# TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Project ID: | 9781 |
| Project Name: | Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) in the Productive, Natural and Forested Landscape of Northern Region of Cambodia |
| Countr(ies): | Cambodia |
| Implementing Agency: | UNDP |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# I. Overview

## A. Description

| | |
|---|---|
| Project name<br>Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) in the Productive, Natural and Forested Landscape of Northern Region of Cambodia | |
| Country<br>Cambodia | |
| GEF ID<br>9781 | Implementing Agency<br>UNDP |
| Executing Entity<br>Ministry of Environment | |
| Trust Fund<br>GET | Project Type<br>FSP |
| Objective<br>To promote integrated landscape management for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity natural resources and ecosystem services in the northern region of Cambodia | |

## B. Key Dates

| | |
|---|---|
| CEO Endorsement/Approval<br>6/9/2020 | Agency Approval<br>7/27/2020 |
| Implementation Start<br>7/27/2020 | First Disbursement<br>8/14/2020 |
| Expected MTR<br>9/30/2023 | MTR Submission<br>5/21/2026 |
| Actual MTR<br>10/31/2023 | Expected Completion<br>7/27/2025 |
| Actual Completion<br>8/22/2025 | Actual TE<br>6/27/2025 |
| TE Submission<br>5/21/2026 | Final Disbursement |

## C. Disbursements

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Financing<br>3,657,650.00 | Cumulative Disbursement<br>3,339,193.88 |

## II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

### A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

The project has been instrumental in bringing about several global environmental benefits, including ensuring improved management in two protected areas Kulen Promtep Wildlife Sanctuary and the Phnom Kulen National Park, totaling 491,853 ha. In addition, the project facilitated improved management in Community Protected Areas (CPA) and in Community Forests (CF) covering an area of 16,658 ha and 5,771 ha, respectively. The project also initiated a reforestation process of forest land through the re-planting of 996 ha.

More than 12,304 direct beneficiaries (52% Women) have been involved in the project, the largest proportion of which has been from the communities living in the project-engaged CPAs/CFs. Said communities have been involved in not only CPAs/CFs management planning, but also protecting and patrolling work and the undertaken reforestation efforts. Furthermore, the communities have been involved in various livelihood development initiatives in the areas of husbandry and agriculture, as well as various vocational initiatives.

The project has via its interventions supported the Sustainable Development Goals 1, 2, 5, 8, 13, and 15; the Aichi targets 5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 19; as well as Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework targets 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 14, 21, 22 and 23.

The project demonstrated a strong commitment to adaptive management and collaboration, especially in its later stages following the project's mid-term. The project, which was launched amid the COVID-19 pandemic, experienced a slow start and was unable to pick up speed until 2023. This was not only due to the negative impact of COVID-19, but also due to different and persistent management-related issues. Overall, it could be said that the project's noteworthy turnaround was expedited by the findings of the Mid-term Review (MTR), which ignited a new approach with regard to the project's implementation. Here it has to be pointed out that this was greatly facilitated by the new National Project Director, who was onboarded in December 2023), as well as the leadership change within the Ministry of Environment, following the national elections. An important adaptive management response, which was instigated after the national elections, was that UNDP and the Ministry of Environment started having regular monthly meetings, at senior/management level, that resulted in an increased level of engagement and appreciation for collaboration, something which has been further built on over time. The change process was also facilitated by that a new Project Coordinator (PC) was onboarded in June 2023 (one month prior to the MTR). It should also not be overlooked that the project's progress in part is due to the PC's ability to adjust and make decisions, as well as the ability to positively interact with the PMU team, project consultants and Letter of Agreement (LOA) Partners. The practical management level engagements between the Project Management Unit (PMU) and UNDP have also been critical in consolidating the working relationship and launching the project forward.

The project remained highly relevant throughout its duration, aligning with national policies, UNDP strategies, and international commitments. Strong stakeholder and community engagement at the local level, resulted in increased management and area protection of CPAs and CF Areas through improved patrolling and monitoring, as well as increased livelihood activities. Capacity building played a central role, with institutional strengthening efforts reaching government departments and community structures alike. This capacity development, particularly for Protected Areas staff and CPA/CF committees, is expected to sustain benefits beyond the life of the project. Community ownership and the capacity building of the communities and their governance structures have laid a solid foundation for ongoing environmental stewardship. The preparation of the Kulen Promtep Wildlife Sanctuary Management Plan and the project's work on developing Community Protected Areas management plans, of which two have been approved, were important project outputs. The approval of the two CPA management plans reflected the project's success in supporting community-based conservation. Furthermore, knowledge products produced by the project offered valuable resources for future initiatives, especially upcoming UNDP projects in Siem Reap.

The environmental impacts achieved by the project, particularly the expansion and formal management of protected areas, are likely to endure. Community capacities in reforestation, patrolling, and site monitoring, as well as the strengthened governance structures, suggest that local environmental benefits will be sustained. While broader financial mechanisms did not fully materialize, local livelihood schemes and the foundation for Payment for Ecosystem Services provide a stepping-stone for future sustainability. Ultimately, despite early setbacks, the project demonstrated resilience, adapted effectively, and achieved notable outcomes in environmental management, institutional strengthening, and community engagement, offering valuable lessons and foundations for future conservation efforts in Cambodia.

The proactive approach by the project in addressing the project delays and the lack of achievements at the project mid-term is one of the project's big achievements. The proactive and consolidated engagement by the Ministry of Environment (MOE) and UNDP leadership, as well as at the project level, must be emphasized as being the main reason for the project managing to end on a high note, which was not foreseen at the time of the Mid-term Evaluation.

## B. Stakeholder Engagement

In the initial part of the project (2020-2022) the project's engagement of stakeholders and partners was comparatively low. This can, to a large extent, be explained by that the project was heavily affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, which placed restrictions upon project gatherings and travel, etc., making it difficult to engage with community stakeholders at the local level. The project's difficulties/delay in setting up the planned partnership agreements resulted in the late signing of the first LOA in August 2022. That said, engagement of stakeholders was done via the project's online meetings and workshops. But as indicated above, the project did not place sufficient efforts into the implementation of, particularly activities under Component 1, which would have involved an important subset of national and provincial partners/ stakeholders. The limited stakeholder engagement was also reported in the MTR.

Beginning from 2022 the project increased its stakeholder participation at the local and community level, mainly spearheaded by the signing and subsequent implementation of the Project's LOAs with the project's Pre-identified partners, strategic partners, and small grant partners. Through the LOAs the project actively worked with 13 different partners (i.e. LOA Partners)133 that implemented key project activities on behalf of the project. In this connection, it is important to note that the PMU in fact oversaw and managed (both financially and technically) the large partner portfolio, which at the time of the Terminal Evaluation had reached a number of 19. The project's partnerships, which were established via the aforementioned LOAs, were a central part in the project's active engagement with local stakeholders, particularly at the community level.

Although the project had both a Stakeholder Engagement Plan and a Gender Action Plan, neither document provided for much/any guidance as to how to engage with the project's stakeholder groups in a targeted and strategic manner. Nonetheless, in the view of the TE Team, the project managed to circumvent this drawback adequately. For instance, in the engagements with the local communities, a general Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) approach was followed in all communities, including ethnic communities. In the community approach, the LOA Partners would present suggestions, community engagements, and the communities, via village meetings, would discuss and agree on specifics. Subsequently, full agreement between the LOA Partners and the Communities would be drawn up. In some cases, specific agreements with individual participants would be prepared, for instance, in the cases of chicken and pig raising, where the initial recipient was to "pay forward" parts of the offspring to a new recipient, thereby making the intervention long-term sustainable, benefiting a broader subset of the community. With regard to the community level engagement, it should, however, be noted that no specific focus was placed on the mainstreaming of women nor on ensuring the inclusion of ethnic minority groups in the project's support. A main reason for this is that women, vulnerable groups, ethnic groups etc. were not mentioned as an area of focus in the grant applications134 which form the basis for the LOAs. This is in the view of the TE Team, a clear missed opportunity as the community interventions, particularly those related to the various livelihood interventions, could have been more inclusive in their design. This is not to say support to women and ethnic communities/peoples was not provided, but this was more by chance than design, where women were involved in the more female-oriented livelihood interventions such as chicken raising, thereby supporting an already existing gender bias. Regardless, it should also be emphasized that the project did manage to ensure an overall engagement of women of 52% and did facilitate the mainstreaming of women, for instance, via some LOA partner engagements in small business start-ups and fruit/vegetable processing135. While this is encouraging, it should also be noted that the level of women's engagement in training and technical workshops does not match this. A total of 3,750 people were trained of which only 1,063 (28%) were women. This disparity is to a larger part explained via the screwed women/men ratio in the respective government departments working on the technical issues related to the project. With regard to the project's awareness-raising work, it has not been possible to gauge how well it has been perceived and what impact it has had, as the follow-up Knowledge, Attitude and Practices survey was not available at the time of the Terminal Evaluation.

Although the involvement of local stakeholders and the engagement of Government partners at national and provincial levels, as well as the involvement of NGO, should be seen as far-reaching, the project had not had any engagement of note with other projects/programs/initiatives. As such, the project could be seen as having been implemented in a sort of vacuum. That said, stakeholders from other projects, NGOs and other actors working in the same sphere have been involved with the project via participation in workshops, for instance. However, linkages and broader collaboration were not established neither by the INRM project nor by other potential partners. While this might be seen as a missed opportunity, it is understandable as projects get swept up in their day-to-day management and its myriad of tasks that broader strategic partnerships are often not pursued or even thought of. That said, the TE Team firmly believed that the project should in the closing stages of the project ensure that linkages are established to the UNDP/GEF-8 project Restoring ecosystems for sustainable development in the Tonle Sap Basin and Siem Reap/Phnom Kulen landscape (hereafter mentioned as the UNDP/GEF project) and the upcoming UNDP/LDCF project Building resilient livelihoods through naturebased solutions in the Tonle Sap Basin and Siem Reap/Phnom Kulen landscape (hereafter mentioned as the UNDP/LDCF project). This approach could be facilitated by UNDP.

### C. Gender Equality

Although the project's the action plan aspect of the Gender Analysis and Action Plan was not designed to look at how gender and women mainstreaming could be integrated into the different project outputs, nor looked at how the SESP identified gender were to be engaged with (again in connection with the project outputs) the Gender Analysis and Action Plan did provide for good overall guidance as to how and where in general gender issues could should be addressed.

In this regard, the project did in its implementation, pay attention to gender and, for instance, developed a rather substantial gender training package247 for the Ministry of Environment, as well as assisted the ministry in developing its Gender Mainstreaming Strategic Plan in the Environmental Sector 2021 – 2025 document248 (an updated version is expected in May 2025)249. A series of other gender focused documents were developed.

Unfortunately, despite the good intentions and the project's focus on gender it has been difficult for the project to create a gender balance in its provided trainings, where in all of the provided training 72% of all trainees were male and only 28% were female. At the Government level this is not so surprising as there are more men in the respective departments working on the technical issues related to the project. This discrepancy was also noted in the Gender Analysis, and while the project would like to push for more women the people engaged in the project's technical trainings had to be topic relevant. Thus, for specialized trainings it would, due to the internal distribution of women and men, be difficult to obtain a 50/50 representation at meetings.

At the community level, there was also a clear discrepancy that cannot be explained away as it can be for the government institutions and here the project potentially could have done more to ensure that the LOA Partners were catering more to the inclusion of women – and for that matter ethnic minorities and the more vulnerable people living in the communities. Part of the "lack of focus" can perhaps be explained by that the Grant Applications used did not stress that the grant proposals should have a strong gender aspect.

However, at the village level, the project has been faced with strong traditional biases and embedded gender roles, which, regardless of good intentions, are difficult to overcome. For instance, while most CPA/CF committees had female committee members these were comparatively few250. In the communities visited by the TE Team CPA committees generally had about 10-12 members, of which 2-4 would be women. This gender imbalance was also apparent in the TE field mission where 35% of the people engaged with were women251 .

However, when the combined data for all of the community engagements are reviewed the data shows that 52% of the people benefiting from the project were women. This might a first glance be difficult to reconcile, but a large part of the explanation has to be found in gender preferences and gender biases. In many cases, the people engaging in the more "home-based" livelihood activities were women where as men were generally more engaged in the more action-dominated interventions, such as patrolling252. More than once, was it noted that women were not suited for (or at least not comfortable with), for instance, ranger work and that women did not participate in meetings because they stayed at home (doing chores)253 .

Taking this into account, it was the view of the TE Team that the Cambodia INRM project has been pushing forth the issue of gender equality and the mainstreaming of women to the extent possible, taking into account the realities on the ground and within Cambodia in general. As a final note the project had a symposium254 (i.e. 19-20 May 2025) where one of the themes was on Gender Mainstreaming in Integrated Natural Resources Management: Way Forward Actions where the project discussed gender mainstreaming in natural resources management and shared experiences from their work on gender mainstreaming at the community level255.

### D. Knowledge Management

With regard to the knowledge management and knowledge transfer the project, in its design, sought to improve the knowledge/information collection, and develop a management system to enhance awareness and sharing of best practices. The project's Knowledge, Management and Communication Strategy, a main tool for guiding this process, was to have been developed at implementation start, but was only ready in 2023. The Impact of this, though, has been minor as the project's production of deliverables did, as mentioned, in earnest only start from 2022/2023. Although the project does have a webpage, housed on the Cambodia Clearing House Mechanism (CHM), the project has not been very successful in developing a strong knowledge management platform. The project could have created a "mini CHM" on INRM in which it would also place its own deliverables. The project did not do this and at the time of the Terminal Evaluation, the information on the project's website is sparse, to say the least. While the project has clearly missed an opportunity in actively "sell their product" the project still has time to ensure that a solid depository of knowledge can be uploaded to the CHM. An outstanding question is, however, what will happen to the project website once the project finishes. The point being the project needs to ensure that its depository of knowledge products will be publicly accessible once the project has closed. On the issue of "selling the product", one of the aims of any project's knowledge management and communication should be to become a "lead influencer" in the project's area of expertise. Something which, with today's online tools, would be within the scope of any project.

While the project did not establish a functioning knowledge management system, it has, regardless, developed a larger library of knowledge products, and the project's work in this regard has been discussed under Indicator 13 above. In an attempt to bring key aspects of the project to market, the project arranged a Symposium265 which brought together key actors and was seen as an important centerpiece by the project. The Symposium was also a springboard from which public outreach was broad-scaled, lifting the project from a local initiative to a national asset. Overall, and even though there is only limited time left of the project, it would be beneficial if it engaged in a solidified effort to capture its achievements as much as possible and ensure that the project knowledge becomes publicly accessible to facilitate a lasting legacy of the project and its results.

## III. Core Indicators

### Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 452173 | | 543707 |

### Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1500 | | 51854 |

| 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Community Protected Areas and Community Forest Areas | | Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources | | 1,500.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Kulen Promtep WS | 61943 | National Park | | | | 26,471.00 |
| Phnom Kulen NP | 68861 | Habitat/Species Management Area | | | | 25,383.00 |

### 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) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 450673 | | 491853 |

| 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Angkhor Protected Landscape | 2351 | Protected Landscape/Seascape | | 10,800.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Kulen Promtep WS | 61943 | Habitat/Species Management Area | | 402,500.00 | 0.00 | 428,970.00 | 33.00 | 0.00 | 67.00 |
| Phnom Kulen NP | 68861 | National Park | | 37,373.00 | 0.00 | 62,883.00 | 32.00 | 0.00 | 62.00 |

### Indicator 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1000 | | 996 |

### Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration

| Disaggregation Type | Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rangeland and pasture | | 1,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

### Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 996.00 |

### Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and woodland under restoration

| Disaggregation Type | Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

### Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) under restoration

| 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) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 101000 | | 73671 |

#### 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 | 0.00 | 73,671.00 |

#### Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations

| 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 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

#### Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided

| Disaggregation Type | Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

#### Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

| Name of the OECMs | WDPA-ID | Total Ha (Expected at PIF) | Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

#### Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

| Title |
|---|
| |

#### Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

| | Number (Expected at PIF) | Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Number (Achieved at MTR) | Number (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | | 1,500 | 0 | 6,398 |
| **Male** | | 3,500 | 0 | 5,906 |
| **Total** | **0** | **5,000** | 0 | **12,304** |

## IV: Co Financing

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financier | Type of Co-financing | Investment Mobilized | Anticipated at CEO($) | Materialized at MTR($) | Materialized at TE($) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GEF Agency | UNDP | Grant | Investment mobilized | 200,000.00 | 155,814.00 | 221,072.00 |
| Recipient Country Government | General Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development (GSSD) | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 1,746,100.00 | | 102,708.00 |
| Recipient Country Government | Department of Biodiversity of GSSD | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 2,592,100.00 | | 264,800.00 |
| Recipient Country Government | General Directorate of Nature Conservation and Protection (GDANCP) of MOE | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 2,169,600.00 | 1,826,175.00 | 161,013.00 |
| Recipient Country Government | General Directorate for Local Community (GDLC) of MOE | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 1,746,100.00 | | 101,590.00 |
| Recipient Country Government | Sub-national administrations of the targeted provinces | In-kind | | 1,746,100.00 | | |
| Recipient Country Government | MOE (combined) | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | | | 1,826,175.00 |
| Recipient Country Government | MOE (combined) | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | | | 1,282,219.00 |
| **Total Co-financing** | | | | **10,200,000.00** | **1,826,175.00** | **3,108,394.00** |

| Comments |
|---|
| |

## V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

**Overall Project/Program Risk Classification**

| PIF | CEO Endorsement/Approval | MTR | TE |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Medium/Moderate | Medium/Moderate |

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

As can be noted in Table 8, there were only three risks, aside from the Social and Environmental Safeguard risks and the UNDP Project Document, which provided evidence for that only a very minimal reflection and risk evaluation had been provided for the project57. As can be seen, the Risk Table in the UNDP Project Document it includes the risks from the Social Environment Screening Procedure (SESP) document (Annex 4 of the UNDP Project Document)58. However, the SESP risks were not all transferred to the Risk Table one to one. Risk 5 in the Risk table is listed as Community members that include disadvantaged groups, minorities, poor and women might not be fully engaged in decisions that affect their land, culture and right59s, but the same risk (risk 2 in the SESP) was Women or vulnerable groups might not be fully engaged in decision that affect their land, culture and rights60 . In a similar manner was risk 10 wording in the Risk Table revised to 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 area61 - from the original risk statement in the SESP (risk7) Improved zoning and management of the PAs and corridors could restrict access to resources from PAs and surrounding lands. This will include indigenous communities living in this area62. This discrepancy between the SESP and the risks description in the UNDP Project Document Risk Table affected five out of the seven Social and Environmental risks. While the discrepancies were minor and, generally speaking, do not affect the risk per se, it was unnecessary and raised concerns about consistency within the project's documentation overall63. More concerning was it that the rating for the Risk Table's risk 8 (SESP risk 5) was changed from a Moderate rating in the SESP64 to a rating of Low in the UNDP Project Document Risk Table65. As UNDP engages in a very thorough SESP approval process, ad hoc changes to the SESP ratings should simply not occur. In the UNDP Project Document Risk and Assumption section, it was correctly noted that Standard 6 on Indigenous Peoples was triggered by the moderate risk rating for risks 8 and 9 (SESP risks 5 and 6). It was also correctly mentioned that an additional environmental and social risks assessment was to be undertaken before project inception. Although not specifically mentioned, this in all likelihood, referred to an Environment Social Management Framework since the UNDP Project Document mentioned that this assessment would be prepared and used to develop the required management measures/plans that would be undertaken during project implementation. This included potentially stand-alone and site-specific management plans (i.e. Social and Environment risk management plans) or even an Environmental and Social Management Plan66. It also included the establishment of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) procedures as well as the establishment of a project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) that was to be established during the first year of project implementation. The UNDP Project Document included in this regard a clear outline for the GRM establishment. The directions for a consolidated risk management, including Social and Environmental risks, were adequately outlined in the UNDP Project Document. As part of this was also that the project would follow the general UNDP guidance/requirements and that the Project Coordinator was to , quarterly, monitor risks and report the risk status to UNDP. The UNDP Country Office would in turn manage the online risk log. Finally, management responses to critical risks were also to be reported in the annual GEF PIR67 .

## VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

| Document Category | Prefix | Title |
|---|---|---|
| M and E Document | Terminal Evaluation (TE) | GEF9781_UNDP5770_FY26_TE_UNDP_Cambodia_MFA_FSP |