Mid-term Evaluation Report
Multi-function Forest Restoration and Management of Degraded Forest Areas in Cambodia

Dr. Dachang LIU

Fourth draft, November 7, 2013

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CF	Community forest / community forestry
DD	Deputy Director
DDG	Deputy Director General
CDRI	Cambodia Development Resource Institute
EA	Executing Agency
FA	Forestry Administration of Cambodia
HVTs	High value timber species
IRD	Institute of Forest and Wildlife Research and Development
MTE	Mid-term evaluation
NTFPs	Non-timber forest products
OWP	Overall work plan
PP	Project proposal
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RUA	Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Ms. Weina Sun, Program Officer, APFNet, for her effective coordination and facilitation of this evaluation; Mr. Peng Peng, Program Officer, APFNet, for accompanying me throughout the entire field survey in Cambodia and his support for me.

I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to Dr. So Thea, Project Coordinator, Mr. Ma Vuthy, Project Assistant, for all the support they provided, including the arrangements of logistics and meeting and consultation with the stakeholders and partners in the project during the entire filed survey. Thanks also go to Dr. Edward V. Maningo for joining our field survey and providing helpful project information.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to everyone we interviewed and consulted, including the local FA staff members and villagers/community members in the project sites, for sharing their time, information and ideas with us and their hospitality.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

A mid-term evaluation of the Project "Multi-function Forest Restoration and Management of Degraded Forest Areas in Cambodia" was conducted by Dr. Dachang Liu to assess the level of progress towards the achievement of the project objectives, identify problems and issues that need to be addressed in the next phase to achieve maximum outcomes, and draw lessons learnt.

The evaluation started on September 20, 2013 and completed on November 7, with this evaluation report ready. The evaluation was conducted by visits to two project sites in Kampong Thom Province and Siem Ream Province of Cambodia; consultation with more than 30 villagers who are, to different extent, involved in the project; interviews with 2 PSC members and 7 members of the project team from FA at central and local levels; desk review on existing project documents, and intensive analysis on data and information collected.

The evaluator assessed relevance and quality of project design, project administration, and accomplishment by project activity, achievement towards project objectives, stakeholder involvement, project costs and finance, and project documentation and communication. Because project administration is largely planned as Activity 1.1 and Activity 1.3 in the project proposal, this evaluation looked at project administration in the two activities, instead a separate section or title.

Based on the findings from the assessment, the evaluator concludes that:

- The project is quite relevant, in terms of its consistency with the objectives and focus of APFNet and its meeting Cambodia's needs for restoration of degraded forests and improvement in community livelihood through forest restoration. The project activities designed to address the "degradation" problem are appropriate, though some of the activities may not be sufficient.
- Project performance (project accomplishment by activity, stakeholder involvement, project costs and finance, and project documentation) is also rated as "good" (refer to *Appendix 4, Project Overall Rating Table)*. Most of the 16 project activities executed are completed as planned and is satisfactory (*refer to Annex 5*).
- Several issues, regarding project planning and implementation, need to be addressed, including (i) the current project goal and objective are not well presented with proper indicators, which may lead to difficulty in achieving and in project result measurement. It is suggested stating project goal more clearly as "rehabilitate the degraded forests in the project sites to a status well stocked with HVT species and high value NTFPs and/or with multifunction, and the project sites become a recognized national model on forest rehabilitation and rural livelihood improvement'' and project objective as "XX restoration demonstration plots and xx ha of restoration areas fully established as designed in community forests in the project sites.

(Accordingly, a number of indicators need further adjustments. (ii) Given multiple-functions of forests serve a significant project component, additional project site(s) relating to biodiversity conservation or multifunction should be considered if resources allow; (iii) few activities were designed and executed to generate income in short term, not in line with project objective of income increase by 10% within project implementation period; (iv) more efforts are needed on capacity building, to achieve the objective -- 20% local FA staff and 10-20% community members learnt technique of forest restoration; and (v) several project activities were executed behind the schedule, which should be avoided in the third project year.

- If all these issues can be effectively fine-tuned and addressed in the third project year, the project can become a good example and demonstration for forest restoration in Cambodia and regions in similar conditions, with some technique and methods well developed for forest restoration, capacity built for foresters and community members, and a good basis formed for income generation and livelihood for communities in the project sites.

Given the performance of the project and the issues/problems that need to be addressed, the evaluator makes 9 recommendations for the project team and APFNet to consider in next phase (Please refer to Section 7: Recommendations).

1. Introduction and Background

Though the piloting of Community forestry in Cambodia started as early as mid-1990s, the sustainable development in the field was not witnessed until the release of Community Forestry Guidelines (Prakas) nationwide in 2006, which clearly established the processes for identifying, legalizing and managing community forests. In 2010, the National Forest Program was approved to provide policy framework for achieving sustainable forest management through 2030 with six sub-national programs, among which community forestry program is one. It sets a target of creating 1,000 community forests, approximately 10% of the total forest area (around 1,000,000 ha) with official legal status by 2030.

By 2012, about 400,000 ha of forests of Cambodia have been designated by Forestry Administration as community forests and managed by communities living in or adjacent to the forests. However, community forestry faces manifold challenges. The majority of the community forests are severely degraded and poorly stocked with timber and non-timber forest products (NTFPs), thus posing a negative consequence for community livelihoods. So far, rehabilitation of these degraded forests depends solely on natural regeneration process, which is difficult to achieve expected results due to changing environment context such as extreme climate and invasive species, and human assisted rehabilitation has never taken place in scale, because of insufficient policy and guidance from local forest authorities and knowledge and skills of forest rehabilitation transferred to communities.

Under the auspices of APFNet, Institute of Forest and Wildlife Research and Development, the Forestry Administration of Cambodia (FA) initiated the project "Multi-function Forest Restoration and Management of Degraded Forest Areas in Cambodia" to pilot rehabilitation of degraded community forests through human intervention to improve livelihood of those communities in northwestern Cambodia, and build capacity for FA staff at various levels.

In line with the Project Proposal, the original Project Goal is ***to develop the capability of the Forestry Administration and local communities on the management and restoration of the Cambodia's biodiversity for sustainable development***; the specific objective of the Project is ***to enhance the restoration of community forest in Siem Reap and Kampong Thom for production of Timber and NTFPs as a means to improve livelihood of local community;*** *and expected outputs are* ***1) Community nursery established in each pilot site, 2) Models of forest restoration plots established in each pilot site, 3) Knowledge and experience on multi-functional forest restoration published and disseminated to relevant stakeholders and general public.***

The Project has selected two sites to pilot rehabilitation of degraded forests for timber and NTFPs production. One site is O Soam village, Salavisay Commune, Balang District, Kampong Thom Province. The other site is Tbeng Lech Village, Tbeng Commune, Banteay Srey District, Siem Reap Province. Both of the project sites are in community forests, except for the nursery in Tbeng Lech Village that was established on private land of the village head.

Rehabilitation is carried out mainly in both demonstration plots and restoration areas in the two project sites. In each project site, the project team together with the community established 4 demonstration plots (one hectare each) to experiment rehabilitation techniques and methods, which would be demonstrated to the villagers. Moreover, Field project staff in O Soam are responsible for restoration of 30 ha of degraded forests; and those in Tbeng Lech would conduct restoration of 20 ha degraded forests, with technical guidance from the project team. Primary methods for rehabilitation are (i) reducing canopy density through thinning to allow more sunlight for retained trees that are mainly high-value timber species (HVTs) to assist natural regeneration, and (ii) planting HVTs in both demonstration plots and restoration areas. In addition, in each project site, a nursery has been established to produce seedlings to be used in the demonstration plots and the restoration areas and to serve as training venue for villagers and core staff from local FA on seedling production and nursery management.

Learning and experience of the project will be compiled, published and disseminated to policy makers, foresters, community members, and other relevant practitioners. This will be a useful way for project scaling up and sustainability.

Duration for the project is three years, from December 2011 to December 2014.

A total of US$441,830 is budgeted for the project, of which US$ 386,570 is provided by AFPNet and US$55,260 is contributed by FA.

2. Purpose and Scope of This Evaluation

The project was launched in December 2011, and now is on the half way. It is time to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the project to assess project performance, in terms of the level of progress towards the achievement of the objectives against actual results, to identify problems and issues that need to be addressed in the next phase to achieve maximum outcomes, and to draw lessons learnt if any. Evaluation results will be fed back to project management process through specific recommendations.

The scope of this evaluation covers all aspects of project management and implementation from project administration and finance to performance and outcomes. Specifically, the evaluation will cover:

- Project design and formulation, including an assessment of the feasibility of the forest restoration plan;
- Project administration (organizational structure, coordination mechanism among stakeholders, project internal monitoring & evaluation system with baseline survey);
- Accomplishment of project activities, demonstration of best practice and capacity building for FA staff and community members in particular;
- Achievement of project objectives, especially multi-functional forest restoration;

- Stakeholder involvement, including but not limited to EA, collaborating partners (CDRI/RUA), APFNet, provincial FA cantonment and especially community participation and benefits;
- Project costs and finance; and
- Project documentation and communication.

3. Evaluation Methods

This mid-term evaluation was conducted as an in-depth project evaluation whereby two members of the project steering committee, the project director, the project coordinator, the project staff in Phnom Penh, the field teams in Kampong Thom Province and Siem Ream Province, and community members in the two project sites were kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation.

Specifically, findings from the evaluation are based on the information collection and analysis through following methods:

(1) Desk review. Project documents, including the project proposal, the overall work plan, two annual work plans, four progress reports, and some other technical reports produced by the project were thoroughly reviewed. A few documents about Cambodian forestry, compiled by FA have also been refereed to. Please refer to Annex 2. *Project Documents, Presentations and Works Referenced*, for details.

(2) Interview and meetings in FA headquarter. Interview and meeting were made in FA Headquarters in Phnom Penh on 25 September 2013 with two project steering committee members, the project coordinator, the finance officer, and the project assistant to discuss project progress, to listen to project finance report, and to discuss if there were any issues needed concern in the next phase of the project and any lessons learnt in the past. A brief discussion on the evaluation plan was also made with the project team members on site to seek their feedback, and the team members were fine with the evaluation plan, without any revision made. Please refer to Annex 3. *A List of Individuals Interviewed and Consulted during Field Visits and Interviews*, for details.

(3) Field visits to the two project sites O Soam Village and Tbeng Lech Village were visited from 26 to 29 September 2013, and the evaluator was joined by Dr. So Thea, Project Coordinator, Mr. Ma Vuthy, Project Assistant, and Dr. Edward V. Maningo, project consultant as well as the APFNet work team all the way, which allowed more intensive discussion and information sharing on the project progress. During the field visits, the APFNet work team and the evaluator observed project outputs, while interviewing and meeting with stakeholders. Please refer to *Annex 1. Mission Itinerary*, for details.

(4) Interviews and meetings with the project team members in Kampong Thom Province and 16 villagers from O Soam. These interviews and meetings took place from 26-27

September. Standard questionnaire was not developed for interviewing villagers, because it is not feasible to use questionnaire form for data collection in such a limited time of survey due to language barrier. Instead, the APFNet work team and the Evaluator made in-depth discussions with the villagers by asking questions as follows:

- Why do you want to participate in the project?
- What role have you played in the project?
- What have you learnt from the training?
- Do you know how to produce seedlings now?
- On what do you decide to retain these timber species in the demonstration plots and restoration areas?
- What improvement do you think the project needs in the next phase?
- What are you going to do with the project outputs (the nursery and the rehabilitated forest)?

And many project activity related questions. Discussion about community forest management in Kampong Thom province was also made with the project team members. Please refer to *Annex 3 A List of Individuals Interviewed and Consulted during Field Visits and Interviews,* for details.

(5) Interviews and meetings with the project team members in Siem Reap Province and 14 villagers from Tbeng Lech. These interviews and meetings took place largely on 28 September, to discuss the issues same as those in O Soam with the villagers, including their view on how and to what extent they will benefit from the project. Please refer to Annex 3. *A List of Individuals Interviewed and Consulted during Field Visits and Interviews*, for details.

Data and information collected through project documents, the interviews and meetings, the field visits were cross-checked and validated to ensure their reliability during the filed visits and meetings and afterwards. Intensive data analysis was made before writing this evaluation report.

4. Evaluation Criteria and Indicators

This evaluation used a four-grade rating/score table to assess quality of the project plan/design and record project performance. Detailed information on evaluation criteria is given in Annex 4.

This evaluation uses the indicators established in the project proposal (*Annex 2. Logical Framework Matrix*), except for several established indicators that are not specific or measurable and need to be modified. These indicators will be discussed in relevant sections below.

5. Evaluation Findings and Conclusions

This section discusses the project plan/design and project performance and management, which was examined from five aspects: project accomplishment by activity, achievement towards the project objectives, stakeholder involvement, project costs and finance, and project documentation. All these are also rated with score for each aspect in *Appendix 4, Project Overall Rating Table*.

5.1. Project Design and Formulation

The concept of the project is quite relevant to current situation of Community forestry in Cambodia and to the issues the project intends to address, and quality of the overall project planning is good, as a result of application of the log framework in the design process. However, several issues have been observed, if not solved properly, that would adversely impact the project in terms of evaluation of result and impacts when the implementation is completed.

(1) The Goal of a project usually indicates long-term objectives that enable far-reaching impacts to the project area, while project objectives, should be specific, attainable and measurable in limited timeframe, and the achievement of the objectives should contribute to achieving the project goal. Specifically, the original goal of the Project - "capacity development for Forestry Administration of Cambodia and local communities" should be an achievable objective within project duration rather than long-term objective (*See Recommendation 1*).

(2) The second indicator of project objective (productivity and income increase by 10%) is not applicable, as income will not be generated when the project ends or even a few years afterwards, if the priority is only on HVTs that require longer term to achieve.

(3) Restoration could be meant by the process of restoring forests, or it could indicate the forest status of being well restored after relevant interventions. A clear definition of restoration for the Project thus matters to lead to specific indicators in terms of concrete activities planning and evaluation.

(4) Representative of the project sites is insufficient. Given the project has been working on community forests to demonstrate multiple functions of forests, focusing economic benefits from HVTs would not be enough. Additional representative site(s) should be established to demonstrate biodiversity conservation and other ecologic benefits. Or such functions could be presented through development of extra project activities on the existing project sites（*See Recommendation 3*）.

(5) Resources allocation is imbalanced for some activities and need to be further adjusted. For example, budget for Activity 1.7 (USD16, 360 for study of seed phenology of indigenous tree species suitable for forest restoration) and Activity 1.11 (USD18, 500 for research in the nursery) is somewhat high, and budget for Activity 1.10 (USD3, 400 for seedling production) is quite low to ensure the results of activities.

(6) NTFP is a means to improving local livelihood, however, few such activity were designed by the project. Meanwhile, current thinning and enrichment planting practices may not largely improve the forest ecosystem so as to produce more valuable NTFPs, fulfilling the income-generating objective becomes more difficult.

5.2. Project Accomplishment by Activity

By the end of September 2013, a total of 16 project activities that were planned were implemented as scheduled in 2 approved annual wok plans. These activities are grouped as follows and assessed with specific comments on results and issues/problems that need further concern in the remaining project year.

Project administration

Activity 1.1: Formation and running of project steering committee and project team
Activity 1.3: convening steering committee meetings

A Project Steering Committee of five members was set up to supervise and guide the project execution and daily management, including review of annual work plans and progress reports, and providing technical and policy advice to the project. Three of the members are from Forestry Administration and its affiliate Institute of Forest and Wildlife Research and Development; one from Faculty of Forestry, Royal University of Agriculture (RUA); and the rest one from Cambodia Development Resource Institute, a Cambodia's leading independent development policy research institute. During the project implementation, committee member from CDRI was changed, and the current membership includes:

- Dr. U Sirina, Committee Chair/Head, Deputy Director General (DDG) of FA;
- Mr. Khon Saret, Committee Member, Deputy Director (DD) of Department of Forest and Community Forestry, FA;
- Dr. Sokh Heng, Committee Member, Director of Institute of Forest and Wildlife Research and Development (IRD);
- Assoc. Prof. Vonn Minin, Committee Member, Dean of Forestry Faculty, RUA; and
- Mr. Nang Phirun who replaced Mr. Koy Ra, Committee Member, Community Forestry Facilitator, CDRI.

So far 2 PSC meetings were held, first one in conjunction with the project inception meeting in 2011, and second one on 22 July 2013.

A Project Management Board (also called project team) was established to execute the project. The team consists of 10 members, four from IRD; three from local forestry administration in Kampong Thom Province, and three from local forestry administration of Siem Ream Province.

Quarterly Board meetings were convened at a quarterly basis at FA headquarters in Phnom Penh with all members attended to report achievements and challenges of each project site, which is a means to monitoring project progress in the sites.

Comments:

(1) While change of PSC member is understood, and it is necessary to inform APFNet in time in line with the project agreement and project management policies.
(2) It is too late to have PSC meeting in July to approve annual work plan and a meeting a year is insufficient to monitor progress too. It is necessary to increase frequency of steering committee meeting, twice a year for example, to enhance communication and provide timely advices, and effectively monitoring project progress.
(3) It will also be helpful to arrange project site checks for PSC members so that they have enough knowledge on field practices to make sound decisions.

Project inception and planning

Activity 1.4: organizing the inception workshop

A project inception workshop was convened in December 2011 to officially launch the project. Mr Qu Guilin, Executive director of APFNet, Dr. U Sirita from Forestry Administration of Cambodia, other distinguished guests, and the project team members, attended the inception workshop to reach common understanding of the project.

Activity 1.2: Preparation of overall work plan and annual work plans

Before the actual project implementation, a 3-month inception period since early 2012 was arranged to develop overall work plan and the first annual work plan. Due to unexpected delay, the overall work plan was not ready until June 2012 to govern the scope and key content of the project. An annual work plan was prepared in March 2012 to cover December 2011 to December 2012; while the second annual work plan covering the period from December 2012 to December 2013, was prepared in March 2013.

Comments:

The work plans were developed greatly behind schedule and accordingly postponed implementation of some activities. It would be better if these plans could be prepared and approved well before a new project year begins to ensure project implementation on schedule

Nursery establishment and operation

Activity 1.5: Identifying suitable locations for nursery establishment

Activity 1.6: Establishing a nursery in each pilot site

Two nurseries were established to produce seedlings for restoring the degraded forests in the project sites. One was established on community forestland in O Soam village. The other was built on private land (land of Mr. Mao Nga, Village Head) in Tbeng Lech Village, largely

because there is no large open space available in the degraded forest for nursery establishment. Each of the nurseries is about 2 km from the village, which necessitates the employment of nursery guards for security (and watering and weeding). APFNet signboards have been well established to display the project activity around the nurseries.

The area of each nursery is about 1500m^2 (50m x 30m), consisting of a small house that is used as "office" cum storehouse; nursery bed with cover shade measuring 96m^2 (8m x 12 m) with a capacity to produce 4,000 -5,000 seedlings a year; and a simple irrigation system (a well and a pump) for seedling production.

Comments:

(1) The two nurseries were fully established to operate since 3rd quarter of 2012, a bit behind the schedule. The produced seedlings total 7,000, which is commensurate with the overall work plan (2,500-3,500 produced at each nursery). But based on observation during the visit and the quantity of seedlings already planted, the potential annual production for each site could be 5000-7000, counting in 90% survival rate.
(2) The nursery in Kampong Thom is co-financed by the Kampong Thom Forestry Administration Cantonment, aiming to create a demonstration training center for local staff and community members in the province and probably beyond. This, to some degree, facilitates the reduplication or scaling up of the project technical outputs.
(3) In addition, there is a need to consider ownership of the nurseries. If they are supposed to be owned by community, a workable tenure system with clear regulations on the ownership of the nursery and resources on the nursery and in place, especially for the nursery in Tbeng Lech Village that was established in private land *（see Recommendation 5）*.
(4) Also, it is better to inform APFNet of the establishment of the nursery on private land rather than community land.

Activity 1.9: seed collection and/or procurement

A total of 57.5 kg orthodox seeds of 10 tree species were purchased from reliable sources in Cambodia to produce seedlings (refer to Activity 1.10) and be used in the experiment on seed treatment and the experiment on potting mixture (Activity 1.11).

Comments:

Though all the seeds used to produce seedlings were bought from other resources and none were collected, it can also be concluded that the activity is 100% completed, as the activity title in the PP is 'seeds collection and/or procurement'. However, since seed phenology study and research in nursery has produced preliminary results, FA staff at central/local level is highly suggested to guide community members to collect seeds by themselves in next season.

Activity 1.10: seedling production/procurement

By the end of August 2013, a total of 12,000 seedlings of 14 tree species were produced in the two nurseries and purchased from outside, of which 60% were produced in the two

nurseries. According to Progress Report dated September 2013, the number exceeds the number planned in the project work plan, that is, to produce between 2500 and 3500 seedlings in each nursery. Moreover, the two nurseries are nurturing a huge number of young seedlings for forest restoration next year.

Comments:

(1) Though the above achievement made, the two nurseries, especially the one in Siem Reap can contribute more than what they are doing now by (i) increasing species for seedling production, selecting not only timber species, but also fast growing non-timber forest production species; and (ii) producing more seedlings to meet demand not only by forest restoration of this project but also potential market demand beyond this project. In this way, the nurseries could generate income for villagers in short term and can self-sustain after the project ends.
(2) With the same size, Kampong Thong nursery produced seedlings doubling the seedlings produced by the Siem Reap nursery. While field observation shows that their seedling capacity is rather similar.

Activity 1.11: research in the nursery

This activity, in fact, is an experiment on seed treatment and potting mixture in an effort to produce quality seedlings. Before the experiment was conducted, Mr. Kim Soben, a local consultant was hired to deliver one training course on experiment methods from 16-25 February 2013, in the two sites. 5 community people and one local FA staff member participated in the training in each project site.

The experiment on seed treatment aimed at a good understanding of germination rate of seeds under different treatments. After the training course, community members conducted the experiment on seed treatment of five species (*Albiizia lebeck, A. lebeckoides, Dalbergia cochinchinensis, Pterocarpus macrocarpus, and Sadora cochinchinensis*) in the O Soam nursery; and the experiment on seed treatment of two species (*Dalbergia cochinchinensis* and *Pterocarpus macrocarpus*) in the Tbeng Lech nursery. Through these experiments, data was collected on generation rate of seeds under three different treatment methods.

The experiment on potting mixture, also conducted in the two nurseries, aimed at understanding of the effect of potting mixture on seedling growth. Eight broadleaf tree species and one pine species were experimented. Of which, 5 broadleaf tree species each used 3 potting mixtures, 3 broadleaf tree species each used 6 potting mixtures. 30 seedlings of each of the broadleaf species were used with each of the potting mixtures. Only 15 seedlings of the pine species were used with each of three potting mixtures, due to the insufficient number of seedlings. Growth parameters, collar diameter and total height of seedlings of the eight broadleaf tree species are collected every month for 9 months.

Comments:

(1) Data collection at a regular basis has shown that seedlings bred with potting mixture grow better than those without potting mixture. When completed by Y3Q2, research

results will be quite useful for quality seedling production in the nurseries. This serves particularly as an important reason for local community to label this project a unique one, as great opportunities were offered for them to participate not only in restoration practices but also in research activities. That is to say, they are able to better understand how they can do and why they do in this way.

(2) Research outputs deserving sharing beyond this project, benefiting more seedling producers.

Study on seed phenology

Activity 1.7: study on seed phenology to identify priority tree species suitable for forest restoration

This study was carried out to understand seed phenology of priority species to guide seed collection for restoration. Based on site condition and local community knowledge in O Soam and Tbeng Lech, four species were selected for forest restoration areas, namely, *Dalbergia cochinchinensis, Dipterocarpus alatus, Hopea odorata, and Pterocarpus marcocarpus.* In addition, the project team members in Kampong Thom also recommended three legume species (*Albizia lebbeck*, *Albizia lebbckoides, Sindora cochinchinensis*) for use in the restoration areas in O Soam, based on their suitability for local condition.

The study identified/marked a total of 19 trees for the seed phenology study. Most of trees were marked in selected forest tracks or trails in O Soam and Tbeng Lech, and a few trees of *Dipterocarpus alatus* in Vor Yeave Pagoda compound, *Albizia lebbeck* along National Road 6 in Kampong Thom, and *Albizia lebbckoides* on the campus of the Institute of Forest and Wildlife Research and Development in Phnom Penh, because these three species were not found in O Soam forest.

Comments:
Sub-activities 1.7.1 (identify target species for phenology study), 1.7.2 (survey for suitable sites), and 1.7.3 (opening forest tracts and marking target trees) were completed. Sub-activity 1.7.4 (Survey of seed phenology) was started but slightly behind the schedule. Eight quarterly surveys are supposed to be conducted during Y1Q3 –Y3Q3 but only three were done till the time of the evaluation. Report on species attribute has been drafted for seven of the twelve priority species identified for planting in the restoration plots and the research plots. With little knowledge on seed phenology study, the evaluator could not give specific comments and recommendations on this activity.

Capacity building

Activity 1.8: training course on nursery management and nursery research

A training course, titled “Tree Nursery Management for Community” was held respectively for O Soam and Tbeng Lech, from 27 December 2012 to 1 January 2013, to provide knowledge and skills on nursery management for the people in the two project sites. Assoc. Prof. Von Monin, from RUA, also serving as Steering Committee member and local consultant

of this project, delivered the training course. A total of 40 people attended the training course (13 in Siem Reap and 27 in Kampong Thom). More people participated in the training in Kampong Thom, because in addition to O Soam Community, representatives from other 11 surrounding communities attended the training, with food and accommodation provided for them during the training by local forestry administration.

Training materials in Khmer was developed and delivered to the course participants. Topics covered by the training course are:

- purpose of tree nursery establishment and management;
- planning for seedling production;
- seasons for seed collection;
- seed processing and storage;
- tools and materials used in tree nursery,;
- seed treatment methods;
- preparation of potting mixtures;
- seedling maintenance; and
- nursery pest and disease control.

The training used a combination of methods including presentations/lectures by the trainer and practical work of seedling production by the trainees. At the end of the course, a majority of the trainees indicated that they improved their understanding and skills of seedling production and nursery management.

Another training course within the framework of Activity 1.11 (research in the nursery) was given by Mr. Kim Soben to test and experiment different techniques in potting mixture, seed treatment, nursery treatment and data collection. Training assessment on 12 participants shows that the other techniques were satisfactorily understood except for data collection- 50% participants are still quite unclear.

Comments:
This activity was completed in time, with more community members and local FA staff members trained than planned. The training was helpful, as it equipped the training participants with skills for nursery establishment and operation, evidenced by the villagers' practice of nursery establishment and management, including seedling production. Because this is an effective means for capacity building, it is much desired to have more training workshops for more local FA staff and villagers and to cover more topics than nursery related topics (see Recommendation 4). In addition, it is much desired to have more women to attend training in the future, versus the # of female participants (9 out of 40) in the training course.

Site assessment and restoration planning

Activity 2.1: site assessment and forest zoning and mapping in the project sites

A site assessment was conducted by Dr Koy Ra, a local consultant, in August 2013. He carried out surveys on condition and species composition of forests and an inventory of main forest types in the two project sites. Consequently, he produced a report on condition and species composition of forests and zones with zoning maps for each project site. Three zones were classified for each project site: Imperata grassland/abandoned agricultural land, *Dipterocarpus obtusifolius* dominated forest (deciduous forest) and secondary semi-evergreen forests in O Soam; abandoned agricultural land, degraded evergreen forest and water logged area in Tbeng Lech.

In addition, five soil samples were collected from each project site and sent to the national laboratory for physical and chemical analysis, in order to make recommendations on fertilizer application.

102 demarcating poles were produced in Kampong Thom by July 2013 and erected on the boundary of O Soam Community Forest in September.

Comments:

(1) The classification of forest into evergreen, semi-evergreen and deciduous is consistent with the classification system of forest types in Cambodia. The broad classification is sufficient for the purpose of forest restoration by type.
(2) But this activity was conducted behind the planned schedule (1st quarter in 2013). Logically it should have been done before other forest restoration activities, as it was intended to provide a basis or guidance for them.

Activity 2.3: planning for restoration of forest zones in the project sites

A planning was made also by Dr. Koy Ra in August 2013. In the plan, he suggested rehabilitation methods for the three zones in O Soam and the three zones in Tbeng Lech. The methods were adopted when the communities established various types of restoration areas.

Comments:

The plan covers all the forest types in the two project sites. But, this activity was behind the planned schedule, which may explain why all other restoration activities were behind schedule somewhat. Villager participation in the planning is limited, and it could be an opportunity for capacity building for communities if involving them more actively in the planning process.

Establishment and maintenance of demonstration plots and restoration sites

Activity 2.4: Establishing a model forest restoration area (2-3 ha) in each project site

Four demonstration plots were established in each site. In each site, 2 ha was intervened with thinning and enrichment planting while the other 2 ha was left for natural regeneration. A clear contrast can thus be readily made with regards to height, DBH and survival rate. In O Soam, the demonstration plots were established in secondary evergreen forest and degraded deciduous forest lacking HVT species. In Tbeng Lech, the demonstration plots were

established in degraded evergreen forests characterized by high density of small trees (height < 10 m).

Boundary of each of the demonstration plots was demarcated by opening a forest track of 1.5m in width. Local communities identified tree species they want to retain and they want to remove. Those they wanted to retain are trees with multifunctional characteristics in order to maintain a technically sound forest canopy (usually 50%) and for harvesting for poles in the future. The villagers marked those trees intended to retain with bright color ribbons, and removed those unwanted trees. About half of the forest canopy was opened. After the thinning, HVT seedlings were planted in the opened areas.

Comments:

(1) The activity was 100% completed, a number of 2,120 and 1,060 seedlings were planted in the demonstration areas in O soam and Tbeng Lech, compared with 500-1000 seedlings planned in the project proposal.

(2) The establishment of demonstration plots entails participative involvement of community members, as they were asked to propose a list of species to be retained or removed, and trained in field before doing thinning and planting.

(3) With an aim to make comparison between plots for natural regeneration and human intervention, good baseline data is definitely important. Therefore, activity 2.6 (planning for data collection, analysis and interpretation) should be attached great importance. One issue is International consultant will be invited only to analyze and interpret data (PP, P14), but this evaluator advises a consultation from planning to collecting and analyzing is more desired.

(4) All retained species and planted seedlings are HVTs, it may need to consider to plant species such as rattan and other NTFPs that can generate income in short term for villagers. (See Recommendation 6)

Activity 2.7: Restoration of degraded forest in the two project sites

The OWP stipulates that one indicator to evaluate the objective is 10-20% of the CF restored with timber and NTFPs, and EA decides to set target at 10%, taking account of limited budget and timeframe. That equals 30 ha in Kampong Thong and 20 ha in Siem Reap. By the time of this evaluation, the project undertook restoration of 25 ha of degraded forests, of which 15 ha in O Soam community forest and 10 ha in Tbeng Lech community forest, which represents 50% of the planned figure. The project team identified and mapped restoration areas with community members, and the local communities carried out restoration with technical guidance from the project team.

Primary restoration method in O Soam is planting trees in line in the zones, especially in Imperata grassland and *Dipterocarpus obtusifolius* dominated forest. Distance between two adjacent lines varies between 10 and 15 m. In these lines, indigenous species were planted 4 m apart along each line. In the grassland, a line of fast-growing *Acacia mangium* was inserted between the lines of indigenous species to promote the process of grassland reclamation and

facilitate the growth of the indigenous species. A total of 5,868 seedlings were planted in O Soam by the early August.

Restoration method in Tbeng Lech is enrichment planting with HVT species in line in degrade evergreen forest dominated with pioneer species and lacking HVT species. A total of 35 lines, 1.5 m width and about 200 m long each, were opened. Distance between two lines is 15 m. *Afzelia xylocarpa, Albizia lebeckoides, Cassia grandis, Dalbergia cochinchinensis, Dipterocarpus alatus, Hopea odorata and Pterocarpus macrocarpus* were planted in each line, 4 m apart. A total of 1909 seedlings were planted.

Comments:

(1) This activity was not included in the project proposal and the overall work plan, and was added later as activity 2.7. The concern behind this addition is not so clear and needs to be clarified, as it does not have any critical difference from Activity 2.4, in terms of land types and methods for restoration. If primary concern is that area of the demonstration plots is too small to be meaningful for restoration demon, a right option is to increase area of forest restoration rather than to establish an additional name. As for land types selected for restoration under this activity, it is same as those for demonstration plots. In fact, the restoration areas are adjacent to the demonstration plots.

(2) It is difficult for the evaluator to conclude whether the adopted practices are the best options for restoration in the two CFs. Because Cambodia has been leaving degraded forests for natural regeneration for years and they are still in the process of exploring best options for human interventions. Interview from the project assistant and community members reflected the thinning and enrichment planting are quite new to them.

Establishment of research plots

Activity 2.5: Establishing a research area on forest restoration in each project site

This research aimed at understanding the ecological needs of selected species (by ethnoecological research) and testing or comparing the performance of the selected species on the different restoration conditions (by a quasi-experiment). Three species, *Pinus merkusii* in O Soam CF, *Dalbergia cochinchinensis* in Tbeng Lech CF and a rattan species (preferably *Daemonorops jenkinsiana*) in the two project sites, were selected for testing their growth performance under field conditions.

In each site, two research plots, one ha each were fully established by August 2013. One research plot in Tbeng Lech was planted with 44 seedlings of *D. cochinchinensis*, and the other plot with 23 rattan seedlings and with 21 planting holes directly seeded with rattan seeds. In O Soam, one plot was planted with 44 pine seedlings, and the other plot with 35 rattan seedlings. In the circle surrounded the planted seedlings, seven trees (naturally regenerated trees) with DBH ≥ 5cm were marked and growth data were recorded. Other

seedlings within the circle with DBH < 5cm were cut at the ground level and removed from the plots.

Comments:
While the establishment of research plots is helpful for better understanding of ecological needs of selected species, follow-up monitoring and observation is necessary. But there is no follow-up activities planned in the overall work plan.

5.3. Achievement towards the Project Objective and Outputs

The project has accomplished its Output 1 (Community nursery established and seedlings produced in each pilot site) and output 2 (Models of forest restoration plots established in each pilot site), excluding those activities for Year 3.

As discussed in Section 5.1, the project objective established in the project overall work plan, is not clear and specific. One of the two indicators (10-20% of community forest restored with timber and NTFPs species) is not clear in terms of meaning of restoration. The other indicator (the productivity of and income generated from community forest increased by 10%) is not measurable by the completion of the project. This problem makes assessment extremely difficult. Therefore, we will not be able to answer whether the project achieve its established objective(s).

Obviously, there is a need to re-phrase the project objective and develop according indicators. (See Recommendation 2)

5.4. Stakeholder Involvement
Villagers in the two project sites were consulted when identifying the tree species that would be planted in the demonstration plots and the restoration areas, and to some extent when selecting the demonstration plots and the restoration areas, especially in Tbeng Lech Village, Siem Reap. Concerns of stakeholders were taken into account in the implementation step.

Comments:
(1) Villager involvement was insufficient given the number of villagers involved and consultation for villager inputs into project activity development and refinement. A project activity intended to seek villager inputs (Activity 2.2, survey of community envision) was planned to conduct in the first half of the 1st year in the project proposal, but in the 3rd in the overall work plan. It will be too late to survey villagers' ideas in late stage of the project, unless it is as part of participatory project evaluation to invite villager feedback.
(2) APFNet, as sponsor, has been actively involved in the project, but failed in fulfilling some of its responsibilities, recommending qualified international experts in developing overall and annual work plans in a timely manner, for example.
(3) The EA has also been actively involved, but RUA and CDRI may be more actively involved as a means to providing technical advice to the project management bodies and villagers.

5.5. Project Costs and Finance

The project overall budget seems to be reasonable, covering so many activities as nursery establishment, research activities, and model and restoration area establishment. The budget allocation, though approved, sounds not to be tapped to its maximum. Take for example, Activity 1.1 (Formation and running of project coordination group and PSC) takes up USD188, 500, more than 40% of the total budget. Also, as noted in Section 5.1, budget for Activity 1.7 (study of seed phenology of indigenous tree species suitable for forest restoration) and Activity 1.11 (research in the nursery) is high, and budget for Activity 1.10 is quite low.

Based on the project financial report by Ms. Heng Borany, Financial Officer, US$217,715 was actually spent for the whole project by 12 September 2013 versus the budget of nearly US$250,000 for the first two years. Actual spending for Output 2 (Model forest restoration established) is US$ 48,908 versus the budget of US$54,130 for the same period.

5.6. Project Documentation and Project Communication

Project documents, such as project proposal, overall work plan, annual work plans, progress reports, other project technical materials and training materials, booking records and financial reports were produced, including some project documents in Khmer for villagers. The documents were well maintained for reference, and for the sake of seeking unified understanding on overall/annual work plan, these were translated into the local language and easily assessed by non-English speaking stakeholders.

However, sharing of project documents and information has largely taken place within the project and primary stakeholders, and was limited to outside the project. Few means has been employed for sharing. Project communication needs to be improved to increase project impacts and achievement dissemination.

5.7. Conclusions

Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that the project is relevant, in terms of its consistency with the objectives and priorities of APFNet and, it's meeting Cambodia's needs for restoration of degraded forests and improvement in community livelihood through forest restoration. The project activities designed to address the "degradation" problem are appropriate, though some of the activities may not be sufficient. Overall, the project design is rated as "good".

Project performance (project accomplishment by activity, sustainability, stakeholder involvement, project costs and finance, and project documentation) is also rated as "good" (refer to *Appendix 4, Project Overall Rating Table)*. Most of the 16 project activities executed are completed as planned and is satisfactory (refer to *Annex 5*)

Though the satisfactory progress and performance, there are some issues that need to be addressed. The issues include:

(i) The current project goal and objective are not well presented with proper indicators, which may lead to difficulty in achieving and in project result measurement. It is suggested stating project goal more clearly and measurable as “rehabilitate the degraded forests in the project sites to a status well stocked with HVT species and high value NTFPs and/or with multifunction, and the project sites become a recognized national model on forest rehabilitation and rural livelihood improvement” and project objective as “(1) XX restoration demonstration plots and xx ha of restoration areas fully established as designed in community forests in the project sites ”(accordingly, a number of indicators need further adjustments).

(ii) Given multiple-functions of forests serve a significant project component, it should consider additional project sites relating to biodiversity conservation or multifunction if resources allow;

(iii) Few activities were designed and executed to generate income in short term, not in line with project objective of income increase by 10% within project implementation period;

(iv) More efforts are needed on capacity building, to achieve the objective -- 20% local FA staff and 10-20% community members learnt technique of forest restoration; and

(v)

Several project activities were executed behind the schedule, which should be avoided in the third project year.

If all these issues can be effectively addressed in the next phase, this project can become a good example for forest restoration in Cambodia and even in regions in similar conditions. It will develop some technique and methods that are working well for forest restoration; build capacity for foresters and community members, and lay a good basis for income generation and livelihood for communities in the project sites.

6. Lessons Learnt

It is still early to draw lessons from the project. More importantly, the project team is in better place to draw lessons from their experience with the project. To this end, the PSC and the project team are encouraged to come up with lessons from now, through workshop, PSC meeting, and project team meeting and when preparing progress reports (all the progress reports just reported progress, and did not include any lessons learnt.) This is extremely important, if the project wants to become a model for forest restoration in Cambodia.

Here provides some observation from the brief field visits and project document review.

- **Pack, develop and disseminate best practices and experiences.** Given its limited

human and financial resources, the project should focus on piloting new methods and approaches and demonstrating best practices. After their suitability is proved, these methods and best practices should be disseminated to other areas with similar context. The project team should be prepared to pack and disseminate its practices and models. This is right direction for the project (leadership) to play leading role in the area of forest restoration. To do so, the project team needs enhancing its effort for lessons learning rather than focusing on activity completion.

- **Community involvement is key for project of such type.** The project was designed and executed to rehabilitate degraded community forests. Experience from the project clearly shows that it is not possible to conduct such restoration efforts without active involvement of communities. Incentives for them to be involved are whether and how they will benefit from the project, during the project, and in the long run. In this case, it is income that will be generated from timber and NTPFs from the forests. This is a valuable lesson for community forest restoration, or an important element of the model developed by the project, rather than just technique and methods.

7. **Recommendation**s

Based on the evaluation findings and conclusions (Section 5) and the lessons learnt (Section 6), eight recommendations are provided for the project team and APFNet to consider in the next phase to achieve maximum project outcomes.

(1) Project Goal: Re-phrase the project goal as "rehabilitate the degraded forests in the project sites to a status well stocked with HVT species and high value NTFPs and/or with multifunction, and the project sites become a recognized national model on forest rehabilitation and rural livelihood improvement". Re-phrasing as such will make the project more meaningful with increasing impacts, and well prepare it as a demon/showcase on forest rehabilitation for Cambodia.

(2) Objective and Indicators: Re-phrase Objective as: "xx restoration demonstration plots and xx ha of restoration areas fully established as designed in community forests in the project sites". Indicators: # of demon plots, ha of restored forests. Develop a new objective as Objective 2: "capacity of FA and local communities on forest restoration developed and enhanced". Indicators: # of local FA staff learnt forest restoration technique/methods; # of villagers learnt forest restoration technique and methods. Re-phrasing and developing project objectives as such will not result in any addition of project activities, but will make project objectives specific and measurable.

(3) Representative of Project Sites: Establish one restoration area in protected forest in one of the project sites or a site nearby to increase representative of forest types for restoration. The rehabilitation effort has so far had main concern about timber and NTFP production by integrating HVT and NTFP species into the restoration areas. Restoring forest with biodiversity and ecological benefits will definitely require different restoration technique and method from those used currently. Otherwise, the project will lose a great opportunity to develop technique and methods for restoring protected forests for ecologic benefits. This is feasible by reducing area of forest restoration for forest products that are planned, use that funding for restoration of protected forest.

(4) Capacity building: Without an increase in the total project budget, organize more training for community members on seed collection, seedling production, nursery management, forest restoration, and community forest management for multiple benefits. This recommendation is made, because capacity building was designed as project goal in the current plan, or as a project objective as recommended by this evaluator. This is possible by using part of funding allocated for Activity 2.5.

(5) Take full advantage of the established nurseries to produce seedlings not only for restoration need of this project, but also meet potential market demand. So doing will make the nurseries self-sufficient, and even as a means for income generation for the villagers in short term. Beside timber species, the two nurseries should consider for seedling production of NTFPs.

(6) Plant rattan and other NTFP species in future restoration effort that are able to generate income, especially cash income in short term. HVT species can generate high income, but in long run.

(7) Communication enhancement: Communication between APFNet and EA should be enhanced to ensure project efficiency. In particular, important change of project scope should be reported before any actions are taken. In addition, PSC and project team should increase meeting frequency, and make sure project is directed and supervised effectively and advice is provided in a timely manner.

(8) It is recommended that project sharing be further enhanced, including more extensive sharing of project documents among the stakeholders, disseminating project news to other agencies, organizations, villagers, and students, through leaflets, FA website and other channels available, and publishing research results, to increase project impacts and people's recognition to it. For instance, the result of Activity 1.11 may be good enough to publish in a professional journal.

Annexes:

Annex 1. Mission Itinerary

Sept. 22-23
Desk study and literature review at home in Kunming.

Sept. 24
Travel from Kunming to Phnom Penh.

Sept. 25
AM: Meet and interview with two project steering committee members and three project team members (see Annex 3 for the names of the people met) at Forestry Administration in Phnom Penh. Dr So Thea, Project Coordinator, presented project progress; and Mrs Heng Borary, Project Financial Officer, made a brief presentation about project financial status.

PM: Meet with the three project team members in FA office to finalize the draft evaluation plan including itinerary, and collect project documents prepared by the project team at FA.

Sept. 26
AM: Travel from Phnom Penh to the project site in Kampong Thom Province*.

PM:
- Meet and interview with 16 villagers from O Soam Village, and the project team members in Kampong Thom and three other local FA staff members.
- Visit one demonstration plot.

Sept. 27
Visit the demonstration plots, the research plot, and the restoration areas in O Soam.

Sept. 28
Am: Travel from Kampong Thom to Siem Reap.

PM: Meet and interview with 14 farmers from Tbeng Lech Village, and the project team members in Siem Reap.

Sept. 29
- Visit the demonstration plots, the research plot, and the restoration areas in Siem Reap.
- Brief meeting with Dr. So Thea, Mr Ma Vuthy and Dr Edward V. Maningo to provide preliminary feedback.
- Travel from Siem Reap to Guangzhou in the night.

Sept. 30 Travel back to Kunming from Guangzhou.

Oct. 3-5 Write evaluation report (home based)

Nov 13 Finalize the evaluation report in response to comments received.

* Note
Dr So Thea, Mr Ma Vuthy, Dr Edward V. Maningo, accompanied us all the way from Phnom Penh to Siem Reap.

Annex 2. Project Documents, Presentations and Works Referenced

Project Proposal: Multi-function Forest Restoration and Management of Degraded Forest Areas in Cambodia

June 2012, Overall Work Plan

March 2012, Annual Work Plan for 13 December 2011 to 12 December 2012

March 2013, Annual Work Plan for 13 December 2012 to 12 December 2013

July 2013, Progress Report

February 2013, Progress Report

April 2013, Progress Report

September 2013, Draft Progress Report

Koy Ra, August 2013, Zoning, Mapping and Site Assessment of Tbeng Lech and OS Som Community Forests in Siem Reap and Kampong Thom Provinces

Edward V. Maningo, Report (on) Establishment of Restoration Research in Kampong Thon and Siem Reap Provinces

Von Monin, January 2013, Training Report on Tree Nursery Management for Community at Prey Kbal Teuk Community Forestry in Siemreap and O Soam Community Forestry in Kampong Thom Province

Forestry Administration, 2010, Cambodia Forestry Outlook Study, Working Paper No. APFSOS II/ WP/ 2010/ 32

Forestry Administration (of Cambodia), 2012, Forestry Statistics of Cambodia

Annex 3. A List of Individuals Interviewed and Consulted during Field Visits and Interviews

- Associate Prof. Von Monin, member of the PSC and Dean of the Faculty of Forestry, Royal University of Agriculture
- Mr Nang Phirum, member of the PSC, from Cambodian Development Resource Institute (CDRI)
- Dr. So Thea, Project Coordinator,
- Mr Ma Vuthy, Project Assistant
- Mrs Heng Borany, Project Financial Official
- Dr Edward V. Maningo, Project consultant
- Mr. Tep Nheata, Project's Kampong Thom Provincial Coordinator, a local FA staff member
- Mr. Tong Yi, project team member in Kampong Thom, a local FA staff member
- Mr. Chan Mony Neat, project team member in Kampong Thom, a local FA staff member
- 16 villagers from O Soam Village (whose names were not collected at the meeting), including nursery guards (part time), community forestry committee members
- Mr. Roun Rean, Head of Sala Visai Village
- Mr. Kong Boravuth, Project's Siem Ream Province Coordinator, a local FA staff member
- Mr. Lim Sothy, project team member in Siem Reap, a local FA staff member
- Mr. Mao Nga, Head of Tbeng Lech Village and Head of community forestry committee
- Mr. Eam No, Vice Head of community forestry committee
- 14 villagers from Tbeng Lech Village (whose names were not collected at the meeting)

Annex 4: Project Overall Rating Table

To support more systematic recording of evaluation findings, this evaluation will use a rating/score table to record project performance and attach it to the evaluation report. The table should be completed in a manner that can be readily shared with any audience.

The Evaluator is to assign the project a Rating and Score for each criterion as follows:

- **Very Good/4:** The project embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *very good* extent.
- **Good/3:** The project embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *good* extent.
- **Fair/2:** The project embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *fair* extent.
- **Poor/1:** The project embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *poor* extent.
- **N/A:** The criterion was *not assessed* (in the 'Justification,' explain why).
- **D/I:** The criterion was considered but *data were insufficient* to assign a rating or score (in the 'Justification,' elaborate).

The Evaluator also is to provide a brief justification for the rating and score assigned. Identify most notable strengths to build upon as well as highest priority issues or obstacles to overcome. (Note that this table should not be a comprehensive summary of findings and recommendations, but an overview only. A more comprehensive presentation should be captured in the evaluation report.)

Criterion	Description of Strong Performance	Evaluator Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
Relevance/ Quality of Design	The project design represents a necessary, sufficient, and appropriate approach to achieving changes in key factors. The project has rigorously applied key design tools (e.g., Logframe).	3.5	
Accomplishment of Activities	Most/all intermediate outputs/activities have been delivered. Most/all without delays.	3.6	
Achievement of Objectives	Most/all stated intermediate objectives/results were attained. There is strong evidence indicating that perceived changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the project.	N/A	

Sustainability of Project Outcomes	Most or all factors for ensuring sustainability of results/impacts are being or have been established as well a scaling up mechanism put in place with risks and assumptions re-assessed and addressed.	3.0	
Stakeholder Involvement	All project stakeholders, especially community members, were sufficiently consulted during the project planning, with their views incorporated into the project design.	3.2	
Project Administration	Management system, coordination mechanism, and internal M & E system are appropriate, sufficient, and operate efficiently.	3.6	
Project Costs and Finance	Human & financial resources were used efficiently. There is a good value for money.	3.8	
Project Documentation and Communication	Project activities and outputs have been appropriately and sufficiently recorded, archived and shared.	3.2	
Overall Score		**3.4**	

Annex 5. Project Progress by Activity

Project Activity	% executed	Notes
Activity 1. 1: Formation and running of project steering committee and project team	Ongoing	
Activity 1.2: Preparation of overall work plan and annual work plans	100%	Excluding annual work plan for 3rd year that was not indicated in the overall work plan.
Activity 1.3: Meeting of the Steering Committee for approving the AWP and OWP	D/I	Meeting was conducted in July 2013.
Activity 1.4: Organize inception workshop	100%	
Activity 1.5: Identify suitable locations for nursery establishment	100%	
Activity 1.6: Establish one nursery in each pilot site	100%	
Activity 1.7: Study of seed phenology of indigenous tree species	60%, survey ongoing	
Activity 1.8: training course on nursery management	100%	
Activity 1.9: Seed collection and/or procurement	100% versus plan	What about the 3rd year?
Activity 1.10: Production/procurement of seedlings for planting	100% versus plan	Seedlings will be produced or procured in the 3rd year?
Activity 1.11: Research in the nursery	65%	
Activity 2.1 Assessment of sites, zoning and mapping of forests in the two pilot provinces	90%	Analysis of soil samples ongoing.
Activity 2.3: Planning of forest restoration for each forest zone in each pilot site	100%	
Activity 2.4: Establish a model forest restoration area (2-3 ha) in each project site	100%	
Activity 2.5: Establish a research area on forest restoration in each project site	95%	
Activity 2.7: Restoration of degraded forest in the two project sites	?	