



Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) in the Productive, Natural and Forested Landscape of Northern Region of Cambodia

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

9781

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

Project Title

Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) in the Productive, Natural and Forested Landscape of Northern Region of Cambodia

Countries

Cambodia

Agency(ies)

UNDP

Other Executing Partner(s):

Ministry of Environment

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Protected Areas and Landscapes, Biodiversity, Focal Areas, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Productive Landscapes, Mainstreaming, Tourism, Fisheries, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting, Financial and Accounting, Payment for Ecosystem Services, Threatened Species, Species, Invasive Alien Species, Tropical Rain Forests, Biomes, Wetlands, Tropical Dry Forests, Lakes, Rivers, Land Cover and Land cover change, Land Degradation Neutrality, Land Degradation, Land Productivity, Sustainable Land Management, Income Generating Activities, Sustainable Agriculture, Sustainable Livelihoods, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach, Ecosystem Approach, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Livelihoods, Climate Change Adaptation, Climate Change, Community-based adaptation, Ecosystem-based Adaptation, Climate resilience, Mainstreaming adaptation, Climate information, Demonstrate innovative approach, Influencing models, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Awareness Raising, Communications, Stakeholders, Public Campaigns, Education, Behavior change, Beneficiaries, SMEs, Private Sector, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Consultation, Type of Engagement, Participation, Information Dissemination, Partnership, Community Based Organization, Civil Society, Non-Governmental Organization, Academia, Gender Mainstreaming, Gender Equality, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Women groups, Gender-sensitive indicators, Access to benefits and services, Gender results areas, Participation and leadership, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Access and control over natural resources, Capacity Development, Innovation, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Learning, Adaptive management, Indicators to measure change, Theory of change

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 1

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Duration

60In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

317,330

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1_P1	Improving Financial Sustainability and Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure	GET	2,457,078	5,123,400
LD-1_P1	Agro-ecological intensification	GET	433,242	2,068,730
LD-3_P4	Scaling-up sustainable land management through the Landscape Approach	GET	450,000	3,007,870
Total Project Cost(\$)			3,340,320	10,200,000

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To promote integrated landscape management for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity natural resources and ecosystem services in the northern region of Cambodia

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 1: Systemic and institutional capacity for integrated landscape management	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 1: Improved national framework and enhanced institutional capacity as foundations for an integrated landscape approach to conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of natural resources.</p> <p><i>Outcome indicators:</i></p> <p>(1) <i>Gender-responsive measures in place for conservation, sustainable use, and equitable access to and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems for large landscapes including (i) policy framework (ii) legal and regulatory frameworks, and (iii) institutional frameworks.</i></p> <p>(2) <i>institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring integrated landscape management planning as measured by UNDP's capacity development scorecard</i></p> <p>(3) <i>No. of regional, provincial and local partners adopting the ILM framework to mainstream biodiversity into their planning systems as indicated by (i) INRM guidelines; (ii) Regional and local plans mainstreaming INRM and Biodiversity; (iii) Sectoral partnerships established for collaborative and integrated planning and management.</i></p>	<p>Output 1.1: Policy and regulations for integrated management of landscapes developed and adopted</p> <p>Output 1.2: Mechanisms, tools and guidelines developed for integration of natural resources management into national land use master planning.</p> <p>Output 1.3: Capacity of key agencies and other stakeholders (with special emphasis of indigenous people and other communities in the target</p>	GET	884,837	2,489,470

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 2: Effective management of PAs and surrounding riparian and multiple use production landscapes in Northern Cambodia	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 2: Targeted Protected Areas and their surrounding production landscapes effectively managed to ensure biodiversity conservation and safeguarding livelihoods and ecosystem services.</p> <p><i>Outcome indicators:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) <i>Extent of land (excluding PAs) managed through an integrated landscape approach with functional institutional, planning, management and monitoring systems in place in over 100,000 ha</i> (2) <i>Terrestrial PAs under improved management effectiveness of 20 points as measured against METT baselines scores of:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KPWS : 33 PKNP : 32 Angkor PL: 59 (3) <i>At least 1,500 ha of Community-based NRM initiated and operational including establishment of Community Protected Areas (CPAs) and of Community Forests (CFs) as measured by: (i) updated management plans; (ii) revised MOAs that clearly define conservation commitments; (iii) monitoring systems in place to evaluate management effectiveness; (iv) communities trained in natural resources management actions; (v) budgets allocated for implementation of management plans, etc.</i> (4) <i>Status of key species in the northern landscape as</i> 	<p>Output 2.1: Landscape-scale mapping exercise of the target areas in northern Cambodia conducted and applied for development of an integrated management framework for the northern landscape</p> <p>Output 2.2 Management plans for targeted PAs developed and operationalized</p> <p>Output 2.3 Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) programs established and co-managed by communities and</p>	GET	1,454,800	5,444,470

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 3: Knowledge management, gender mainstreaming and M & E	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 3: Knowledge management, gender mainstreaming and monitoring and evaluation contributes to identification of improved tools, approaches and best practices for replication and scaling up.</p> <p><i>Outcome indicators:</i></p> <p>(1) Increase in level of knowledge (disaggregated by gender) on INRM approaches as defined by: (i) Number of community members trained and adopting new technologies, practices, etc. (ii) Communication strategy and action plan developed and effectively implemented; and (iii) KAP survey to test knowledge and awareness of targeted groups.</p> <p>(2) Number of knowledge products that reflects best practices and lessons learned available including: (i) Case studies disseminated; (ii) no. of policy guidance notes; (iii) Technical reports, publications and other KM products; (iv) no. of local workshops held to facilitate dissemination of field lessons; (v) inclusion of public engagement pages on national and sub-national websites and social media platforms.</p>	<p>Output 3.1: Knowledge management and communications, gender mainstreaming and monitoring and evaluation strategies developed and implemented</p> <p>Output 3.2: Knowledge Management and gender mainstreaming contribute to learning and facilitates replication and scaling up of integrated natural resources management approaches elsewhere in the country.</p> <p>Output 3.3: Improved and user-friendly information</p>	GET	841,620	1,550,000

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
			Sub Total (\$)		3,181,257	9,483,940
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
			GET		159,063	716,060
			Sub Total(\$)		159,063	716,060
			Total Project Cost(\$)		3,340,320	10,200,000

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	200,000
Government	General Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development (GSSD)	In-kind	1,746,100
Government	Department of Biodiversity of GSSD	In-kind	2,592,100
Government	General Directorate of Nature Conservation and Protection (GDANCP) of MOE	In-kind	2,169,600
Government	General Directorate for Local Community (GDLC) of MOE	In-kind	1,746,100
Government	Sub-national administrations of the targeted provinces	In-kind	1,746,100
Total Co-Financing(\$)			10,200,000

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Cambodia	Biodiversity		No	2,457,078	233,422
UNDP	GET	Cambodia	Land Degradation		No	883,242	83,908
					Total Grant Resources(\$)	3,340,320	317,330

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

PPG Amount (\$)

130,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

12,350

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Cambodia	Biodiversity		No	100,000	9,500
UNDP	GET	Cambodia	Land Degradation		No	30,000	2,850
Total Project Costs(\$)						130,000	12,350

Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	452,173.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	1,500.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park	125689	Select	1,500.00			<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	450,673.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	---------	---------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Angkor Protected Landscape	125689 2351	SelectProtected Landscape/Seascape		10,800.00			59.00		□
Akula National Park Kulen PromtepWS	125689 61943	Select		402,500.00			33.00		□
Akula National Park Phnom Kulen NP	125689 68861	SelectNational Park		37,373.00			32.00		□

Indicator 3 Area of land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	1000.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	1,000.00		

Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	101000.00	0.00	0.00
Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
100,000.00			
Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
Type/Name of Third Party Certification			
Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
1,000.00			
Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Submitted

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		1,500		
Male		3,500		
Total	0	5000	0	0

PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION

1. Project Description

There are no significant changes in the project design from the original PIF. During the PPG stage, Outcomes and Outputs have undergone some modification as required to improve the design of the project and reflect the outcomes of PPG consultations and assessments. All original elements of the PIF are still included in the Outcome and Output statements of the project as detailed in Table B. These are further detailed in *Section A.1.3 of this CEO Endorsement Request and Annex G of CEO ER*.

The co-financing amount has slightly decreased from PIF estimate of USD 10,000,000 to 8,461,060 ensuring a more realistic figure.

1) Global environmental problems, threats, root causes and barriers to be addressed.

There are no significant changes from the PIF. Through the PPG process - threats, impacts, and barriers presented in the original PIF have been further refined and elaborated through consultations. Please refer to *Section II Development challenge in the UNDP Project Document for details*.

2) Baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects.

There are no significant change from the PIF. However, *Section II Development challenge, baseline scenario and Section IV Results and Partnerships, Part on “Partnerships and Stakeholder engagement” of the UNDP Project Document* identify a wider range of partners that would be involved in project implementation and include baseline initiatives (including baseline budget estimates) that will contribute to the results of the project.

3) Proposed alternative scenario, with brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project

The relevance and feasibility of the proposed outcomes and outputs have been confirmed (*Refer Figure 2 for Theory of Change and Section IV, of UNDP Project Document*) through additional expert review and through extensive consultations during the preparation phase of the project (*Refer Section IV “Results and Partnerships”, Stakeholder engagement plan and Annex 5 of UNDP Project Document*). Project indicators and targets have been refined to reflect on-ground practicalities and ecological considerations. Some modifications from the original PIF as discussed below:

In order to ensure that there is a structured approach to the design of the project, Component 1 focuses on national foundational activities (policies, procedures, guidelines and regulatory systems) that are needed to promote an integrated management of biological landscapes. Component 2 focuses on trialing the integrated planning and management of the northern landscape. Component 2, in particular focuses on improved protected area management systems and integration of such approaches at sub-national and local level planning systems and rehabilitation of degraded agricultural lands to improve their productivity. Component 3 covers knowledge management, gender mainstreaming and monitoring and evaluation. There has been some re-organization of outputs from the original PIF. Detailed changes from the PIF and rationale for these changes are presented in greater detail in Annex G of CEO ER.

Response to Project Reviews (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion, and responses to comments from the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF) is provided in Annex B of the CEO ER.

Alignment with GEF focal area strategies

The project addresses the GEF-6 BD Focal Area Program 1 objective – *Improving Financial Sustainability and Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure*. The project is particularly aligned with the core activities of Program 1 with the intent of finding new strategies to supplement the restricted government budget for PAs as well as respond to commercial opportunities for PAs. Accordingly, Output 1.4 is aimed at supporting the assessment of potential revenue options, including assessing existing legal and policy barriers for the promotion of new cost-effective practices, systems and schemes, all aimed at making sites more attractive to visitors and increasing their own revenue generation capacity. Following the assessment, the project will support the testing of a few suitable sustainable financing activities (including strengthening existing PES activities) for three Protected Areas (Angkor, Kulen Promtep and Phnom Kulen) that entails mechanisms for channeling of resources to conservation and local community benefit; and based on these results to review, report on, and propose recommendations for promotion of sustainable financing in PAs in Cambodia. The project also addresses GEF-6 LD Focal Area Program 1: *Agro-ecological intensification*. Under Output 2.4 the project will facilitate wider adoption of SLM measures and biodiversity-friendly agricultural systems as well as viable traditional farming methods. This is to ensure increased food production and income, livelihoods, whilst improving agro-ecosystems resilience and reducing pressures on PAs and natural forests, resulting in improved habitat connectivity. Recognizing that smallholders and indigenous People (IP) are poorly resourced and not in a position to incur the costs associated with these measures, ‘incentive mechanisms’ will be provided as needed, and will be piloted to stimulate wider adoption. SLM measures and incentives are targeted to address degradation and improve productivity of agricultural lands through employment of two parallel interventions: (i) establishment of SLM exemplars; and (ii) provision of incentive mechanisms for wider adoption of SLM and biodiversity-friendly agricultural systems. In terms of GEF-6 LD Program 4 objective - *Scaling-up Sustainable Land Management through Landscape Approach*, the project will support efforts to improve production landscapes with environmental benefits and encourage wider application of innovative tools and practices for natural resource management. This will include approaches at improving soil productivity, water resource management, and vegetation cover in production landscapes systems as to benefit land users most vulnerable to land degradation. The project will support specific roles of men and women in these systems through (i) capacity development and grant financing for sustainable land and forest management; (ii) multi-stakeholder planning at the biological corridor level involving both public and private sectors to inform decision-making on integrated management of ecosystem services; and (iii) improving agricultural land management within key biological areas to improve forest connectivity through empowerment of local communities in decision-making and management of productive assets.

4) Incremental/additional cost reasoning

Baseline projects as well as other contributions to the project’s baseline and co-financing are given in *UNDP Project Document Section IV (Results and Partnerships)* for each project component, and *Section IX (Financial Planning and Management)*.

The indicative co-financing for the project has been confirmed with a total of USD 8,461,060 (see Table C above). GEF resources will be used to address efforts in developing an enabling framework for integrated management of biological landscapes in the country including legislation, policy and institutional mechanisms for conservation and resource management. This will be done through the provision of incremental funding to add on to investments already being made by project partners. The project preparation phase has also engaged stakeholders, developed a shared vision and initiated steps towards the removal of barriers for effective implementation. The project can therefore, be considered entirely incremental above the baseline situation.

5) Global Environmental Benefits

The GEF increment builds on the existing programs undertaken by the Government of Cambodia for biodiversity conservation, maintaining ecosystem services, sustainable land and forest management. In the alternative scenario enabled by the GEF, the project will work towards removal of systemic and institutional barriers for integrated natural resources planning through: (i) strengthened institutional, legal and regulatory frameworks that incorporate biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services considerations into sectoral, national and sub-national land use planning; (ii) strengthened national capacity for integrated natural resources management planning with protected area management and biodiversity mainstreamed; (iii) effective operationalization of an integrated planning and management approach in northern landscape in the country with community protected area and forest management, biodiversity compatible SLM and improved agricultural land restoration in place; (iv) an effective integrated natural resources management supporting key ecosystem service (i.e. water) and biodiversity of global significance; (v) biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into the agricultural, tourism and forestry sectors, supporting the reduction of key threats to globally and regionally threatened ecosystems and species; and (vi) knowledge management for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services, SLM, and agricultural and livelihood productivity is captured and shared, encouraging ongoing and widespread implementation. The proposed project generates GEBs by contributing to Aichi Targets #5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 19.

The global benefits that will be delivered include improved management effectiveness of around 450,673 ha of existing protected areas, improved agricultural productivity in around 1,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands, community protected area and forest improvements in 1,500 ha of key biodiversity areas. Refer Table 1 below for GEB benefits:

Table 1: Global Environmental Benefits

Summary of Baseline Scenario	Summary of GEF Scenario	Global Environment Benefit
<i>Component 1: Systemic and institutional capacity for integrated landscape management</i>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cambodia's globally significant habitats threatened by poor watershed and land use practices, climate change and over exploitation of natural resources - Development planning at national, regional, provincial and local levels does not fully account for ecosystem values and biodiversity, leading to continued loss of habitat and critical ecosystem functions - Gaps in policies and planning systems result in unabated threats to biodiversity as drivers of change accelerate within large biological landscapes - Limited capacity at national, provincial and local levels level to lead on integrated natural resources planning and management results in less efficient approaches to biodiversity management of large landscapes - Regulatory frameworks and enforcement capacities to ensure compliance with conservation and sustainable development guidelines and regulations limited and less effective in preventing negative development impacts, encroachment, and illegal hunting and consumption) - Limited government financing for protected areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthened policy and institutional framework for integrated natural resources management of large landscapes - Improved partnership arrangements and cooperation for integrated planning and management of large landscapes - Strengthened application of policies and regulations on biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resources management within large landscapes - Improved approaches for mainstreaming of biodiversity and ecosystem services into key sectors and into national, provincial and local socio-economic planning tested - Enhanced capacity to implement decision-making tools to inform improved land use planning for biodiversity conservation outcomes, economic valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem goods and services; - Capacity enhanced to carry out management planning, use of management standards and protocols for biodiversity landscapes and demonstrates potential for PA contributions to socio-economic development and community livelihoods - Improved financial instruments tested and demonstrated in pilot PAs 	<p>BD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved integrated natural resources management of landscape covering around 100,000 ha, maintaining globally important biodiversity and ecosystem services - Improved conservation management in 3 existing PAs covering around 450,673 ha - Improved conservation of 1,500 ha of key biodiversity areas through community PAs and forest areas to improve forest and habitat - Connectivity and enhance the viability of key species and ecosystems - Status of key species in the northern landscape such as (i) Sarus Crane; (ii) Giant Ibis; and (iii) Lesser adjutant improved based increased number of nests protected and success rate - Increase in level of institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring of integrated natural resources management planning in northern landscape - At least 4 Commune Development and Commune Investment Plans and at least 4 District Development Plans and District Investment Plans fully integrate biodiversity considerations from INRM framework within the northern landscape - Increased awareness of community members, government and
--	---	--

<i>Component 2: Effective management of PAs and surrounding riparian and multiple use production landscapes in Northern Cambodia</i>	sector agency staff, private sector and other stakeholders (disaggregated by sex and type of beneficiary) aware of and
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity conservation, sustainable land and forest management, and protected areas management is not fully integrated into provincial and local socio-economic development plans and processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity conservation, sustainable management of land and forests, and PA management consolidated within biodiversity corridors and aligned with existing provincial and local planning and management structures 	<p>taking action to address potential conservation threats and their adverse impacts on biodiversity within biological landscapes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resource use management and planning does not take place at the landscape level or adequately take account of potential impacts on protected areas and biodiversity rich areas from production landscapes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multi-stakeholder participation in biodiversity mainstreaming decision-making strengthened 	<p>LD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 1,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands, under improved rehabilitation using biodiversity-friendly restoration technologies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key biodiversity areas and other critical habitat areas outside protected areas are somewhat disconnected from each other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated strategies in place for the northern landscape in Cambodia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PA management strengthened and integrated into overall land and resource use planning frameworks in surrounding areas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information is not available to enable effective biodiversity within large landscapes sites, or to measure and track the negative impacts of development, agricultural expansion, or other development processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community PA and forest areas management strengthen with improved co-management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity-friendly and revenue sharing standards for tourism development / operations for biodiversity corridors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development can lead to deforestation and degradation of native forest, threatening globally significant biodiversity and results in increasing land degradation, loss of ecosystem services, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainable livelihoods activities benefiting local residents and reducing their negative impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved productivity and incomes from previously degraded agricultural lands
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourism development does not fully capture economic potential nor address needs of local communities and channel adequate benefits to local communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourism actively contributing to conservation outcomes and community livelihoods through partnerships with private sector 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some communities / residents within PAs rely on unsustainable resource uses (overharvesting of forest products; hunting; etc.) due to a lack of experience or knowhow on sustainable livelihood options and a lack of incentive 		

Component 3: Knowledge management, learning and scaling-up

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Key stakeholders are unaware of the damaging impacts of their actions on fragile ecosystems and biodiversity, the economic implications of this degradation, regulations to protect them and the penalties for breaking these. - Information is not readily available to enable effective biodiversity monitoring within PAs sites, or to measure and track the negative impacts of development	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Increased awareness of stakeholders and local communities and broad support for PAs and recognition of their multiple benefits and contributions to local economies - Strengthened monitoring and reporting systems for PAs and their management effectiveness collated and reported at a national level - Enhancement of learning network for transmission of best practices and fit-for-purpose science.
--	--

6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

Innovativeness: The project design is innovative in several ways. First, it proposes to pilot the first programs in Cambodia for integrated planning and management in large landscapes. The project seeks to mainstream biodiversity and water conservation outcomes in sectoral and provincial economic planning. This approach, that would involve multi-stakeholder planning and an inter-sectoral coordination approach to landscape management in Cambodia would propose the following approaches: (i) a landscape being viewed as a system in its self, comprised of various natural, cultural and socio-economic components; in turn, it is part of the bigger national, regional, thematic, and global networks of national landscapes; (ii) landscape would be appropriately zoned by ecology-based planning using a patch-matrix model for biodiversity and water conservation, taking account of landscape ecology, inter-connectedness, vegetation zoning, regional land-use planning, hydrological parameters, nature and cultural landscape integration, etc. (i.e. landscape planning); (iii) bringing actors from the provinces, communities, market and civil society sectors together to achieve mutual understanding and negotiate and implement mutually agreeable plans, combining top-down and bottom-up approaches and promotion of community participation (i.e. intersectoral coordination); and (iv) promoting a conservation and water-based economy in large landscapes, with value creation and increased economic benefits for local people; labelling of goods and services from the landscapes (e.g. tourism products and services; sustainable agricultural products; NTFPs, etc.); consumption and production in line with sustainable development; fair distribution; and awareness of conservation of nature and culture. Lessons learned on collaboration with the tourism and other sectors can be shared with other landscapes and protected areas in the region. Secondly, it is innovative because it would seek to link KBAs (and “set-asides”) and forest and riparian restoration as part of a larger effort to improve biodiversity conservation outcomes and improve connectivity of individual parts of the larger landscape. Thirdly, it would serve as a pilot to develop and test sustainable financing mechanisms at the local level (community or district level) to improve incentive for community engagement in conservation, including establishment of local level revolving funds, tourism concession fees, accommodation surcharges, etc.).

Sustainability and Scaling Up

The project will address sustainability as follows:

Financial sustainability will be achieved by a number of means, including: (i) ensuring that through the integrated management planning exercise for the landscape, the national, provincial and local entities that will facilitate the convergence of national, provincial and local government financial resources to support conservation and sustainable community livelihoods that would help financially sustain activities beyond the life of the project; (ii) ensure a partnership arrangement between national, provincial, sector and local institutions, communities, NGO and private sector partners within the northern landscape that will ensure complementarity and cost-effectiveness of multiple partners and investments; (iii) develop new business models for landscape conservation, sustainable natural resources use, community livelihoods and value chains that recognize the full range of environmental ecosystem services provided by large landscapes and their attendant species and ecosystems. Developing market linkages for sustainable forest and agriculture products and services, ecotourism and local handicrafts and establishment of “brand” labels that will ensure financial sustainability of local livelihoods; (iv) support for establishment of Community level revolving funds that will help to financially sustain and expand investments beyond the project period; (v) facilitating market linkages, green certification of products and services to improve sustainability and value addition; (vi) training of local entrepreneurs and enterprises; and (vii) linkages with financial institutions. Implementation of such models through carefully developed business plans could lead to a diversification of funding base from sources such as ecotourism, NTFPs and other mechanisms.

Institutional sustainability will be ensured through systematic capacity development of existing public institutions (particularly that of NCSD, DBD, MOE, GDANPC, MAFF, Provincial level sector and administrative entities, local communities and civil society organizations that operate in the northern landscape. By engaging these stakeholders in gender responsive conservation and livelihood investment planning, the project will help establish alliances for conservation and sustainable use of biological resources that is expected to continue beyond the project period. Carefully tailored training and capacity building to enhance the skills of local communities in relation to sustainable forest use, SLM, ecotourism and other local producers will provide institutional sustainability. The project’s institutional arrangements will further help build coordination structures at the national and landscape level with representation from different development sectors and stakeholders (including provincial and local government entities, NGOs and private sector) to implement integrated landscape planning and to ensure that Provincial and local development plans mainstream biodiversity policies. To ensure sustainability of institutional arrangements for integrated landscape management planning and ensuring mainstreaming of biodiversity policies into socio-economic development plans, the Government of Cambodia will work towards institutionalization of these coordination mechanisms as part of its long-term strategy to streamline and support biodiversity goals. Formalization of these coordination arrangements will enable sustaining and scaling up of benefits of the project within biological landscapes in the country.

Social sustainability will be enhanced through the development/strengthening of stakeholder participation mechanisms for the target biological landscape. A Knowledge Management and Communication plan will be developed early during the project to facilitate awareness and enhance stakeholder participation. The project will ensure adequate consultation and participatory decision making to ensure that project activities are detailed in collaboration with local communities, so that extensive consultation including all affected groups is undertaken prior to delineation of areas to be set aside for conservation, so as to avoid excessive community resource use areas or to improve the management of such uses. Social sustainability will also be achieved by strengthening of community institutions (Community Forests, Community Protected Areas, Community Fisheries, Water and Agriculture User Groups, etc.), ensuring their active participation in planning and implementation of conservation and sustainable natural resources management, improving community capacity for management of natural resources and for improving grievance redressal mechanisms that will ensure social sustainability. These objectives and measures are all to be anchored in a gender responsive approach resulting from robust mainstreaming of gender in all aspects of the project cycle.

Environmental sustainability will be achieved through a coordinated approach involving improved protected area management approaches, sustainable natural resources, forest and land management, watershed and riparian area management, securing improved forest restoration and sustainable forest product use, improving incentives for conservation and community participation. It would also help reduction of external threats on PAs and wildlife through landscape level partnerships, where poaching will be controlled and improve inter-provincial collaboration. The water focus of integrated landscape management will help to mitigate climate change impacts and enhance community resilience. This work at biological landscape is aimed at ensuring environmental and socio-economic sustainability through improved institutional capacity, policies and legislation.

Potential for scaling up: The project is designed to provide demonstration models for up-scaling in Cambodia. In particular, the capacity building and the development of guidelines and regulations for each aspect of the project will strongly support up-scaling. Ensuring that activities, impacts and lessons learnt from the demonstration landscape are disseminated widely helps generate a bottom-up demand for similar activities throughout the country. The Project's investment component will seek to develop synergies among rural development actors and programs with an objective of raising additional investments that will fund and expand models of resource use and alternative livelihood activities within and outside of the targeted landscape. The financial strategy plan would facilitate replication and scaling (Output 3.2) and help assess sustainable financial and institutional arrangements for scaling up, support identification of new biological landscape sites, develop a best practice manual and conduct dissemination events to encourage uptake of integrated conservation approaches in other sites. In particular, activities to be undertaken as part of the effort of scaling up include the following:

- **Develop a financial strategy** based on lessons learned at the field level that will ensure that the integrated management planning approach and models developed and pilot tested in the pilot landscape is scaled up to include all other landscapes in the country. Output 3.2 would support the analysis, documentation and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned that deliver tangible improvements in biodiversity, watersheds and natural resources status to provide examples for replication. It would also entail participation in regional workshops and best practice sharing events to improve learning and exchange of experiences in mainstreaming biodiversity considerations, and integrated water management

planning and practices. Based on these best practices and lessons, the financial strategy will provide a basis for actions at other key landscapes, identify required institutional and coordination arrangements resources and partnership commitments (including with NGOs), select interventions and potential sites for replication by the fifth year of the project.

- **Annual seminars** for key staff and decision makers on best practices, experiences and needs;
- **Financial mechanisms** identified to strengthen and upscale financial support to conservation and sustainable land use/natural resource management in landscape
- **Publishing of best practice manuals/handbooks/compendiums** of integrated landscape management approaches; and
- **End of project national seminar** on outcomes and replication for integrated landscape approaches in Cambodia.

7) Cost efficiency and effectiveness

The project has been designed to reflect the most cost-effective approach. A number of strategies were evaluated during the project formulation stage to identify those strategies and activities that demonstrate this cost-effective approach. The cost-effective approaches that have been applied to the project are the following:

Defining a holistic approach to project formulation: The project adopts an integrated spatial approach that connects land, water, forest and productive systems and their various interactions to maximize opportunities for synergies, such that selected actions and interventions generate multiple benefits. This is to be accomplished through development and implementation of well-designed conservation actions (protected area management with defined conservation management practices, sustainable resource use areas, non-consumptive use areas, set-asides to facilitate restoration and recovery of disturbed habitats), sustainable community resource use and management and livelihood improvement measures in agriculture, tourism, small-scale enterprises, etc. and the improved management of land and forest-based activities (based on an integrated landscape conservation approach).

Sequencing of activities: Project design and sequencing of project activities ensures that foundational activities are completed first (under Outcome 1), such as (i) establishing functional governance and coordinating mechanisms at the national and sub-national levels; (ii) policy and regulatory changes for establishing integrated landscape management and clarifying institutional responsibilities for landscape planning, management and oversight; and improved policies and practices that facilitate mainstreaming biodiversity into sector and environmental planning; and (iii) capacity improvements developed to provide the necessary groundwork for later demonstration of integrated planning and management in the selected northern landscape under Outcome 2. The project includes subsequent documentation, dissemination of best practices and knowledge management in Outcome 3 to lay the ground work for scaling up of integrated planning and management landscapes in the country and feedback mechanisms to influence further policy and legislative changes, as appropriate.

Improving efficiency, effectiveness and coordination of management and enforcement actions: The effective, efficient and coordinated use of existing national, provincial, local and NGOs capacity and resources (including manpower, budgets, equipment, etc.) based on individual agency mandates. This will ensure that landscape activities are defined within

existing budgetary and institutional constraints that operate in the country and is considered a more cost- effective and sustainable strategy for management of landscapes and parts within, rather than rely on unreliable external funding that cannot be sustained beyond the project period.

Models to demonstrate benefits: Project design ensures selectivity in the identification and development of on-the-ground demonstration models (Outcome 2) focusing mainly on trialling of integrated planning and management, environmentally sustainable forest, water, riparian and land resources (including agriculture) use, livelihood best practices, trialling of community-based ecotourism best practices, so as to ensure cost-effectiveness in terms of avoiding duplication and ineffective spread of activities.

Building on existing lessons and best practices: As a measure to ensure cost-effectiveness, project design focuses on use of available resource to the extent possible building on the existing Provincial management planning approaches. Project-supported staff would work closely with Provincial level and sector staff in collaboration with local communities and local partners will make use of available information and expertise to develop plans that follow the “No Regrets” principle adopted by national policies. This results in plans that have higher levels of participation and buy-in. While the plans may look simpler, it is more likely to be accepted and implemented by local communities. It would also build and replicate lessons from on-going and other national initiatives.

Data management systems: The project will focus on the development of standardized but simple information collection and databases at landscape level coupled with the use of remote sensing in combination with ground-truthing methods. The Knowledge Management and Communication Strategy in particular makes use of free and widely available forms of communication in the country.

Co-financing: The total GEF investment of US\$ 3,340,320 for this project will leverage a minimum of US\$ 8,461,060 in cofinancing with additional associated financing inputs anticipated during project implementation.

A.2. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

A.3. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

Wide range of consultations with stakeholders have been conducted during the PPG stage. Initial stakeholder analysis during the PIF stage was followed up with consultation during the PPG stage in terms of the design of the project. During the PPG stage, the stakeholder analysis was updated and elaborated following consultations undertaken by international and national consultants at the landscape sites and with the provincial and municipal governments addressing both institutional stakeholders in the context of their

statutory involvement in the project, and more broadly for non-governmental stakeholders including natural resource-dependent communities. Field level stakeholder consultations were conducted to obtain the perspective of the different stakeholders during the period August through September 2018. A number of bilateral meetings with future partners were also conducted. An Inception Workshop was conducted on August 15, 2018 and a Validation workshop in January 10, 2019, in Phnom Penh to discuss the project design and reach general consensus on project outcomes, outputs, activities and institutional arrangements for the project.

The purpose of the Stakeholder Involvement Plan (SIP) for the project is to ensure long-term sustainability of the project achievements, based on transparency and the effective participation of the key stakeholders. The objectives include the following: (a) to identify the main stakeholders of the project and their basic roles and responsibilities in relation to the project; and (b) to take advantage of the experience and skills of the main stakeholders, safeguard their active participation in different activities, reduce obstacles in project implementation, and sustain gains after project completion. The approach is based on the principles of fairness and transparency in selection of stakeholders, ensuring consultation, engagement and empowerment of relevant stakeholders. This is to ensure: (i) better coordination between them from planning to monitoring and assessment of project interventions; (ii) access of information and results to relevant persons; (iii) accountability of stakeholders; (iv) implementation of grievance and redress mechanism; and (v) sustainability of project interventions after its completion.

Stakeholder involvement will enhance the planning and management of northern landscape in Cambodia. Stakeholder engagement will secure the conservation of globally and nationally important biodiversity within the northern landscape, and mainstream biodiversity and sustainable natural resource use in socio-economic activities. MOE will be responsible in ensuring that collaborative links will be established with other national and provincial governments, NGOs and local communities, while local governments will coordinate with sector and local level stakeholders. The Project may solicit the services of NGOs to implement project activities.

In terms of IPs, engagement with IPs will focus on application of principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) principles. In particular efforts would be made to: (i) improve IP participation and decision making; (ii) empower and gender sensitize tribal leaders and men so as to ensure that women have a voice in decision making; (iii) support efforts at improving land security; (iv) improve quality of life, food security and sustainable livelihoods; (v) facilitate strengthening of tribal governance; and (vi) improve IP capacity and skills, etc.

Annex 5 of the UNDP Project Document provides a detailed stakeholder engagement plan and defines the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders, including IPs.

Documents

Title**Submitted**

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only; Yes

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor; Yes

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body; Yes

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

This project recognizes that men and women in Cambodia play different roles in managing natural resources. While, women and men possess different knowledge(s) and transmit it in various ways due to their respective roles and responsibilities in the private and public spheres, women both historically and currently are primarily responsible for food preparation and distribution and for ensuring the short and long-term health of the family and community. Women have a greater knowledge of the flora and fauna surrounding them and play very important roles in biodiversity conservation sectors, for example, for daily livelihood, women play significant role in preserving and maintaining the generic diversity of plant species as result of selection preference based on food habits, food culture, taste, nutrition, and the health benefits of different species. However, it has frequently been considered a sector dominated by men, making it difficult for women's participation on access to natural resources and benefits arising from these resources. Men have better access to and control of forest products and agricultural machinery including access to and control of Renewable Natural Resources (RNR) training and, extension services. However, men and women have equal access to and control over agriculture, labour, credits (loans), health and, education services. With regard to livestock benefits, women have

better access to and control over men. The benefits accrued from agriculture and, forestry activities were equally shared between men and women, while benefits from an off-farm contract, business and farm labour accrued more to men.

Indigenous women in Cambodia are highly knowledgeable about biodiversity as it relates to plants, wildlife and other natural resources that may have nutritional or medicinal value. In Mountainous regions, women and forest are strongly connected with one another because women, especially those residing in forest have a deep connection with the forest ecology since they are in charge of collection water, as well as food, fuel, fodder leaves for their family. Thus, women immediately perform a significant part in the protection of the forest that will be quite critical to the achievement of the preservation plan in addition to using forest resources. The cultural and culinary practices of indigenous and smallholder farmers play a significant role in preserving and maintaining the generic diversity of plant species as result of selection preferences based on food habits, food culture, taste, nutrition, and the health benefits of different species

In general, most people in the communities, especially women and elderly women, do not have a solid understanding of ways and means of managing natural resources more sustainably, they do, however, have a sense that business patterns are changing, affecting their forest resource collection/harvesting yields and resulting in more difficult living conditions for their families. Almost all of women in Cambodia as well as in each community have no conceptual understanding of how to deal with fair or equity benefit sharing, particularly with respects to their livelihoods and development. The government has observed that women and men do not have a good understanding on the sustainable utilization of a natural and genetic resource, consequently, within their communities, there is lack of understanding of sustainable harvesting techniques and its use. This is further aggravated by the lack of proper capacity development programs. Consequently, this has resulted in inappropriate use of natural resources and the gradual depletion of biodiversity. For more detailed information on gender relationships in Cambodia refer Annex 6 of UNDP Project Document.

The government recognizes that the main considerations for ensuring gender equality are the following:

- Ensuring women's representation and participation in natural resources management sectors;
- Creating enabling conditions for women's participation;
- Enhancing women's capacity to participate in decision-making processes; and
- Maintaining gender disaggregated records to enable monitoring of policies and projects to ensure women's inclusion.

The project will actively seek the support of the Ministry of Women's Affairs (MWA) to ensure that gender equality is central to the definition of policies, legislation, guidelines and practices relating to INRM in the country. All documents produced through the project will be reviewed by MWA to ensure that gender aspects are well integrated and that such new policies and plans will adequately benefit women. In addition, at the national level the project will provide equal opportunity to both male and female policy makers, decision makers, and managers of the central institutions to participate in matters relating to INRM. At provincial level, the women will be encouraged to participate in discussions relating to INRM matters and in participating in training, awareness raising and education activities. A gender-balanced involvement of participants in relevant activities including advocacy, capacity building and consultation will be promoted. During project implementation, consultation and capacity building activity planning will be specifically focused on ensuring that women are actively engaged in all aspects of policy, legislative, and skills development. Specific efforts would be made to seek the advise and guidance of the Ministry of Women's Affairs to help integrate gender equality into policies and programs, including enhancing education and awareness of gender concerns. During implementation, MWA will be actively engaged to support gender mainstreaming in project related activities.

Annex 6 of the UNDP Project Document provides a gender analysis and mainstreaming action plan.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;
improving women's participation and decision making; and or
generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? (yes)

Documents

Title

Submitted

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

If yes, please upload document or equivalent here

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

A.5. Risks

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.

As per standard UNDP requirements, the Project Manager will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability are high (i.e. when impact is rated as 5, and when probability is rated as 4 and probability is rated at 3 or higher). Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.

Table 2: Project Risk and Mitigation Matrix

Project risks					
Description	Type	Impact, Probability and Risk Level	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
General Risks					
Risk 1: Limited capacity of sub-national authorities in the implementation of integrated landscape management	Institutional	Moderate P=3; I =3	Component 1 will include capacity development activities for national and sub-national authorities on IEM planning, sustainable NRM management, integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in sub-national planning. The project will establish database/system on watershed management plan for informing planning process of the sub-national authorities. The project will identify successful experience of sub-national authorities' role on landscape management from in and out of the country.	Project Director (PD)	Implementation

<p>Risk 2: Relevant government agencies at the national and provincial levels may be reluctant to promote conservation-oriented financial reforms for a fear of losing other short term economic development revenues</p>	<p>Institutional</p>	<p>Moderate P=2; I=3</p>	<p>The project will work closely with relevant government agencies. The project aims to influence the national development and fiscal development planning process. An assessment of ecosystem functions and its value (economic valuation) will be conducted to inform the national and sub-national authorities. Participatory planning at the local level will serve as a platform for development plans that integrate conservation priorities. It will be critical to capture the potential of ecosystem markets. The pilot project will develop necessary capacity and tools for mainstreaming biodiversity into a National Policy.</p>	<p>PD</p>	<p>Implementation</p>
<p>Risk 3: The Siem Reap Water Supply Authority may be reluctant to collaborate, fearing loss of business revenue.</p>	<p>Institutional</p>	<p>Low P=2, I =2</p>	<p>The project will work towards developing capacity of local government officials and stakeholders in different sectors integrating ecosystem services into local land-use and development planning. The emphasis will be that the interventions will be essential for achieving long-term sustainable, inclusive and equitable development, thereby making good business sense. The project will support development and application of a range of tools. Targeted ecosystem valuation work will be conducted, including targeted scenario as appropriate. The process will be done with full participation of stakeholders in government, non-government and the private sector, fostering understanding of the need for and benefit from striking the right balance between development and safeguarding the environment. An effective communication strategy and stakeholder involvement plan will be developed and implemented in view of increasing stakeholder support.</p>	<p>PD</p>	<p>Preparation and Implementation</p>
<p>Social and Environmental Risks</p>					

<p>Risk 4: Duty bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations and right holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights.</p>	<p>Institutional</p>	<p>Moderate I = 3; P = 3</p>	<p>A capacity needs assessment will be undertaken early in the project to define training needs and additional skills required to implementation of the project. Training will focus on key ministries including integrated natural resources planning and management approaches. Technical advice, extension services and direct learning by doing support from specialists within the relevant agencies (including external technical support) combined with demonstrations to promote adoption of sustainable practices within the target landscape to enhance capacity and participation of duty bearers and right holders. The project will seek to affirm the significance of local communities including indigenous people by facilitating their engagement through appropriate modalities, building their capacity and awareness for implementation of sustainable natural resources and livelihood strategies.</p>	<p>PD</p>	<p>Implementation</p>
---	----------------------	----------------------------------	---	-----------	-----------------------

<p>Risk 5: The project potentially would reproduce discrimination against women based on gender, and limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources.</p>	<p>Social</p>	<p>Moderate I = 3; P = 3</p>	<p>The application of the “<i>Gender Analysis and Mainstreaming Action Plan</i>” prepared during the PPG stage (Annex 6 of UNDP Project Document) will ensure that the project contributes to gender equality and creates equitable opportunities for women and men at all levels of engagement. The project will promote equal representation of women in project related decisions in communities, use of a gender and socially inclusive lens to every project activity and output to further analyze impacts on the rights of women and vulnerable peoples; support special investments based on women’s requirements to ensure that they adequately benefit from project investments; use of the monitoring plan (RAF) with gender responsive indicators to access gender dimensions; training and capacity building to enhance gender and socially responsive knowledge at all levels of the project cycle and within the institutions; and oversight provided by the Ministry of Women’s Affairs to ensure appropriate mainstreaming of gender issues.</p>	<p>PD</p>	<p>Implementation</p>
--	---------------	----------------------------------	---	-----------	-----------------------

<p>Risk 6: Project activities to ensure conservation and sustainable natural resource use (including the cultivation of orchid species as a livelihood measure) could have unintended negative consequences on endangered species or critical habitats if not planned or implemented correctly (including insufficient enforcement of protected area management rules).</p>	<p>Environment</p>	<p>Moderate I = 2; P = 3</p>	<p>Project impacts are to be managed through ensuring that selection of investment sites will follow extensive biological mapping so as to conform to project's objective of 'enhancing the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services'; all community agriculture, productive and livelihood activities will take place within community lands and no new areas within the PAs are proposed for such activities; any interventions on community lands would take place following application of FPIC processes and protocols, appropriate zoning of the PAs to ensure that biodiversity areas are conserved with minimum interference; use of screening checklist (based on SESP for project investments to screen all investments to ensure that they comply with sound social and environmental principles; the planning process for PA management will entail establishing specific rules and regulations for location and nature of sustainable natural resources harvest and use and livelihood activities and supported by community capacity building efforts for implementation and enforcement of these management plans; community investments will include specific reciprocal commitments by local communities for voluntary compliance and support for conservation action; implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan; and activities in PAs will be carried out with the aim of better management, higher chances of sustainability, biodiversity protection and protection of ecosystem services. Specific emphasis will be placed on integrating and supporting the Community Protected Areas as part of sustainable land management. In terms of the promotion of orchid cultivation for livelihoods that might have negative impacts on wild harvesting, the project will institute the following measures: (i) identification of habitats within PAs for priority conservation and ecological restoration; (ii) concerted monitoring and enforcement, concurrently with strengthening pathways for sustainable legal trade; (iii) propagation and cultivation by small community enterprises to ensure wild populations are not negatively impacted; (iv) licensing orchid cultivation through certification procedures to minimize risk of wild</p>	<p>PD</p>	<p>Implementation</p>
--	--------------------	----------------------------------	---	-----------	-----------------------

<p>Risk 7: The potential outcomes of the Project will be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?</p>	<p>Environment</p>	<p>Moderate I=3; P=3</p>	<p>Climate change impacts on the project outcomes and interventions were factored in during the project design with emphasis on catchment and riparian management across the landscape will support climate change mitigation through flood and drought reduction in target areas. At the local level, the project will support measures for management of climate related risks including: (i) participatory community risk assessment (including climate change); (ii) strengthening of sustainable and other conservation practices will enhance protection of ecosystem services; (iii) monitoring plan to ensure that the health of the eco-system is kept in focus and (iv) the knowledge management and communication strategy activities will help raise public awareness and involvement in climate smart actions.</p>	<p>PD</p>	<p>Implementation</p>
<p>Risk 8: the proposed project may result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture.</p>	<p>Socio-cultural</p>	<p>Low I=2; P =2</p>	<p>The risk will be managed through following measures. The Ministry of Environment Heritage Department will work closely with the APSARA Authority to propose similar heritage zones similar to those already used in Phnom Kulen National Park. The effective use of the grievance redressal system Section IV, Part iv of UNDP Project Document) to address these specific concerns. The use of a screening checklist based on SESP (Annex 4 of UNDP Project Document) to screen all investments from an environmental, social and cultural perspective. Any project related economic development initiatives proposed by communities will rest on the maintenance of the integrity of their cultures, traditions, religious values, for example, in agricultural practices, eco-tourism, etc. and provisions made for the documentation by IP cultural practices to enhance biodiversity conservation after FPIC.</p>	<p>PD</p>	<p>Implementation</p>

<p>Risk 9: It is likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples. Consequently, it is possible that the project can affect land tenure arrangements and customary rights</p>	<p>Social</p>	<p>Moderate I = 3; P = 3</p>	<p>The project will not entail any restrictions on the current practices of the IPs, and any new investments in agriculture, sustainable natural resources activities and livelihoods will only be defined following FPIC protocols. During the participatory investment planning process, the project will support community decision making on their priorities and needs, rather than have any new practices imposed. The project will use the screening checklist defined through the SESP to ensure that any new investments or improvement in existing practices of IPs are socially and environmentally sound. The project will work with IPs to identify their specific needs and assess any issues related to land, community forestry, etc. Any unexpected restriction in resource access (although not a design aspect) will be compensated by the preparation and implementation of a livelihood plan to replace any lost incomes. The project design will further incorporate the need for FPIC and develop an IP plan in Year 1 of the project.</p>	<p>PD</p>	<p>Implementation</p>
---	---------------	----------------------------------	---	-----------	-----------------------

<p>Risk 10: Improved zoning of the corridors for multiple different uses, community human rights, including access may be restricted in PAs and surrounding lands. This will include indigenous communities living in this area</p>	<p>Social</p>	<p>Moderate I = 3; P = 3</p>	<p>This risk will be managed by applying the framework for INRM to ensure that project activities are detailed in collaboration with Provincial and local governments and local communities, to delineate areas to be set aside in a manner to avoid limitations on existing community resource use rights and access. The establishment of KBAs, HCVFs that will be planned and managed under community governance mechanisms will take into consideration current uses of these resources. The use of the screening checklist for project investments to ensure that investments comply with sound social and environmental principles and ensure avoidance of restriction in access to the extent feasible. Decisions regarding restrictions, if any, on resource use will not be imposed, but will involve through an informed, transparent and consultative community consensus building process (refer Annex 8), and any restrictions, if any will be adequately compensated to match or exceed loss of incomes or livelihoods. An alternative livelihood development plan will be prepared early in project implementation (Year 1) for any households that are likely to be denied access to resources or current livelihood practice and application of the project grievance redressal mechanism to address any specific community concerns.</p>	<p>PD</p>	<p>Implementation</p>
--	---------------	----------------------------------	--	-----------	-----------------------

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the Institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

The project will be implemented following UNDP's national implementation modality, according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Cambodia, and the Country Program.

The **Implementing Partner** for this project is the General Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development (GSSD/NCSD). The Implementing Partner is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.

The **Project Board** (PB) The Project will provide overall direction and oversight in the delivery of project outcomes. The PB will be chaired by GSSD/NCSD and include the DBD/GSSD, Executive Secretary/MAFF, DGANCP/MOE, GDLC/MOE, MOWRAM, Representatives from Provincial Adminstration and Provincial Departments of Environment, UNDP, and NGOs such as ADF, WCS, IUCN and Live and Learn.

The PB shall perform the following tasks: (i) formulate and submit overall plan and annual plans for the project implementation; (ii) prepare and carry out the actual project implementation; (iii) carry out activities related to bidding, contract management; (iv) budget management, perform financial and asset management of the project; (v) monitor and assess the implementation of the project activities; (vi) prepare the acceptance and transfer of the results of the project after completion, finish audit works, transfer assets of the project, prepare the terminal report and financial statement of the project, follow regulations on project closeout as per UNDP-GEF procedures.

Project Director: PD is the designated representative of NCSD. He/she will head the PMU and will be accountable to GSSD/NCSD for the use of project resources and to deliver on outcomes. The PD will manage the implementation of all project activities and will work closely with all partner institutions to link the project with complementary national programs and initiatives. The PD is accountable to the PB for the quality, timeliness, and effectiveness of the project intervention implementation, as well as for the use of resources. The PD will be technically supported by contracted national and international consultants and service providers. Recruitment of specialist services for the project will be done by the PD, in consultation with UNDP and NCSD. The NPD will not be paid by the project, but will represent a government in kind contribution to the project.

Project Coordinator (PC): will be assigned with responsibility to support PD in technical aspects of the project, provide direct guidance to project management unit to achieve project results/targets. .

Project Management Unit (NPMU) consisting of a Project Director, Project Coordinator, Communication Officer, M&E Officer, Finance Officer and an Administrative Officer. This team will assist the PB to run the project on a day-to-day basis. The functioning of PMU will end when the final project Terminal Evaluation report and corresponding management response, and other documentation required by the GEF and UNDP, has been completed and submitted to UNDP (including operational closure of the project).

Project Assurance will be undertaken by the UNDP Program Officer responsible for the project based in the UNDP CO. The UNDP Program Officer will also act as a focal point of UNDP CO in facilitating and monitoring the project implementation. He/she will maintain a continuous partnership with the project team and participate in all project reviews, work/budget planning meetings, monitoring visits and evaluations. She/he will certify the annual and quarterly work-plan/budgets/progress reports, as well as proposed use of unspecified budget within the annual budget already approved for the project.

Coordination with other projects: The proposed project will coordinate with several government programs and specific projects associated with it to generate positive results through combined action (where appropriate) and to share lessons learned and best practices. The key national environment and natural resources management agencies whose programs will be coordinated with the project include the NCSD, MOE, GDANCP, MAFF and Provincial entities. These are detailed in Section VIII (Governance and Management Arrangements and in Annex 3 of the UNDP Project Document.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

The socio-economic benefits of the project will be seen at the individual as well as collective community level which means that changes at the household level and also in economic groups such as self-help groups, producer groups and cooperatives will be there in the following manner:

- At least 5,000 persons in the northern landscape will directly benefit through improved livelihoods and incomes, of which an estimated 30% will comprise of women;
- Implementation of integrated ecosystem management strategies and mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in sectoral and national, provincial economic development planning will result into improved and sustainable agriculture, better water conservation and management and improved livelihood and value chain products and services. This will collectively result in better conservation and livelihoods outcomes;
- Improved access to basic goods and technical services, technology and improved agricultural, forestry and tourism practices - diversification of livelihoods in agriculture and non-farm sector including tourism and agri-based products will ensure more livelihood options and better prices and income.
- An increase in community incomes from sustainable livelihood activities (calculated for each community) of around 15% wherein around 50% of beneficiaries will be women;
- The focus on addressing gender inequality wherein various initiatives such as technological interventions for drudgery reduction in livelihood and household based activities, promotion of alternative livelihood options, participation of women in various local conservation committees are proposed. The project envisages more gender equality in context of sex ratio, decision making powers, ownership and control of resources, reduction in drudgery as well as working hours of women and women leadership as well as participation.;
- A reduction in the natural resource conflicts and increase in effective implementation of sustainable practices. There will be at least 10 such additional practices that would be forthcoming from the project for potential replication within and outside the participating landscapes; and

Stable or improved populations of key endangered species in the landscapes.

A.8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate on the Knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

Knowledge management is included under Component 4, Outputs 4.1 and 4.2. A knowledge management and communication plan will be developed at the beginning of the project to achieve the overall goal of creating linkages between the stakeholders from the provincial and national level, for information, exchange of ideas and implementation of community-based conservation (including community protected areas and community forestry), sustainable land management, livelihood and tourism activities. The knowledge management and communication plan is intended to ensure that: (i) the project is well understood, accepted, and implemented effectively and equitably; (ii) knowledge and lessons learned from the implementation process of this project are captured, documented and used to improve current and future project practices; (iii) understanding of integrated ecosystem planning and management is increased; (iv) knowledge management products are disseminated and used; and (v) local communities have increased awareness of biodiversity conservation and

threats to biological resources. In addition, it will help identify promising and good practice ecosystem-based and adaptive mechanisms relevant to community-based conservation and sustainable natural resources use and help document and disseminate results of best practices to enable up-scaling to other landscapes in the country and across the region.

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

The project is aligned to the following objectives of “Rectangular Strategy” for Growth, Employment, Equity and Efficiency (Phase II): (i) ensuring an average annual economic growth of 7%. It is in line with one of the strategies namely, promotion of Agriculture Sector, which includes (i) improved productivity, diversification and commercialization and, (ii) sustainable management of natural resources. In addition, the project is in line with the National Strategic Development Plan 2013-2018 in ensuring a “balance between development and conservation”, in particular, increase the contribution of natural resources to the development of agriculture sector by ensuring: (1) green cover, forest and wildlife conservation; (2) the sustainability of fisheries resources; and (3) the sustainability of the ecosystem.

The project is designed to support the Forestry Law by striving to ensure the sustainable management of forests for social, economic and environmental benefits, including conservation of biological diversity and cultural heritage. It also promotes the objective of the Protected Area Law in ensuring the management, conservation of biodiversity, and sustainable use of the natural resources in the protected areas. The project also corresponds with the National Forestry Programme’s approach (2010-2029) in promoting holistic and cross-sectoral approaches: using landscape planning approach through collaboration with relevant government agencies, local governments, and civil society.

The project is designed in line with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and aligns with the following theme and strategic objectives^[1]:

- Theme 1 – PA system and three strategic objective (SO) namely SO 1: Strengthen the knowledge of the national protected area system for decision-making; SO 2 - Accelerate the implementation of Cambodia’s obligations in compliance with Aichi Biodiversity Target 11; SO 3- Strengthen the enabling environment.
 - Theme 2 – threatened species and its three strategic objectives.
 - Theme 3 – Environmental security and its three strategic objectives.
 - Theme 4 – sustainable land-use planning. SO 2: Integrate land-use planning in sustainable development and poverty reduction strategies, plans and programs; SO 2: Strengthen the enabling environment for the implementation of the land-use planning.
 - Theme 4 - sustainable water resources and two of its objectives.
-

- Theme 12: sustainable animal and wildlife resources management and its three strategic objectives.
- Theme 13: sustainable agriculture animal production.
- Theme 16: customary sustainable use and traditional knowledge and its three strategic objectives
- Theme 19: community participation. SO 1: Enhance effective and efficient community participation in natural resource management.

It is fully aligned with the draft National Action Programme to Combat Land Degradation in terms of increasing national agriculture productivity and poverty alleviation through adoption of Sustainable Land Management practices and improved adaptation to climate change. According to the draft NAP, there are ten critical watersheds in Cambodia. The project will cover 2 of the critical watersheds. To achieve the Land Degradation Neutrality under the UNCCD, Cambodia's NAP has identified five Strategic Objectives (SO), and the project will particularly contribute to SO#2: implementation of SLM in the critical watershed of Cambodia; SO#4: skill training on watershed management to local authorities; and SO#5: generating financial mechanism for innovative financing such as PES. Cambodia is currently in the process of setting up the national Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) baselines, targets and the progress indicators, which is expected to conclude by end of 2017. By deploying landscape planning approach, the project will support landscape survey to understand current state and trends of land degradation in the northern region. The findings of the survey will guide stakeholders to identify, set baselines and design/implement measures to avoid, restore, halt and reverse land degradation to achieve 'Neutrality' or no net degradation. Although, the project will focus on landscape level planning, the intervention will support 2-3 degraded plot sites to restore its productivity aiming to reverse degradation rate. The LDN monitoring system will be integrated with the EMIS proposed under component 3 of the project to synergize national information portal for land degradation monitoring and evaluation.

The project will further contribute to the strategic objective of the Cambodia Climate Change Strategic Plan (2014-2023) by increasing capacity of local government and communities to identify climate induced opportunities in agriculture production systems, ecosystem and nature protected areas. The national REDD+ strategy aims to arrest the current alarming rates of deforestation and forest degradation in the country to reduce GHG emissions from the forest sector. The project's activities to effectively conserve PAs and forested areas will directly contribute to the REDD+ efforts for reducing GHG emissions.

The project corresponds with the priority actions identified by the National Protected Areas Strategy and Management Plan. The project offers a unique opportunity to implement and learn from these actions for instance, through testing a landscape approach and various sustainable financing options for conservation and to scale-up these lessons to the national level PA management.

The Environment and Natural Resources Code is currently under preparation, and the code will develop overarching principles to guide existing laws and policies towards sustainable development including issues of integrated ecosystem management. The code will also clarify the jurisdictions of line ministries in order to specify the roles and mandates of different ministries in relation to particular resources. The purpose of this clarification is to ensure maximum efficiency and effectiveness of environmental governance. Importantly, the code

will develop an enabling legal framework for sustainable financing of the conservation of ecosystems and biodiversity which are increasingly at risk. The project will address priority actions through providing scientific knowledge base that would form a basis for effective and efficient governance of natural resources and through exploring conservation financing options.

Importantly, the project will also link up with Cambodia's SDGs 1, 2 and 15 as follows:

Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere

Target 1.2: By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions

Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture

Target 2.4: By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality

Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss

Target 15.1: By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements

Target 15.2: By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally

Target 15.3: By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world

Target 15.9: By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts

[1] National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, February 2016, National Council for Sustainable Development

C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:

Table 3: Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Inception Workshop	GSSD	5,000	5,000	Within two months of project document signature
Inception Report	Project Director	None	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop
Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP	UNDP Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Risk management	Project Director Country Office	None	5,000	Quarterly, annually
Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	Project Director and M&E Staff	None	10,000	Annually before PIR
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Project Director and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies	UNDP Country Office	28,000 (\$7,000/YR)	5,000	Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies
Lessons learned and knowledge generation	Project Director	64,000	20,000	Annually
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	Project Director and M&E staff UNDP Country Office	None	10,000	On-going
Stakeholder Engagement Plan	Project Director UNDP Country Office	None	10,000	On-going
Gender Action Plan	Project Director UNDP Country Office UNDP-GEF team	None	10,000	On-going

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Director UNDP Country Office	None	10,000	On-going
Project Board meetings	Project Board UNDP Country Office Project Director	10,000 (2,000/Year)	5,000	At minimum annually
Supervision missions	UNDP Country Office	None[2] ²	10,000	Annually
Oversight missions	UNDP-GEF team	None ¹¹	10,000	Troubleshooting as needed
GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits	UNDP Country Office and Project Director and UNDP- GEF team	None	None	To be determined.
Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool to be updated by	Project Director and M&E staff	None	None	Before mid-term review mission takes place.
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	25,000	5,000	Between 2 nd and 3 rd PIR.
Terminal GEF Tracking Tool to be updated by	Project Director and M&E staff	None	None	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	33,000	5,000	At least three months before operational closure
Translation of MTR and TE reports into English	UNDP Country Office	2,000	None	As required. GEF will only accept reports in English.
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses		167,000	120,000	

[1] Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.

[2] The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)**A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator	5/23/2019	Tashi Dorji, UNDP Regional Technical Specialist	+66-2-304-	tashi.dorji@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):

Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture

Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss

This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Program Document: By 2023, women and men in Cambodia, in particular the marginalized and vulnerable, live in a safer, healthier, more secure and ecologically balanced environment with improved livelihoods, and are resilient to natural and climate change related trends and shocks

This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan: IRRF Output 1.4.1: Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains

IRRF Output 2.4.1: Gender-responsive legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions strengthened, and solutions adopted, to address conservation, sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing of natural resources^[1], in line with international conventions and national legislation.

	Objective and Outcome Indicators (no more than a total of 15 -16 indicators)	Baseline^[2]	Mid-term Target^{[3]³}	End of Project Target	Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions^{[4]⁴}
--	---	-------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	--

<p>Project Objective:</p> <p><i>To promote integrated landscape management for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, natural resources and ecosystem services in the northern region of Cambodia</i></p>	<p>Indicator 1 (Ref: GEF Core Indicator 4.1):</p> <p>Area of landscape (excluding PAs) under improved practices to benefit biodiversity as measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Completion of mapping and zoning, - Establishment of landscape management strategy, and - Functioning coordination platform for decision-making and measures in place for its integrated management 	<p><i>Individual parts of landscape managed through sectoral approaches with little efforts at integration of biodiversity, ecosystem and socio-economic considerations in planning processes</i></p>	<p>- Integrated landscape management frameworks agreed among all stakeholders including specific long-term conservation outcomes to be achieved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mapping and zoning completed; - landscape management strategy 	<p><i>At least 100,000 ha (excluding PAs), but including riparian systems and agricultural and human influenced lands managed through an integrated approach with functional institutional, planning, management and monitoring systems in place</i></p>	<p>Means of verification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Government gazette notification -PA management plan -SLM plans -Community income survey reports <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Local communities, national and provincial governments understand livelihood benefits and ecological security from cooperation with and sustainable management of land, water, forest and other natural resources. Thus, they will participate in sustainable management and ecosystem restoration work. -The National and Provincial Governments consider it their priority to support integrated ecosystem management planning of its landscape and implement target oriented activities with local communities to improve conservation and sustainable use of such resources. -Provincial and local governments, CBOs, private sector and communities collaborate closely for preparation of Integrated landscape plans and approaches
	<p>Indicator 2 (Ref: GEF Core Indicator 2.3):</p> <p>Area of degraded agricultural lands under sustainable land management in production systems</p>	<p><i>Agricultural lands under continued degradation due to poor management regimes and lack of proven and cost-effective methods of use and restoration</i></p>	<p><i>At least 200 ha of degraded agricultural lands under improved rehabilitation using biodiversity-friendly restoration technologies</i></p>	<p><i>At least 1,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands, under improved rehabilitation[5]^s using biodiversity-friendly restoration technologies</i></p>	

	<p>Indicator 3: (Ref. GEF Core indicator 11): Number of direct project beneficiaries disaggregated by gender and measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Average increase in incomes of participating households from agricultural and livelihood practices 	<p><i>Baseline annual average incomes in project area assessed at US\$ 850/year/⁶ household¹⁶ from agricultural activities amongst participating households</i></p>	<p><i>Around 500 persons composed of at least 30% women with average increase in income by 5% from agricultural activities in participating households</i></p>	<p><i>At least 5,000 persons composed of at least 30% women benefiting from improved natural resources management practices, improved livelihoods and small business development with 15% average increase in incomes from agricultural activities from average baseline in participating households</i></p>	<p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Natural disaster/climate change may affect the restoration work. -Lack of capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project. -Political transitions leave plans unused. -Livelihood benefits from sustainable management may be limited and slow for communities to give up current unsustainable practices - Lack of involvement from private sector and/or resource users (including vulnerable people) with continued unsustainable practices -Conflicts over territorial issues between provincial and sector entities and local communities could undermine efforts at promoting integrated planning approaches
--	--	---	--	--	---

<p>Component 1 <i>Systemic and institutional capacity for integrated landscape management</i></p> <p>Outcome 1: <i>improved national framework and enhanced institutional capacity as foundations for an integrated landscape approach to conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of natural resources.</i></p>	<p>Indicator 4 (Ref: <i>UNDP mandatory indicator: IRRF Output 2.5 indicator 2.5.1</i>):</p> <p>Gender-responsive measures in place for conservation, sustainable use, and equitable access to and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems as indicated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Policy frameworks: (b) Legal and regulatory frameworks: and (c) Institutional frameworks 	<p><i>Specific, targeted integrated biodiversity management planning and management regulations, guidelines and policies largely absent or rudimentary</i></p>	<p><i>Policy, legal and regulatory and institutional frameworks for integrated planning and management</i></p> <p><i>clarifying integrated NR planning for mainstreaming biodiversity in sectoral and local planning systems drafted and under review by National Assembly</i></p>	<p><i>At least six instruments</i>⁷ <i>Policy, legal and regulatory and institutional frameworks</i>⁸</p>	<p>Means of verification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Government gazette notifications -Government or sector administrative orders -Official release of guideline notices and guideline documents -Updated UNDP capacity development scorecard -Monitoring reports <p>Assumption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The national government will develop appropriate legislative, policy, institutional and technical measures informed by gender analysis that facilitate integrated landscape planning and management in a timely manner. -Development strategies and landscape management strategies and plans will be officially endorsed by provincial governments with allocation of appropriate staff and funding for their implementation -The Provincial Governments will
--	--	--	--	---	--

	<p>Indicator 5: Level of institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring integrated landscape management planning as measured by UNDP's capacity development scorecard comprising following agencies:</p> <p>NCSD, DBD, MOE, MAFF and GDANPC</p>	<p><i>Limited institutional for planning, implementation and monitoring of multiple use integrated planning and management in landscapes as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard baseline values of 19</i></p>	<p><i>Increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 5 point increase in UNDP National Capacity Development Scorecard baseline value</i></p>	<p><i>Increase of institutional capacity as measured by at least a 12 point increase in UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard of baseline values</i></p>	<p><i>take active part in developing the strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project</i></p> <p><i>-Local communities are convinced mainstreaming biodiversity and gender into key development sectors is in their long-term interests</i></p> <p>Risks:</p> <p><i>-Priorities of Provincial and Sector agencies and local communities might shift if development benefits take long to manifest</i></p>
--	--	---	---	--	--

	<p>Indicator 6: Number of regional, provincial and local partners adopting the ILM framework to mainstream biodiversity into their planning systems as indicated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) INRM guidelines adopted (b) Regional and local plans mainstreaming INRM and Biodiversity (c) Sectoral partnerships established for collaborative and integrated planning and management 	<p><i>Limited engagement of multiple partners mainstreaming biodiversity consideration into their planning systems</i></p>	<p><i>INRM Guidelines to facilitate increased engagement of partners in biodiversity mainstreaming into sub-national planning systems developed</i></p>	<p><i>Fully integrated partner engagement for promotion of through ILM framework functional (as measured by (i) at least five sectors and institutions engaged; (ii) at least 5 guidelines/protocols actively applied; (iii) multi-sector and multi-stakeholder participation in annual work planning at least in two provinces; (iv) three tiered mechanisms for resolution of sectoral conflicts applied; and (v) annual sharing and dissemination of information amongst sectors and stakeholders</i></p>	<p>Data Collection Methods: Project progress reports INRM Meeting notes</p> <p>Assumption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Political will to support engagement of multiple partners in Integrated land Management. -The national government will develop appropriate legislative, policy, institutional and technical measures that facilitate integrated local planning and management in a timely manner. -Partners will take active part in developing strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project -Plans and actions approved but not resourced. <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Confusion and conflict over roles and responsibilities -Priorities of partners might shift if development benefits take long to manifest -Planning bodies that build capacity may not be adequately motivated to be engaged for change
--	---	--	---	--	---

<p>Component 2</p> <p>Effective integration of PAs and surrounding riparian areas and multiple use production landscapes in Northern Cambodia</p>	<p>Indicator 7: (Ref: GEF Core Indicator 1.2): Terrestrial PAs under improved management effectiveness as measured by METT scorecard for following PAs:</p> <p>1. KPWS 2. PKNP 3. Angkor</p>	<p>Baseline METT scores: KPWS : 33 PKNP : 32 Angkor PL: 59</p>	<p>Average increase by at least 10 points in METT for the PAs</p>	<p>Average increase by at least 20 points in METT from current baselines for the PAs covering 450,673 ha</p>	<p><u>Means of verification:</u> -Updated METT Tracking Tools -CPA and CF co-management plans Co-management MOAs -Project progress reports -Annual work plans and budget reports <u>Assumption:</u> -Development strategies and management plans will be officially approved by Sector agencies and Provincial governments with allocation of appropriate funding for their implementation</p>
	<p>Indicator 8: Community-based NRM initiated and operational as indicated/measured by:</p> <p>Extent of Community Protected Areas (CPAs) and of Community Forests (CFs) established with (i) management plans including renewal of existing CPAs, and (ii) MOAs for co-management signed and under community management with budgetary allocations for implementation</p>	<p>Current CPA and CFs under co-management not fully effective due to lack of capacity, resources and extension support</p>	<p>All existing CPAs and CFs mapped, management effectiveness evaluated and proposals for improving conservation and sustainable NRM defined and agreed with communities</p>	<p>At least 1,500 ha of CPAs and CFs under improved management as measured by (i) updated management plans; (ii) revised MOAs that clearly define conservation commitments; (iii) monitoring systems in place to evaluate management effectiveness; (vi) communities trained in natural resources management actions; (v) appropriate budgets allocated for implementation of management plans, etc.</p>	<p><u>Risk:</u> -Administrative/political changes may undermine the implementation of the management plan strategies -Lack of capacity in government and communities to meet obligations related to project -Conflicts between Provincial and sector entities and local communities regarding management and access to natural resources may undermine integrated planning approaches</p>

	<p>Indicator 9: Status of key species in the northern landscape as measured by increased number of nests protected and success rate over baseline values for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Sarus Crane (ii) Giant Ibis (iii) Lesser adjutant <p><u>Note:</u> The greater the rate of success of nest protected, the greater the possibility of chicks hatched as validated from data collected in 2008-2009 study as follows: (Sirus Crane 57 nests protected with 90 chicks hatched; Giant Ibis a10 nests protected with 17 chicks hatched and Lesser adjutant with 261 nests protected and 489 chicks hatched)[9]⁹</p>	<p><i>Current baselines of success rates of protected nests (Sarus Crane 87% based on 96 nests protected; Giant Ibis 86.7% based on 60 nests protected and Lesser adjutant 94.4% based on 431 nests protected)[10]¹⁰. Key species nesting and success rates validated in Year 1 and monitored annually or bi-annually in defined locations</i></p>	<p><i>30% Increase in number of nests protected and success rate stable or increasing from validated baselines</i></p>	<p><i>100% Increase in number of nests protected and success rate stable or increasing from validated baselines</i></p>	<p>Means of verification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Nesting and survival monitoring reports <p>Assumption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Adequate technical capacity available for undertaking monitoring species populations -Wildlife populations are declining because of hunting, and improved enforcement will help increase population -Adequate incentives to enable local communities to take conservation actions to protect nests <p>Risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -External factors beyond the control of the project (e.g. climate change) might effect bird populations negatively
--	---	---	--	---	--

	<p>Indicator 10: Reduction in soil loss and run-off based on erosion/run-off plots for various SLM practices under different climatic, topographic and soil conditions in MT/ha/yr. [11]¹¹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 	<p>No specific information available of erosion and run-off rates for a variety of existing agricultural and land practices in different climatic, topographic and soil types.</p> <p>Baselines for current erosion rates under selected existing land practices to be measured in Year 1</p>	<p>Establishment of erosion/run-off plots under various SLM practices (along with control plots) to define erosion and run-off rates</p>	<p>At least an average of 30% reduction in erosion and run-off rates under different SLM practices in different climatic, topographic and soil types</p>	<p><u>Means of verification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Erosion and run-off measurement reports <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Adequate technical capacity to establish and effective monitoring plots for measuring erosion/run-off rates -Capacity to design and select appropriate and varied sites for establishing monitoring plots to capture landscape diversity -Adequate community commitment to monitoring <p><u>Risks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Catastrophic events (flooding, landslides, etc.) can undermine the credibility of the monitoring events
--	--	---	--	--	--

	<p>Indicator 11: Number of local plans that mainstream objectives of integrated landscape management (IEM) frameworks as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commune Development Plans; 2. Commune investment Plans, 3. District Development Plans and 4. District Investment Plans 	<p><i>Commune Development Plans, Commune Investments Plans, District Development Plans and District Investment Plans have limited attention to mainstreaming biodiversity consideration into their planning systems</i></p>	<p><i>Guidelines, regulations and frameworks and capacity improvements being undertaken to facilitate biodiversity mainstreaming into sub-national planning systems</i></p>	<p><i>At least 4 Commune Development and Commune Investment Plans and at least 4 District Development Plans and District Investment Plans fully integrate biodiversity considerations from ILM framework within the project landscape</i></p>	<p>Data Collection Methods: Project progress reports District and Commune development and investment plans</p> <p>Assumption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The national government will develop appropriate legislative, policy, institutional and technical measures that facilitate integrated local planning and management in a timely manner. -Development strategies and management plans will be officially approved by provincial and local governments with allocation of appropriate staff and funding for implementation -The local government will take active part in developing strategies and implementation using new knowledge and skills provided by the project <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Priorities of provincial and local governments might shift if development benefits take long to manifest - Plans are developed but not used, particularly by resource users - Planning bodies that build capacity may not be adequately motivated for change
--	---	---	---	---	---

<p>Component 3</p> <p><i>Knowledge management, gender mainstreaming, learning and M&E</i></p>	<p><i>Indicator 12:</i> Increase in level of knowledge (disaggregated by gender) on INRM approaches as defined by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Number of community members trained and adopting new technologies, practices, etc. (b) Communication strategy and action plan developed and effectively implemented; and (c) KAP survey to test knowledge and awareness of targeted groups. 	<p><i>Coordinated outreach on conservation threats lacking. Limited awareness of impact unplanned development among general public. Baseline survey established in Year 1 after KAP survey</i></p>	<p><i>At least 200 community members trained in relevant INRM approaches and 50% effectively applying these measures (at least 30% women)</i></p>	<p><i>At least 1,000 community members trained in relevant INRM approaches and 50% effectively applying these measures (at least 30% women)</i></p>	<p><i>Means of verification:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -KAP surveys - KM documents, best practice documents, proceedings of dissemination events and implementation reports <i>Assumption:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Stakeholders willing to actively participate in the review process. -Project management will be able to identify, document and disseminate the best practices -Mid Term Review and End of Project Evaluation of the project will also contribute to identifying the best practices -Best practices from sustainable resource management readily available to resource users <p><i>Risks:</i></p> </p>
---	---	--	---	---	---

	<p>Indicator 13: Number of knowledge products that reflects best practices and lessons learned available including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Newsletters and media events (b) Case studies disseminated (c) Number of policy guidance notes (d) Technical reports, publications and other KM products (e) Number of local workshops held to facilitate dissemination of field lessons (f) Inclusion of public engagement pages on national and sub-national websites and social media platforms 	<p>Limited [12]¹² number of KM products on conservation and sustainable resource management codified and disseminated nationally and regionally</p>	<p>At least five additional KM products on conservation and sustainable resource management codified and disseminated nationally and regionally</p>	<p>At least twenty additional KM products on conservation and sustainable resource management codified and disseminated nationally and regionally</p>	<p>-Government priorities may change from due to political pressure from resource users -Actions among the assorted agencies and NGOs remain uncoordinated List the source of the data and explain how the</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

[1] Includes oceans and marine and freshwater ecosystems, forests, biodiversity and ecosystems, land rights, and management of chemicals and waste.

[2] Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and need to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation.

[3] Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation.

[4] Data collection methods should outline specific tools used to collect data and additional information as necessary to support monitoring. The PIR cannot be used as a source of verification.

[5] The active implementation of a number of biodiversity-friendly agricultural land restoration and livelihood options (Output 2.3)

[6] Cambodia Socio-economic survey 2017, Ministry of Planning. These figures are calculated based on riel 306,000/month from agricultural related activities. Figures are average for rural Cambodia and not specific to the project area. Actual baseline incomes in the project area will be updated/validated in Year 1.

[7] These could include: PA declaration notices clarifying institutional roles and responsibilities and zoning; revised/new Development Orders to reflect mainstreaming of biodiversity in development actions; PA regulations; Guidelines for private forests management; guidelines for biodiversity mainstreaming in mining, forestry, tourism, etc.;

[8] Specifically includes decrees, circulars or guidelines to incorporate biodiversity consideration in socio-economic development planning, mainstreaming biodiversity into tourism, agriculture, forestry and other relevant sectors, biological corridor zoning, and differentiation of EIA and BIA application in different zones of biological corridors

[9] Case study: Bird Nest Protection Program in Northern Plains of Cambodia. USAID (2009)

[10] An evaluation of effectiveness of direct payment for biodiversity conservation” The Bird Nest Protection Program in Northern Plains of Cambodia. Biological Conservation 157 (2013)

[11] The use of erosion plots (along with control plots) is intended to demonstrate to farmers the benefits of SLM on land productivity and prevention of soil loss under different climatic, terrain and soil conditions as well as to identify implementation challenges and good practices for replication. A few villages in each district will be selected for demonstration of SLM benefits. It would be difficult to develop a baseline for the entire northern landscape that required a time series data of mountain stream discharge and would be difficult to undertake. In addition, it would be difficult to quantify sediment flux due to its dependence on peak flow incidence and even if sediment flows were quantified, it will still be also challenging to attribute reduction in sediment flow in micro-watersheds to SLM activities alone

[12] Less than 5

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comment	Response	Relevant Section of UNDP Project Document and - GEF CEO ER.
Comments from GEFSEC Review (PIF STAGE)		

PROJECT DESIGN

6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?

Question 1: At CEO endorsement, please include information about how the engagement of IPs and women were ensued throughout project design and how the project will ensure inclusion at implementation

An important consideration highlighted by stakeholders during the design process was to be more focused and take more time to facilitate real stakeholder engagement in the target landscape. With a short time available in the PPG direct contact with IPs would have been rushed, and as such the team had specific dialogues with relevant stakeholders such as FAO and Archaeology and Development Foundation (ADF) already working in the landscape about Indigenous Peoples (IPs).

Importantly, the implementation phase will work with existing partners in the landscape so as to facilitate engagement of all stakeholders in the landscape. Based on the inputs of partners the implementation phase will update the stakeholder engagement plan and refine it for target audience including IPs and gender considerations.

Refer Annexes 5 and 6 of UNDP Project Document

Comments from STAP

<p>1. The importance of working across sectors and institutions is emphasized across the components. STAP encourages the project proponents to give more consideration to the design, monitoring and assessment of landscape interventions. Doing so will increase the evidence of applying spatial planning approaches at the landscape level. It also will increase understanding of how outcomes can be improved when integrating agricultural production, biodiversity conservation, and forest management. The following papers may be useful to consider when designing the project: 1) Sunderland, T., et al. (2017). "A methodological approach for assessing cross-site landscape change: Understanding socio-ecological system". Forest Policy and Economics 84 (2017) 83–91. 2) Reed, J. et al. (2016). "Integrated landscape approaches to managing social and environmental issues in the tropics: learning from the past to guide the future their progress is measured and to support indicators, so they capture measurements". Global Change Biology (2016) 22, 2540–2554, doi: 10.1111/gcb.13284</p>	<p>The project design process provided significant opportunity to work across sectors and institutions. The major considerations identified in the project design were that the scope was too ambitious and more time is needed to build real engagement from partners for integrating agricultural production, biodiversity conservation and forest management across the northern landscape. There was agreement that a focus on water would be strategic in bringing stakeholders together to consider integrated natural resource management. As an active member of the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative, the Ministry of Environment proposed the "Toolkit for the Indicators of Resilience in Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes" as a relevant tool, which will also help to engage stakeholders. The project will promote scientific cooperation and species and ecosystem assessments to define approach priorities for landscape planning</p>	<p>Refer Section III "Strategy", including "Rational for Selection of Project Area" of UNDP Project Document that discusses the design of the project that focuses on water</p>
<p>2. STAP encourages UNDP and Cambodia to define the methodology used to analyze the georeferenced data in the Environmental Information Management System (EIMS). In addition, STAP recommends describing how the remote sensing data will be validated through ground-truth methods. It also is not clear what capacity stakeholders (e.g. Ministry of Environment) have to use, manage, and maintain the EIMS. It is important to outline plans on how UNDP and Cambodia envision hosting and maintaining the platform, particularly once the project ends. It would be valuable for UNDP to discuss with Conservation International the implementation of a GEF project that uses remote sensing to monitor and assess land degradation, and ways to operationalize the platform, train GEF stakeholders, and maintenance/hosting of the platform after the project ends. More information about CI's project can be found at: https://www.conservation.org/gef/projects/Pages/NDVI.aspx</p>	<p>During the design process concerns were raised about the unsustainable nature of project level EIMS systems. Furthermore, there has previously been a lack of Government access to and ownership of project level data as it has been documented in many different formats and supplied to different agencies. There have been questions around forest clearing and land degradation rates as existing data sources are based on varying definitions and as such confuse rather than strengthen information management. The project design process engaged with existing GEF projects and identified practical lessons and potential methodologies for scaling up. The Ministry of Environment has agreed to define and adapt the methodology to strengthen and standardize internal Government information management systems.</p>	<p>Refer Section IV "Results and Partnerships" Output 3.3 in UNDP Project Document</p>

<p>3. STAP recognizes that multiple key stakeholders will be part of the project. To make effective their participation, STAP recommends developing a strategy for engaging with stakeholders, and developing governance project arrangements. This would include differentiating between the stakeholders' different roles and responsibilities during specific points in the project design and implementation: that is, asking who to engage (what unit in the Ministry of the Environment); when to engage them (e.g. for designing the theory of change); and, who should be involved in the decision-making and implementing each component. STAP is somewhat concerned that a rigorous stakeholder analysis does not appear to be included in the activities for Component 2, Outcome 03 where this understanding of the power relationships between stakeholders will be essential. Initial guidance can be found in, for example, World Bank documentation such as http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/PoliticalEconomy/PDFVersion.pdf. Useful stakeholder analysis templates are available free or commercially at modest cost.</p>	<p>A preliminary stakeholder engagement plan was developed as part of the design process, however the design process noted that participation when rushed is typically manipulation. Approaches to stakeholder engagement are changing over time and best when they are for a specific message and tailored to the specific audience. The design process therefore made a start on the process, with a strong consideration on gender inclusivity, but encourages a more gradual approach to better understand the site, audience and issues and then design a stakeholder engagement response. Under Component 2 the Ministry of Environment has agreed to conduct a full stakeholder engagement plan in Year 1 as part of the finalization of the target sites and in-line with the core message.</p>	<p>Refer Annex 5 of UNDP Project Document</p>
<p>4. For component 1.2, it is unclear whether remote sensing will be used for the landscape level analysis of ecosystems, and to obtain information on the state of forests and land degradation. STAP welcomes the use of remote sensing for this purpose in combination with ground-truth methods. For the assessment of ecosystem services, STAP recommends using the "System of Environmental-Economic Accounting" developed by the United Nations: https://seea.un.org/</p>	<p>The interpretation of remote sensing data is an important part of landscape level analysis of ecosystems, and the design process proposes the use of standardized Government remote sensing data to provide information on the state of forests and land degradation. The Ministry of Environment has agreed to review the "System of Environmental-Economic Accounting" developed by the United Nations: https://seea.un.org/.</p>	<p>Refer Section IV "Results and Partnerships" Output 2.5 in UNDP Project Document</p>
<p>5. STAP is pleased that component 4 on knowledge management will serve multiple purposes at the project level, and also contribute to Cambodia's monitoring of its land degradation neutrality targets. STAP recommends linking the EIMS platform to UNCCD's global database on land management approaches and technologies, the World Overview of Conservation Technologies (WOCAT): https://www.wocat.net/. Furthermore, STAP suggests applying the UNCCD's Scientific Conceptual Framework on Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) to assist with implementing a strategy to address land degradation and achieve LDN. The framework can be valuable for the implementation of component 2.</p>	<p>Knowledge management has been strengthened in the proposed design. The Government's Ministry of Environment has agreed to assess, adapt and apply the UNCCD's Scientific Conceptual Framework on Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) using the northern landscape as a demonstration site.</p>	<p>Refer Section IV "Results and Partnerships" Component 3 in UNDP Project Document</p>
<p>Comments from Germany</p>		
<p>Germany welcomes the proposal and underlines the STAP recommendations, especially those relating to the inclusion of a sound stakeholder analysis for Component 2</p>	<p>Refer to responses to STAP comments above</p>	<p>Refer responses above</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent to date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies & Review	65,000	49,477	15,523
Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Prodor , CEO ER, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes	32,500	24,738	7,762
Component C: Validation Workshop and Report	32,500	24,738	7,762
Total	130,000	98,953	31,047

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLows (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

Core Indicator 1		Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use				(Hectares)
		Hectares (1.1+1.2)				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 1.1	Terrestrial protected areas newly created	1,500	1,500			
Indicator 1.2	Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness	450,673	450,673			
	Sum	452,173	452,173			
Indicator 1.1	Terrestrial protected areas newly created					
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
A network of Community Protected Areas and Community Forest Areas	NA	NA	1,500	1,500		
		Sum	1,500	1,500		
Indicator 1.2	Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness					
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score		
				Baseline		Achieved
				Endorsement	MTR	TE
Kulen Promtep WS		Sanctuary	402,500	35		
Phnom Kulen NP		National Park	37,373	30		
Angkor Protected Landscape		Protected landscape	10,800	59		

	Sum	450,673				
Core Indicator 3	Area of land restored				(Hectares)	
					Hectares (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)	
					Expected	
					PIF stage	Endorsement
Indicator 3.1	Area of degraded agricultural land restored		845		1,000	
	Sum	845		1,000		
Indicator 3.1	Area of degraded agricultural land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			Sum	845	1,000	
Core Indicator 4	Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)				(Hectares)	
					Hectares (4.1+4.2+4.3+4.4)	
					Expected	
					PIF stage	Endorsement
Indicator 4.1	Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity		NA		100,000	
	Sum	NA		100,000		
Indicator 4.1	Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity					
	Landscape consisting riparian systems and agricultural and human influenced lands managed through an integrated approach		Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			NA	100,000		
Core Indicator 11	Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment				(Number)	
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			Female	NA	1,500	
			Male	NA	3,500	
			Total	NA	5,000	

ANNEX: Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

Annex F: GEF Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Influencing models			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transform policy and regulatory environments		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Convene multi-stakeholder alliances		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate innovative approaches		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deploy innovative financial instruments		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Sector		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capital providers	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial intermediaries and market facilitators	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large corporations	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SMEs	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individuals/Entrepreneurs	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Grant Pilot	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Reflow	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beneficiaries		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Communities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Society		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Based Organization	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Governmental Organization	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academia	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trade Unions and Workers Unions	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Type of Engagement		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Dissemination	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partnership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communications		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness Raising	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Education	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Campaigns	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Behavior Change	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity, Knowledge and Research			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity Development		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Generation and Exchange		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Theory of Change	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indicators to Measure Change	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Innovation		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge and Learning		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Management	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Equality			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Mainstreaming		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beneficiaries	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women groups	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex-disaggregated indicators	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender-sensitive indicators	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender results areas		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access and control over natural resources	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation and leadership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access to benefits and services	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity development	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness raising	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge generation	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focal Areas/Theme			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Integrated Programs		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Commodity Supply Chains (^{ie} Good Growth Partnership)	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodities Production
			<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Screening Tools
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Conservation Value Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Carbon Stocks Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Soybean Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Oil Palm Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Beef Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Resilience (climate and shocks)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Production Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Agroecosystems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land and Soil Health
			<input type="checkbox"/> Diversified Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Land and Water Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Small and Medium Enterprises
			<input type="checkbox"/> Crop Genetic Diversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains
			<input type="checkbox"/> Gender Dimensions
			<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-stakeholder Platforms
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Food Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Restoration
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodity Production
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Land Use Planning
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Integrated Landscapes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains
			<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Cities		
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated urban planning
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban sustainability framework
			<input type="checkbox"/> Transport and Mobility
			<input type="checkbox"/> Buildings
			<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal waste management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Green space
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Biodiversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Food Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Energy efficiency
			<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal Financing

		<input type="checkbox"/> Global Platform for Sustainable Cities
		<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Resilience
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected Areas and Landscapes	<input type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Protected Areas <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal and Marine Protected Areas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Productive Landscapes <input type="checkbox"/> Productive Seascapes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Based Natural Resource Management
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming	<input type="checkbox"/> Extractive Industries (oil, gas, mining) <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry (Including HCVF and REDD+) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tourism <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & agrobiodiversity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fisheries <input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure <input type="checkbox"/> Certification (National Standards) <input type="checkbox"/> Certification (International Standards)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Illegal Wildlife Trade <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Threatened Species <input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife for Sustainable Development <input type="checkbox"/> Crop Wild Relatives <input type="checkbox"/> Plant Genetic Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Animal Genetic Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Livestock Wild Relatives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Invasive Alien Species (IAS)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biomes	<input type="checkbox"/> Mangroves <input type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs <input type="checkbox"/> Sea Grasses <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetlands <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rivers <input type="checkbox"/> Lakes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tropical Rain Forests <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tropical Dry Forests <input type="checkbox"/> Temperate Forests <input type="checkbox"/> Grasslands <input type="checkbox"/> Paramo <input type="checkbox"/> Desert
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial and Accounting	<input type="checkbox"/> Payment for Ecosystem Services <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Trust Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Finance
	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Protocol to the CBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety <input type="checkbox"/> Access to Genetic Resources Benefit Sharing
<input type="checkbox"/> Forests	<input type="checkbox"/> Forest and Landscape Restoration	<input type="checkbox"/> REDD/REDD+
	<input type="checkbox"/> Forest	<input type="checkbox"/> Amazon <input type="checkbox"/> Congo <input type="checkbox"/> Drylands
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Land Management	

		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem Approach
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community-Based NRM
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Livelihoods
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Income Generating Activities
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Agriculture
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Pasture Management
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Forest/Woodland Management
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Fire Management
		<input type="checkbox"/> Drought Mitigation/Early Warning
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation Neutrality	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Productivity
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Cover and Land cover change
		<input type="checkbox"/> Carbon stocks above or below ground
	<input type="checkbox"/> Food Security	
<input type="checkbox"/> International Waters		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Ship	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Freshwater	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Aquifer
		<input type="checkbox"/> River Basin
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Basin
	<input type="checkbox"/> Learning	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fisheries	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances	
	<input type="checkbox"/> SIDS : Small Island Dev States	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Pollution	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics
		<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from all sectors except wastewater
		<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from Wastewater
	<input type="checkbox"/> Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan preparation	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Action Plan Implementation	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Large Marine Ecosystems	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Aquaculture	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Marine Protected Area	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Mangrove
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs
		<input type="checkbox"/> Seagrasses
		<input type="checkbox"/> Polar Ecosystems
		<input type="checkbox"/> Constructed Wetlands
<input type="checkbox"/> Chemicals and Waste		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Mercury	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Artisanal and Scale Gold Mining	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Power Plants	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Industrial Boilers	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Cement	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Ferrous Metals Production	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Ozone	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent Organic Pollutants	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sound Management of chemicals and	

			<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste	
			<input type="checkbox"/> e-Waste	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Emissions		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Disposal		
		<input type="checkbox"/> New Persistent Organic Pollutants		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Polychlorinated Biphenyls		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Eco-Efficiency		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Pesticides		
		<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Vector Management		
		<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Other		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Emissions		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Open Burning		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Best Available Technology / Best Environmental Practices		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Green Chemistry		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation		
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Least Developed Countries	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Small Island Developing States	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Disaster Risk Management	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sea-level rise	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Resilience	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate information	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem-based Adaptation	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer	
			<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Programme of Action	
			<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Plan	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming Adaptation	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Complementarity	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community-based Adaptation	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Livelihoods	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation		
			<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture, Forestry, and other Land Use	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Energy Efficiency	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Urban Systems and Transport	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Renewable Energy	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Financing	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer		
			<input type="checkbox"/> Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN)	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Endogenous technology	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Needs Assessment	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer	
		<input type="checkbox"/> United Nations Framework on Climate Change		
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nationally Determined Contribution	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance (Rio Markers)		
			<input type="checkbox"/> Paris Agreement	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Development Goals	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 1	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 2	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 1	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 2	

ANNEX G: changes to the original project concept and rationale

The Table below summarizes changes made to the Outcomes and Outputs of the original PIF and the rationale for doing so. Most of the changes are intended to provide the project with a more coherent strategy, thereby reducing its complexity, number of outputs and the scattered nature of some activities. These are discussed below:

	PIF (Original Project Concept)	GEF CEO ER (Changes)	RATIONALE
Components	Component 2: Effective management of PAs and surrounding production landscapes	Component 2: Effective management of PAs and surrounding riparian and multiple use production landscapes in Northern Cambodia	Revised to incorporate the connectivity of water through the riparian ecosystems
	Component 3: Knowledge management, learning and scaling-up	Component 3: Knowledge management, gender mainstreaming, learning and M&E	Revised to capture “gender mainstreaming” and “M&E”
Project Outcomes	Outcome 1: Improved regulatory framework and enhanced national framework and enhanced institutional capacity as foundations for an integrated landscape approach to conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of natural resources.	Outcome 1: Improved national framework and enhanced institutional capacity as foundations for an integrated landscape approach to conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of natural resources.	Slight change to replace “regulatory” framework with “national” framework since Outcome 1 entails developing the foundational activities necessary to promote INRM actions. Outcome 1 deals not only with the regulatory framework, but other national actions such as policies, governance, institutional and financial mechanisms
	Outcome 02: Selected Protected Areas managed to ensure biodiversity conservation on a sustainable basis while safeguarding livelihoods and ecosystem services Outcome 03: Land across 1,052,500 ha of forest and production landscapes in the north of Cambodia managed on a sustainable basis to enhance productivity and livelihoods and protect ecosystem services	Outcome 2: Targeted Protected Areas and their surrounding production areas effectively managed to ensure biodiversity conservation on a sustainable basis while safeguarding livelihoods and ecosystem services	This is combined as single outcome as the two Outcomes reflected in the PIF are defined through a single planning process and further demonstrate that PA management and the management of the surrounding landscape is an integral process
	Outcome 04: Replication and scaling up of the effective tools resulting from the pilot-scale application of the integrated landscape approach to biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management at national and provincial levels	Outcome 3: Knowledge management, gender mainstreaming and monitoring and evaluation contributes to identification of improved tools, approaches and best practices for replication and scaling up	Re-sequenced as Outcome 3 on account of combination of Outcomes 2 and 3 into a single Outcome 2. Slight rewording to capture title of “Component 3”

Outputs	Output 1.1 Relevant policies, legislation, procedures, guidance and national standards for sustainable land use, forests conservation and PA management reviewed, their adequacy assessed for an integrated landscape approach and amended as necessary.	Output 1.1 Policy and regulations for integrated management of landscapes developed and adopted	The Output title is made shorter, but covers all the aspects mentioned in PIF Output 1.1
	Output 1.2 Landscape-scale survey of the target areas in northern Cambodia conducted to identify/confirm state of ecosystem health, ecological values and vulnerabilities, agricultural productivity, state of forests, and degraded land that merits rehabilitation/restoration. Data to be entered in EIMS	Moved to Output 2.1: Landscape-scale mapping exercise of the target areas in northern Cambodia conducted and applied for development of an integrated management framework for the northern landscape	Shifted to Component 2 in keeping with project design strategy where Component 1 focuses on national foundational activities (policies, legislation, capacities etc.) and Component 2 of activities at the landscape level (Northern Cambodia)
	Output 1.3 Capacity of men and women from local communities (with special attention to any indigenous communities in the target areas) in the project , local government and NGOs increased to encourage participation and responsibility-sharing for participatory planning and management of natural resources (including PAs, CPAs, CFS).	Output 1.3: Capacity of key agencies and other stakeholders (with special emphasis of indigenous people and other communities) assessed and enhanced in mainstreaming of biodiversity and ecosystem services in policy, planning, management, monitoring and enforcement and enforcement	Included all capacity development activities under one Output (rather than diffusing across many outputs). Capacity of local communities and IP will be included in Outputs 2.3 and 2.4
	Output 1.4 Strengthen capacity of: 1) Ministry of the Environment (MoE) in PA planning, management, monitoring and enforcement; 2) Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) in land and forest planning, management, monitoring and enforcement.	Incorporated into Output 1.3 above	Incorporated into Output 1.3 to reduce the number of Outputs
	Output 1.5 Mechanisms, tools and guidelines developed for mainstreaming of sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation (including PAs, Biodiversity Conservation Corridors and Production Forests) into regional land use master plans.	Re-ordered as Output 1.2: Mechanisms, tools and guidelines developed for integrated natural resources management into sub-national land use master plans.	Better sequence project outputs and make it more manageable during implementation.

Output 1.6 System developed for the incorporation of INRM and landscape management in area-based planning approaches of districts and provinces with effective integration and coordination with stakeholder (communities, sectoral agencies, and private sector) within and between various levels and jurisdictions.	Moved to Output 2.1 Landscape-scale mapping exercise of the target areas in northern Cambodia conducted and applied for development of an integrated management framework for the northern landscape	Shifted to Component 2 in keeping with project design strategy where Component 1 focuses on national foundational activities (policies, legislation, capacities etc.) and Component 2 of activities at the landscape level (Northern Cambodia)
Output 1.7 Management plans for three selected pilot Protected Areas developed through a participatory approach with the dual aims of biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods of stakeholder communities.	Moved to Output 2.2 Management plans for targeted PAs developed and operationalized	Shifted to Component 2 in keeping with project design strategy where Component 1 focuses on national foundational activities (policies, legislation, capacities etc.) and Component 2 of activities at the landscape level (Northern Cambodia)
None	New Output 1.5 “Support the development of a functional governance and coordination mechanism to facilitate integrated natural resources (biodiversity and ecosystem) planning and management at the landscape level”	Added as anew Output, rather than as an activity under an output given the importance of establishing a functional multi-sectoral and multi-sector platform to ensure effective coordination and collaboration at the landscape level
Output 2.1 The adopted management plans in the selected pilot PAs covering 450,673 ha implemented through participatory approaches according to adopted zones and their respective provisions, ecosystem health targets, status of species at risk and indicator species.	Incorporated into Output 2.2 above	Done to reduce the number of Outputs and make the project more manageable
Output 2.2 Best practice financing mechanisms for PAs (such as ecotourism and others) identified and tested to move towards financial sustainability in the three selected PAs.	Moved to Output 1.4	Moved to Component 1 as this would entail certain policy and planning decisions that need to be made at the national level to support sustainable financing mechanisms in particular for the 3 target PAs, but more generally for all national PAs in the future.

Output 2.3 Community Protected Areas (CPAs) and Community Forestry (CFs) established and managed in collaboration with communities and other stakeholders including opportunities for sustainable income generation from PAs identified; equitable sharing of benefits arising from protected resources and ecosystem services ensured.	Output 2.3 Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) programs established and co-managed by communities and indigenous people	The use of CBNRM is considered more appropriate as it includes CPAs, CFs and other forms of community managed areas. The Output would result in increased income and other benefits to communities and indigenous people (and included in the RFA as an indicator) it is excluded from the title of the Output to keep title of the Output shorter
Output 2.4 The PA component of the monitoring system at local and sub-national levels established for ecosystems, biodiversity and forest to identify trends and ensure that any changes in biodiversity-important areas remain within acceptable limits	Moved as Output 2.5: The monitoring of status and trends of ecosystems, biodiversity and forest to ensure that changes remain within acceptable limits.	Moved to Output 3.3 on account of changes in Output sequencing
Output 3.1 Degraded farmland in 2-3 pilot sites[1] in the upland agricultural sector (including vegetable and fruit producers, honey, mushrooms, medicinal herbs, spices, etc) rehabilitated by farmers and others (both women and men), to restore soil fertility and move towards environmentally sound production through e.g. contour bunds, mulching, planting of riparian vegetation strips, introduction of nitrogen-fixing intercrops, conservation agriculture, integrated crop management, drip-irrigation, recycling compost and other natural fertilizer, cover crops, soil enrichment, natural pest and predator controls, bio-intensive integrated pest management and other techniques Free technical advice from extension workers combined with hands-on training and awareness programs will be designed to promote adoption of sustainable practices by the farmers. This will be identified in consultation with the farmers and stakeholders during the PPG phase.	Moved as Output 2.4: Degraded farmland identified and SLM measures to restore soil fertility and improve land productivity	Moved for sequencing purposes and simplified

	<p>Output 3.2 Sustainable productive land practices (the wildlife-friendly Ibis Rice and Sustainable Rice Platform programmes) scaled up in the targeted areas as defined in the Watershed Management Plans.</p>	Dropped	<p>The Ibis rice program is running well with support from a number of projects, including WCS, so additional support from the GEF project is not necessary. However, the GEF project will cooperate with the Ibis rice program to draw on lessons and experiences from it. Moreover during the PPG stage, other priorities actions related to landscape production were identified, for instance commercialization of Orchid, which is now recognized in Output 2.4. The project will not finance the rice platform, but will collaborate with it.</p>
	<p>Output 3.3 National and local authorities responsible for the implementation of enhanced land use plans (LUP)^[2] supported and advised so as to incorporate biodiversity conservation and ecosystem protection goals.</p>	Incorporated into Output 1.3	<p>Done to reduce the number of Outputs and make the project more manageable</p>
	<p>Output 3.4 The agricultural and forest land component of the monitoring system at local and sub-national levels established to record state and identify trends and ensure that any changes in biodiversity-important areas remain within acceptable limits</p>	Integrated into Output 2.5	<p>Done to reduce the number of Outputs and make the project more manageable</p>
	<p>Output 4.1 Conduct a Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA) on Business as usual vs sustainable ecosystem management scenarios for Tonle Sap Lake fisheries, highlighting for decision-makers the impacts of actions in surrounding watersheds. This will also include associated training of TSA to government/local institutions.</p>	Dropped	<p>The PPG team (in consultation with RGC) felt that the TSA would not necessarily be an appropriate tool to bring about a change in policy. Further, given the cost and complexity of the TSA, it was found not to be cost effective within the context of the project.</p>
	<p>Output 4.2 Regional coordination platform across the three targeted provinces strengthened to bring together government and CSOs to share lessons learnt and help establish land used planning (LUP) systems for replication. The project aims to introduce landscape planning approach based on assessment of ecosystem functions of the landscape including zoning and demarcation of the PAs.</p>	<p>Included as part of Output 3.2 “Knowledge Management and gender mainstreaming contribute to learning and facilitates replication and scaling up of integrated natural resources management approaches elsewhere in the country”</p>	<p>Done to reduce the number of Outputs and make the project more manageable</p>

Output 4.3 Pilot activities and tested approaches evaluated, verified and/or amended to serve as a platform for sharing lessons, and made available in the form of manuals and other guidance, including electronic media, for building on the enabling and foundational elements and implementing the successful approaches, instruments and tools	Included in Output 3.2 as discussed above	Done to reduce the number of Outputs and make the project more manageable
Output 4.4 Existing knowledge management tools assessed and an Environmental Information Management System (EIMS) developed and implemented to serve as an accessible repository of the information, experience, lessons and knowledge arising from the project, its pilots and tests. The system will be on a GIS platform, maintained centrally by the MoE with input from a broad catchment and wide accessibility. Its applicability will be broad and include national monitoring and reporting on progress towards MEAs and SDGs including the LDN target of UNCCD, Cambodia's NDC and the NBSAP	Covered under revised Output 3.3: "Improved and user-friendly information management system to integrate lessons from the landscapes operational"	Done to reduce the number of Outputs and make the project more manageable
Output 4.5 The criteria that will be used for the selection of future PAs, forests and productive agricultural land to which the successful products of this project will be applied, developed in collaboration with key stakeholders, including specifically women.	Covered as activity 3.2.7 under Output 3.2, namely "preparation of a replication and scaling up strategy based on project experiences and best practices for promotion of integrated landscape planning and management, including institutional, financial and resource requirements, partners and coordination arrangements"	Done to reduce the number of Outputs and make the project more manageable

LD Indicators	(i) The area of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) secured; (ii) Increase in forest cover and reduced fragmentation of forest in the targeted landscape; (iii) Livelihoods and incomes from sustainable use of forests and agricultural land (no. of beneficiaries and households to be confirmed during PPG); (iv) Increase in land area under sustainable agricultural management and climate smart-agriculture; (v) Land degradation index remains stable or improves in the targeted three watersheds from baseline”.	Retained following Indicators as per RFA Indicator 2 (Ref: GEF Core Indicator 2.3): Area of degraded agricultural lands under sustainable land management in production system Indicator 3: (Ref: GEF Core indicator 11): Number of direct project beneficiaries disaggregated by gender and measured by: (i) -Average incomes of participating households from agricultural and livelihood practices An additional LD indicator has been added as follows: Indicator 10: Reduction in soil loss and run-off based on erosion/run-off plots for various SLM practices under different climatic, topographic and soil conditions in MT/ha/yr.	In terms of the other 3 potential indicators referred to in the PIF, the PPG team felt 3 indicators related to LD was sufficient. Further, the indicator on HCVF is in some way already reflected in the improved management effectiveness and CBNRM indicators. The PIF Indicator on Increase in forest cover and reduced fragmentation is more difficult to attribute to the project that will only support limited forest restoration activities. The PIF indicator on land degradation index is more complex to reflect in terms of project impacts.
Executing Agency	Ministry of Environment	GSSD/National Council for Sustainable Development (GSSD/NCSD)	Given the nature of the project requiring coordination with multi-government agencies such as Ministries of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries (MAFF); Water Resource and Meteorology; Land Management, Urban Planning and Contraction; the NCSD has the right mandate in taking the lead in implementing to ensure that coordination. The NCSD is an inter-ministerial body in charge to sustainable development issues including biodiversity and climate change. In addition, the Minister of Environment is the chair of the NCSD, so the NCSD can provide more effective leadership and guidance during the implementation.
Co-financing	USD 10,000,000	USD 8,461,060	This figure is a more realistic estimate of co-financing that can be monitored and ensured.

[2] Is a system of designating different zones for different usage (settlement, conservation, tourism, etc.). Due to the lack of zoning and demarcation guidelines (particularly for the PAs), land conflicts are widespread in Cambodia.



Submitted to GEF Secretariat Review

[Go To Home](#)