving this. In addition, CAFOD hopes to increase its income and planning for this growth needs to be considered in developing country strategy papers.

Purpose: To provide information to CAFOD team and partners, from the view of an external evaluator, that will inform the next Country Strategic Planning phase.

Objectives:

- 1/. To evaluate the success of CAFOD's program on Disaster Risk Reduction and Sustainable Livelihood and Land and Natural Resources Management within the target provinces where our partners have been implementing projects and examine the achievement of outcome targeted within the Cambodia program framework.
- 2/. Comment and make recommendations on current program M&E and reporting an how this may be adjusted in the next Country Strategic Planning.
- 3/. Document lessons learned and best practice to inform future strategy.
- 4/. Make recommendations for future objectives and actions that will inform the future Strategic Planning process.

To achieve the above the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact sustainability and replicability of CAFOD's work should be taken into account.

Annex 1 – TOR for evaluation

Role and Responsibilities/Deliverable output:

- Develop the detailed evaluation plan including the methodology and timeframe, in consultation and coordination with the relevant CAFOD staff (i.e., PO Cambodia and regional representative)
- Develop assessment tools and conduct evaluation: Collect both qualitative and quantitative data: The methodology should include a collection strategy which provides a sound basis for the evaluation. Research the impact of the project at the community, seeking both qualitative and quantitative data. These tools should also enable the collection of stories and capture the learning or good practice in the program which we can document and share across the organization.
- Identify and engage relevant stakeholders
- Review of relevant aspects of partner organizations to determine their influence on the outcome and impact of CAFOD-supported projects
- Final report should be written in English, which include key issues/finding and recommendations for consideration in any future strategy/activities, key practices, and thematic learning
- Presentation and discussion of evaluation findings to CAFOD's management team and to relevant partners, if required.

Management/ supervision:

The consultant will be responsible for successful completion of her/his assignment, under the guidance of and reporting to CAFOD-SEA Regional Representative. The consultant is expected to collaborate closely with CAFOD' Program officer in developing the methodology and conducting the evaluation.

Qualifications/Experience Required

- Proven experience in designing methodology and successfully undertaking program evaluations
- Understanding and knowledge about Cambodia context would be preferred
- Experience in undertaking consultations with stakeholders (eg. International and National NGO staff, Government officials, community leaders etc. to inform evaluations).
- Experience of working with any of the following is an advantage: women's empowerment, community empowerment, livelihood development, gender analysis, land and natural resources management and disaster risk reduction.
- Fluency in English: both written and spoken.
- Speaking Khmer language is an advantage

Timeframe:

The work is expected to be completed by the end of March 2014. The consultant will be contracted for the period not exceeding 25 working days, starting after signing the contract. A detailed work plan with timeframe will be developed and agreed in consultation with CAFOD. This assignment is expected to include multiple consultative meetings with individual CAFOD partners.

Deadline for submission of the draft report is 1 week before the contract ended, CAFOD will have two weeks to respond to the report and ask for any clarifications or additional information, and submission of the final report is due one week after receiving feedback from CAFOD.

Proposals include budget should be submitted by e-mail to kkeo@cafod.org.uk your earliest convenience by 03 January 2014 at 5pm.

**Annex 2 - List of documents received from CAFOD & Partners
(as well as other documents received from Key Informants or researched through internet)**

SN	Institution/Organization	Name of document
1	Royal Government of Cambodia	National Strategic Development Plan 2009-2013
2	Royal Government of Cambodia	Guidelines for updating NSDP 2014-2018
3	Ministry of Planning	Scorecard on implementation of Cambodia's MDGs 2012
4	Ministry of Planning	Poverty scorecard (based on commune databases) 2004-2012
5	Ministry of Environment (CC Dept)	Mainstreaming CC resilience into development planning in Cambodia, 2013
6	Ministry of Environment (CC Dept)	Cambodia REDD+ Roadmap 2011
7	Ministry of Water Resources	Climate Change Strategic Plan for Water Resources 2013-2017
8	Ministry of Rural Development	Strategic Plan of Rural Development for CCA in Cambodia - 2012
9	Ministry of Economy & Finance	Monthly Bulletin of Statistics - January 2014
10	Ministry of Economy & Finance	Monthly Bulletin of Statistics - December 2013
11	Ministry of Economy & Finance	Monthly Bulletin of Statistics - January 2013
12	Ministry of Economy & Finance	Monthly Bulletin of Statistics - January 2012
13	Ministry of Economy & Finance	TOFE - Budget implementation 2012 (Final)
14	Ministry of Industry, Mines & Energy	Cambodian Power Development Plans 2009
15	CAFOD	Website: www.cafod.org.uk
16	CAFOD	Just One World (June 2010)
17	CAFOD	IATI Implementation Schedule for CAFOD (Feb 2012)
18	CAFOD	CAFOD Environment Policy (May 2011)
19	CAFOD	CAFOD DRR Framework (undated)
20	CAFOD	CAFOD Accountability Framework (CAF) - March 2012
21	CAFOD	Policy Statement on Vulnerability and Inequality - Draft V4 (undated)
22	CAFOD	Promoting Gender Equality (undated)
23	CAFOD	Evaluation of CAFOD Partnership Program Arrangement (PPA) 2008-11
24	CAFOD	Evaluation of CAFOD PPA 2008-11 - management response
25	CAFOD	DFID/CAFOD PPA Mid-term Independent Progress Review - 2012
26	CAFOD	DFID/CAFOD PPA Mid-term IPR 2012 - management response
27	CAFOD	Annual Country Report 2010-11
28	CAFOD	Annual Country Report 2011-12
29	CAFOD	Annual Country Report 2012-13
30	CAFOD	Cambodia CSP Presentation 2007-10 (PPT)
31	CAFOD	Cambodia CSP July 2009 Final
32	CAFOD	Country Briefing Final Feb 2012
33	CAFOD	Revised 3 year plan 2011-2014

**Annex 2 - List of documents received from CAFOD & Partners
(as well as other documents received from Key Informants or researched through internet)**

SN	Institution/Organization	Name of document
34	CAFOD	Revised 3 year plan 2013-2016
35	CAFOD	Trip Report Cambodia Oct 2008
36	CAFOD	Trip Report Cambodia May 2009
37	CAFOD	Trip Report Cambodia Mar 2010
38	CAFOD	Trip Report Cambodia Nov 2010
39	CAFOD	Trip Report Cambodia Mar 2012
40	CAFOD	Trip Report Battambang May 2012
41	CAFOD	Batteries Tool case study - Cambodia
42	CAFOD	Batteries Tool personal book - template
43	CAFOD	Batteries Methodology HIV June 2011
44	CAFOD	Group work on Batteries Tool
45	CAFOD	Monitoring tool for Voice & Accountability
46	CAFOD	V&A Monitoring tool introduction
47	CAFOD	V&A Tool for filling out
48	CAFOD	Revised Risk Assessment Tool
49	CAFOD	VIA feedback form Feb 2013
50	CAFOD	VIA Final Nov 2012
51	CAFOD	Trustees report (incl. Audited Financial Statements) 2010-2011
52	CAFOD	Trustees report (incl. Audited Financial Statements) 2011-2012
53	CAFOD	Trustees report (incl. Audited Financial Statements) 2012-2013
54	CAFOD	Review of CAFOD's HIV and AIDS program in Cambodia 1996-2013 (Nov-Dec 2013)
55	Banteay Srei	Website: http://banteaysrei.info
56	Banteay Srei	Annual report 2008-09
57	Banteay Srei	Annual Report 2012
58	Banteay Srei	Annual Report 2013
59	Banteay Srei	Evaluation of Strategic Plan July 2013
60	Banteay Srei	Financial report 2012 (CAFOD)
61	Banteay Srei	Financial report 2012 (Global)
62	Banteay Srei	Financial report 2013 (CAFOD)
63	Banteay Srei	Financial report 2013 (Global)
64	Banteay Srei	Financial report Jan-Dec 2010
65	Banteay Srei	Financial report Jan-Dec 2011 (Global)
66	Banteay Srei	Funding Grip & Operational plan 2013

**Annex 2 - List of documents received from CAFOD & Partners
(as well as other documents received from Key Informants or researched through internet)**

SN	Institution/Organization	Name of document
67	Banteay Srei	Funding proposal to CAFOD 2013
68	Banteay Srei	Global annual implementation plan 2013
69	Banteay Srei	Joint Partner Assessment Final (Jan 2014)
70	Banteay Srei	Revised funding grid CAFOD July 2013
71	Banteay Srei	Six month progress report Jan-Jun 2013
72	Banteay Srei	Six months report Jan to Jun 2010
73	Banteay Srei	Six months report Oct 08 to Mar 09
74	Banteay Srei	SWOT analysis with Siem Reap team Nov 2013
75	Banteay Srei	Annual Operational Plan 2014
76	Banteay Srei	Funding Proposal to CAFOD 2014
77	Banteay Srei	Global Funding Grid 2014
78	Banteay Srei	Logical Framework 2014
79	Banteay Srei	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2010
80	Banteay Srei	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2011
81	Banteay Srei	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2012
82	Banteay Srei	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2013
83	Banteay Srei	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2014 (Jan-Apr)
84	Banteay Srei	Advocacy Tool
85	CCSP	Website: http://www.ccspcambodia.org
86	CCSP (WGPD)	Website: http://www.wgpd.net/
87	CCSP	Annual report 2010
88	CCSP	Annual report 2011
89	CCSP	Six month report 2012 (Jan-Jun)
90	CCSP	Six month report 2012 (Jul-Dec)
91	CCSP	Annual report 2013
92	CCSP	WGPD Program Plan 2011-15 (draft)
93	CCSP	GVO - contract 2013
94	CCSP	GVO - finance report 2013
95	CCSP	PVT - contract 2013
96	CCSP	PVT - finance report 2013
97	CCSP	Finance report 2010
98	CCSP	Finance report 2011
99	CCSP	Finance report 2012

**Annex 2 - List of documents received from CAFOD & Partners
(as well as other documents received from Key Informants or researched through internet)**

SN	Institution/Organization	Name of document
100	CCSP	Finance report 2013
101	CCSP	Finance report 2013 (Global - Jan-Mar)
102	CCSP	Audit confirmation letter 2009-10
103	CCSP	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2010
104	CCSP	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2011
105	CCSP	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2012
106	CCSP	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2013
107	CCSP	Joint Climate Change Initiative (JCCI) - Report to Forum Syd 2012
108	CCSP	Annual Report to Development and Peace (July 2010-June2011)
109	DPA	Website: http://www.dpacam.org
111	DPA	2010 - Financial Report (EU format)
110	DPA	2010 - case studies
112	DPA	2011 - DRR-CCA report (PPA)
113	DPA	2011 - Final narrative report (3 yrs) - EU
114	DPA	2011 - Final financial report (3 yrs) - EU
115	DPA	2012 - Annual Report
116	DPA	2012 - DRR-CCA report (PPA)
117	DPA	2012 - Financial Report
118	DPA	2012 - V&A report (advocacy DRR-CCA)
119	DPA	2013 - DFID Livelihood theme
120	DPA	2013 - V&A report (advocacy DRR-CCA)
121	DPA	Mar 2013 to Feb 2014 - DRR-CCA (PPA)
122	DPA	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2010
123	DPA	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2011
124	DPA	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2012
125	DPA	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2013
126	DPA	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2014 (Jan-Apr)
127	DPA	Six month narrative report 2012 (Jan-Jun)
128	DPA	Six month financial report 2012 (Jan-Jun)
129	DPA	Six month narrative report 2013 (Jan-Jun)
130	DPA	Six month financial report 2013 (Jan-Jun)
131	DPA	Three-year proposal to CAFOD 2013-2015
132	DPA	Global budget 2013-2015 (RAT & MDK)

**Annex 2 - List of documents received from CAFOD & Partners
(as well as other documents received from Key Informants or researched through internet)**

SN	Institution/Organization	Name of document
133	DPA	Evaluation Report 2011 - RAT & MDK
134	DPA	Annual narrative report 2009
135	DPA	Annual financial report 2009
136	DPA	Six month financial report - Jan-Jun 2011
137	DPA	Payment letter CAFOD to DPA for Y3 EU project
138	NGO Forum	Website: http://www.ngoforum.org.kh
139	NGO Forum	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2010
140	NGO Forum	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2011
141	NGO Forum	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2012
142	NGO Forum	Grant Agreement with CAFOD 2013
143	NGO Forum	Annual Narrative report 2010
144	NGO Forum	Annual Narrative report 2011
145	NGO Forum	Annual Narrative report 2012
146	NGO Forum	Annual Narrative report 2013
147	NGO Forum	Revised Action Plan 2012-2014 (CORE)
148	NGO Forum	Revised Action Plan 2012-2014 (DIP)
149	NGO Forum	Revised Action Plan 2012-2014 (ENV)
150	NGO Forum	Revised Action Plan 2012-2014 (LLP)
151	NGO Forum	Revised Action Plan 2012-2014 (RIC)
152	NGO Forum	Monitoring and activity report 2011
153	NGO Forum	Monitoring and activity report 2012
154	NGO Forum	1st six months report 2013
155	NGO Forum	2nd budget revision 2013
156	NGO Forum	Action Plan 2014 Final
157	NGO Forum	Monitoring and activity report 2013
158	NGO Forum	Revised Action Plan July-Dec 2013
159	NGO Forum	Financial Statement (unaudited) 2010
160	NGO Forum	Six month financial report Jan-Jun 2011
161	NGO Forum	Notes to six month financial report Jan-Jun 2011
162	NGO Forum	Budget-law database 2010-2013
163	NGO Forum	Budget-law implementation 2000-2011
164	NGO Forum	A review of Cambodia's NSDP 2009-2013
165	NGO Forum/IBP	Budget Transparency Brief - January 2013

**Annex 2 - List of documents received from CAFOD & Partners
(as well as other documents received from Key Informants or researched through internet)**

SN	Institution/Organization	Name of document
166	NGO Forum/IBP	Workshop report on National Budget process & transparency (Sept. 2013)
167	NGO Forum	A review of Aid Information Systems and Aid Efficiency in Cambodia (Oct 2013)
168	NGO Forum	Draft report Final Term Evaluation, NGO Forum, June 2011
169	Tear Fund UK	Linking good practice CBDRM with government policy and practice
170	Tear Fund UK/ECB	Toward Resilience: A Guide to Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation
171	UNDP	Human Development Report Cambodia 2013
172	UNDP	Cambodia Annual Report 2012

Annex 3

THINK ABOUT YOUR LIFE !!

If you think you are unhappy, look at them

如果你认为自己很高尚,看看他们

A man in a small boat on a river holds a baby in a red plastic tub. The scene is outdoors with a boat and water visible.

If you think your job is tough, how about him?

如果你的工作难做,那他呢?

A person is lying on a mat on a sidewalk, possibly resting or sleeping. The background shows a street scene with a person standing nearby.

If you think your salary is low, how about her?

如果你的工资低,那她呢?

A person is pushing a bicycle on a street. The scene is outdoors with a person and a bicycle visible.

If you think you don't have many friends, ask yourself if you have one sincere friend...

你没有依靠
可能是你没有寻找
远方,
共同的思念

A soldier is sitting on the ground with a dog. The scene is outdoors with a soldier and a dog visible.

You think study is a burden, how about her?

当你认为学习是一种负担时,那她呢?
这就是她的作业本

A child is sitting at a desk writing in a notebook. The scene is indoors with a child and a notebook visible.

When you feel like giving up, think of this man

这种感觉,你能懂吗?

A man is pushing a bicycle on a path. The scene is outdoors with a man and a bicycle visible.

If you think you suffer in life, do you suffer as much as he does?

如果你认为自己很苦,你有他苦吗

A person is pushing a bicycle with large stones on the back. The scene is outdoors with a person, a bicycle, and stones visible.

If you complaint about your transport system, how about them?

如果你的交通不够好,那他呢?

A group of people is crossing a narrow bridge. The scene is outdoors with people and a bridge visible.

Annex 3

If your society is unfair to you, how about her?



**Now Please Think
Again About Your
Life! You Have More
Than You NEED.**

**Corruption Starts From NEED To
GREED!**