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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This report evaluates DCA/CA’s Cambodia Food Security Programme (FSP) which has been operating from June 2005 to December 2009. The FSP focuses on supporting sustainable livelihood enhancement approaches that promote human rights and advocacy in order to assist poor Cambodians to successfully claim their constitutional right to food. Under the DCA/CA umbrella, seven partners work in tandem throughout Cambodia to achieve the objectives of the Programme. The overall purpose of the evaluation was to gain a better understanding of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the FSP; and to examine what could be learned from this to inform the development of the next FSP Plan. As such, this evaluation forms part of the Programme assessment and organizational learning.

In order to assess the FSP, highlight any gaps within the Programme, and document lessons learned, the study considered information from the original FSP log frame and a 2008 revised FSP log frame matrix; annual FSP reports; individual partner project reviews and evaluations; various monitoring reports and other relevant documentation; as well as comments from stakeholder interviews, backed up by field visit observations in three provinces where fieldwork was undertaken. The Programme evaluation was carried out by a team of four external evaluators over 29 days.

Main Findings
Overall, this evaluation found that the relevance of the FSP interventions was high at all stakeholder levels. Furthermore, the FSP strategy is consistent with DCA/CA’s worldwide mandates on Rights Based approaches to secure livelihoods, gender equality, and climate change, and supports the Cambodian Government’s overarching plans to reduce poverty and the Cambodia Millenium Development Goals on Food Security and Nutrition.¹ The FSP interventions are relevant to the contextual food insecurity needs determined at the start of the Programme, and all immediate objectives are relevant to the Development Objective’s emphasis of ensuring food security through service delivery and advocacy. The effectiveness and efficiency of the FSP’s delivery; its short and longer term impacts; and sustainability potential; were all very good at the village and commune levels, but only moderate at district, province, national and indirect partner levels. The main reason for the comparatively lower results at higher levels was a lack of strong, operational linkages between partners and these higher stakeholder levels. Summarized findings for all stakeholders follow:

Village RH/DB level
- **Strengths:** The most significant changes included better health, nutrition and water supply (which save time and effort for women); Village Banks (VBs) which give access to credit (especially for women); and better FS through agriculture techniques (for men and women). FS months increased from 6-9 months in 2005 to 11-12 months by the end of 2009 according to FG respondents. Other significant changes were increased empowerment and solidarity through forming groups; raised awareness of claiming rights from government DBs, especially for infrastructure; and RH/DBs’ needs being met

¹ DANCHURCHAID Report 2008, Rolling Plan 2009-2012 and Budget 2010-2013
through joint development planning and more access to government funds to support communities.

- **Weaknesses**: Funding constraints hinder RHs from undertaking leadership roles in time consuming community and advocacy activities, particularly if these roles are voluntary and take RHs away from their normal income generating activities. In cases of land-grabbing or seizure of natural resources by outsiders, the results of FSP support have been mixed. While there have been some successes, some communities are yet to receive title or compensation for their land, even though they have gone through the appropriate channels to request land dispute resolution.

**Commune and District DB level**

- **Strengths**: The most significant changes were improved CDC/DDC roles and responsibilities, planning and management; DDPs/CDPs allocation of government funds to help solve FS problems, land rights and NRM issues; allocation of resources from PDPs to DDPs/CDPs; increased empowerment of females and males, and more opportunities for responsible and accountable leadership (for both sexes). A positive shift in attitude towards women being able to fill more roles in local government, reflects greater gender sensitization.

- **Weaknesses**: Overall DBs’ actual accountability is low to moderate. This is due to a range of reasons including limited DB absorptive capacity; generic rather than specific training; and lack of operational linkages. Their accountability is unlikely to improve dramatically in the short to medium term because of the ongoing contextual problems with decentralization and deconcentration (D&D), low government wages and support for activities, and slow progress on anti corruption policies.

**Partner level**

- **Strengths**: Partner strategies were relevant to achieving the FSP’s objectives. Partners have gained greater management experience with FS issues; improved the quality of the Programme; and stimulated new initiatives, such as climate change interventions.

- **Weaknesses**: Joint activities, apart from the partner platform, to foster synergy of effort, are limited; and strong linkages outside of the community/commune/NGO context with provincial DBs and national level ministries, indirect partners such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), World Food Programme (WFP) and private sector actors don’t exist. Some partner NGO networking groups are not able to provide long term support to their target communities, due to funding of discrete interventions within a project, rather than broader long term funding.

**Indirect Partners**

- **Strengths**: Annual FSP Reports indicate that significant advocacy outcomes have occurred at the national level, e.g. forums have challenged the government on issues of transparency and accountability in managing public property.
• **Weaknesses:** this evaluation found that meaningful linkages between partners and indirect partners were limited in comparison to the other levels.

**DCA/CA**

• **Strengths:** DCA/CA has gained Programme development experience to carry forward into the next FSP phase, and has maintained good relationship with stakeholders.

• **Weaknesses:** The reported lack of carry over of funds from one year to the next, may constrain activities. For example, if planting dry season rice is delayed in one year because of drought, funds are not able to be carried over to the next dry season.

In addition to the above, the following **findings** and **lessons learned** can be drawn from the evaluation:

1. The FSP has been largely effective in achieving its objectives because it has taken an integrated Programme approach which works at various levels through different partners delivering complementary FS components. Developing a clear strategy for how to expand the partnership base, as well as how to balance partnership strengthening and Programme development, is one of the challenges to be addressed prior to the next FSP phase.

2. Though the RBA is relevant to ensuring FS, there is a lack of clarity at a conceptual level about what this means, notably amongst lowly educated, poor target groups

3. The relevance of cross-cutting issues (gender, governance, climate change, advocacy, empowerment, RBA) was high while HIV/AIDS and migration were comparatively low.

4. Partner FS Project models which encompass a balance of self-help, networking with support services outside of the government, and advocating for improved government DB accountability, could help to improve expected Programme outcomes and lessen the risk of inactivity while RHs wait for government DBs to become accountable.

5. Clear entry and exit strategies as well as clear guidelines for ownership and maintenance of assets, enhances sustainability.

6. The current FSP geographical spread was ranked highly. Any changes to it should be considered carefully by the FSP design team, since a spread which becomes too wide may result in the FSP losing focus and partners finding it difficult to work together because of sheer distances. A new context analysis should assist with this decision.

7. The effectiveness of land research and dissemination is low suggesting a lack of sound evidence based research and information sharing to inform the FSP. A broader range of research topics (not just land issues) could help meet the needs of more stakeholders.
8. DCA/CA has added value through partner capacity building; networking; and supporting funding applications. More value could have been added by making gender more visible throughout the FSP and supporting research more strongly.

9. Partners’ capacity building in facilitating linkages, proposal writing, and M&E, could have been improved to enhance effectiveness. Good proposal training is critical since success in obtaining funds is essential to sustainability.

10. The Partner Platform received mixed reviews since not all partners see mutual benefits in working together. Using the platform as an arena to present different partner models of entry and exit strategies, or sharing success stories and lessons learned on issues like sustainability and land titling, could assist partner synergy and advocacy efforts.

11. Respondents suggestions regarding additional interventions in the next FSP phase which might make the Programme more relevant to target group needs, included health services, education, and youth focused components.

Conclusion
The evaluation findings have revealed that DCA/CA’s dual focus of service delivery (approximately 68% of funding) and advocacy (approximately 25% of funding), has been appropriate and largely successful, particularly at the village, commune and partner support levels over the last 5 years. A new contextual analysis which takes into account the impact of the GFC; the current social, political and economic operating environment; and the resources available to DCA/CA and partners; should guide DCA/CA in determining what combination of RBA and service delivery interventions might be appropriate for the next FSP phase. A thorough discussion with relevant stakeholders as to how DCA/CA should continue with the dual pronged approach, will be necessary prior to the next phase.

A summary of recommendations to be considered for the next design phase follow below. These draw on the conclusions and lessons learned from the findings and have been written under each objective in line with the 2008 FSP Revised Matrix which guided this study. For ease of reference, the recommendations are cross-referenced to the section and page numbers in the body of this report which present the relevant discussion.

Note: Due to the large number of Programme issues investigated under Objective 4, Objective 4 recommendations have been divided into suggestions dealing specifically with Objective 4 interventions, and General Programmatic considerations.

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
Objective 1 Recommendations: (see 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 pg 11)

1. that FSPs which improve the basic needs of food, water and income be promoted by partners and funders, because they yield significant outcomes and impact for the village level target groups.
2. that future FSPs have clear entry and exit strategies to clarify the ownership, ongoing maintenance and management of structures and interventions, in order to avoid confusion between stakeholders.

**Objective 2 Recommendations (see 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 pg 13)**

3. that FSP partners discuss alternative ways of compensating leadership efforts of village and higher level DBs and put in place strategies to enable their continued effective management of community, commune, district and provincial DB structures.

4. that partners include the local community group formation and empowerment approach models which encompass a balance of self-help, networking with others outside of the government, and advocating for improved DB accountability, in future FSP design and implementation because of its very positive impact on target groups, especially the most vulnerable.

**Objective 3 Recommendations (see 5.3.1 pg 15)**

5. that DCA/CA maintains FSP efforts to strengthen accountability and transparency of Government structures, but broadens its focus from land title issues to other priority causes of food insecurity as determined by an up-to-date contextual analysis.

**Objective 4 Recommendations**

**Recommendations specific to Objective 4 Interventions:**

**Partner Platform (see 5.4.1 pg 19)**

6. that the Partner Platform process be reviewed by all relevant stakeholders to improve its effectiveness and efficiency.

**Capacity Building (see 5.4.2 pg 20)**

7. that DCA/CA reviews its capacity building process to ensure the selection of trainers with appropriate skills and knowledge, and undertakes Training Needs Analyses so that the training delivered meets the specific needs of target groups.

**Cross-Cutting Issues (see 5.4.3 pg 20)**

8. that DCA/CA considers prioritizing the relevance of cross-cutting issues to FSP Objectives, according to target group priority needs in future FSPs to enhance outcomes.

**Adding Value (see 5.4.4. pg 21)**

9. that DCA/CA and partners consider setting up in the next FSP, a separate, well resourced gender component that clearly develops a conducive environment to achieving gender equality through capacity building of partners to have a similar vision and plan, formulating appropriate gender indicators, and earmarking funds specifically for gender mainstreaming.
Land Issue Research and Dissemination (see 5.4.5 pg 22)
10. that DCA/CA reviews its research support and dissemination process to make it more effective and efficient and includes a wider range of research topics in line with stakeholder needs.

Facilitating linkages (see 5.4.6 pg 22)
11. that DCA/CA considers incorporating a separate component within the new FSP focusing on implementing effective linkages, with appropriate indicators which clearly identify direct and indirect partners and measure meaningful engagement with them; and training on this as a crosscutting activity.

Recommendations concerning General Programmatic Matters
Programme Design and Implementation (see 5.4.7 pg 24)
12. that partners review what makes up the RBA they wish to employ in the next FSP phase, agree upon a common definition at both a conceptual and practical implementation level, and attempt to make this understood by all stakeholders through initial and refresher trainings.

13. that before formulating any future FSPs, DCA/CA holds a participative planning workshop with all relevant stakeholders to brainstorm the contents and wording of a new FSP logical framework. A new context analysis should be undertaken by the design team and selected interventions should address the identified constraints as well as the specific needs of target groups. Any interventions should also be in line with DCA/CA’s priorities, partner mandates, and the government’s Food Security Plans.

Monitoring (see 5.4.8 pg 27)
14. that a review of the FSP monitoring system, including DCA/CA staff roles, be undertaken during the new FSP design phase to improve the relevance and efficiency of information gathering as well as the effectiveness and impact of management response.

Programme verses Project Approach (see 5.4.9 pg 27)
15. that the FSP continues to take a Programme Approach. In doing so, DCA/CA should develop a clear strategy as a result of discussing whether it is more effective and efficient to: 1) support a small number of large and relatively self-sufficient partners running complementary (parallel) projects; or 2) support a larger number of smaller NGOs working in synergy together; or 3) have a combination of both.

Efficiency of Programme Delivery (see 5.4.13 pg 30)
16. that DCA/CA reviews its Programme delivery process to improve its effectiveness and efficiency, particularly in funding delivery, for example by considering the carry over of funds for activities from one year to the next, if these funds have not been used in the allotted time period due to external controlling factors.

Other actors’ efforts outside of the FSP to improve food security (see 5.4.15 pg 33)
17. that the results of a new contextual analysis be used to guide DCA/CA and relevant stakeholders in determining what combination of RBA and service delivery interventions might be appropriate in the next FSP phase.
3. INTRODUCTION

3.1 The purpose and scope of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to gain better understanding of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the FSP; and to examine what could be learned from this to inform the development of the next FSP Document. The evaluation objectives were: 1) to evaluate the relevance and impact of the FSP in relation to its objectives, as well as the appropriateness of individual project strategies in contributing to this; 2) assess the complementarities and synergy between projects within the FSP; and 3) provide recommendations for future scope and design of the new FSP Phase, including the potential role of DCA/CA in contributing to partner capacity building and to advocacy for rights-base approaches to food security. It should be noted that a mid-term review of the FSP had been carried out in 2007 with the participation of DCA and CA, with subsequent revisions being made to the remaining part of the FSP. The Evaluation Team were asked to take account of the key elements of the 2008 FSP revised matrix in formulating their questions and study orientation.

Since most of the partners’ projects had been reviewed prior to this evaluation, further in-depth assessments of each project were not warranted in this overall Programme evaluation. Rather, the Terms of Reference (TOR) requested a study which focused on the processes involved in the delivery of the FSP, and synergy between Partner projects, in order to highlight any gaps and provide recommendations to address these.

The report has been organized in the following way: Section 1 above presents the Executive Summary. Section 2 outlines the Recommendations to be considered for the next FSP phase. This section (Section 3) introduces the report layout, evaluation scope, and study methodology. Section 4 gives a brief background of the Programme. Section 5 containing the Main Findings combines an assessment of all stakeholder opinions and desk study results, along with conclusions to these findings, lessons learned, and recommendations for all objectives. Appendices A - I present the TOR; 2008 revised FSP matrix; Methodology; List of people interviewed; Questionnaires and summarized responses from each of the six stakeholder groups interviewed in the field and Phnom Penh; a summary of FSP partners; summarized evaluations of four partners; root causes of food insecurity; and Bibliography, respectively.

3.2 Evaluation Methodology

The methodology for the study included: a comprehensive literature study of relevant documents provided by DCA/CA, and material from other sources; questionnaires targeting the six above mentioned levels of stakeholders; field observation from ‘walk and talk’ visits with farmers, VDCs, and partner field staff; informal discussions with DCA/CA staff; feedback from stakeholders who attended a participative workshop at which the findings and recommendations were presented; and ideas from the Consultants themselves, who have 30 years of combined experience and knowledge of Food Security issues and Agriculture Extension Methods used in Cambodia to improve farmer livelihoods.
3.3 Specific Evaluation Questionnaires targeting six levels of stakeholders
In line with the TOR parameters, questionnaires targeting six levels of stakeholders, including semi-structured face-to-face individual and focus group discussions (FGD) were developed with:
1) Village level male and female Rights Holders/Duty Bearers (RH/DBs);
2) Duty Bearers (DBs) at Commune level and above;
3) Provincial Ministry DBs (Women’s Affairs and Rural Development);
4) the NGO Advocacy Network for Development (NAND) and Vigilance assisted LAND groups;
5) Individual Programme/Project Managers from DCA/CA and staff from the seven partners; and
6) Country Representatives from individual Partner Projects and DCA/CA and Indirect Partners.

4. BACKGROUND
4.1 Brief Background of the Programme
The cost of the FSP over 5 years was approximately Danish Krone 37,445,498 (USD 7,779,943). In formulating this first generation FSP in 2005, DCA drew on previous experience from its Civic and Political Space Programme as well as its long term partnership with Lutheran World Federation (LWF). Whilst LWF delivered FS components, six other NGOs included as partners in subsequent years, added local empowerment and advocacy at various stakeholder levels, nutrition, disaster risk reduction, and women’s empowerment, to complement and strengthen the Programme (see 4.2 below and Appendix F for partners’ contribution to the FSP).

In 2008, DCA Cambodia’s FSP merged with CA’s Programmes. The DCA/CA’s FSP is in line with the Cambodian Government’s overarching plans to reduce poverty and is consistent with DCA and CA’s worldwide mandates. Guided by principles of empowerment and social justice; a concern for reaching Cambodia’s poorest people; and a partnership strategy; DCA/CA Cambodia takes a rights based approach (RBA) to development. This approach links human rights, democratization, and poverty reduction, and attempts to encompass broader cross-cutting issues as gender equality, HIV/AIDS, migration, and climate change.

In practice, the FSP emphasises the promotion of sustainable livelihoods, nutrition and empowerment of the poor through organization and awareness raising of stakeholders at local, sub-national and national levels. Its development objective is: ‘Enhancing the fulfillment of the constitutional right to food and sustainable livelihood systems for rural communities, particularly vulnerable groups and the disadvantaged (women headed-households and children).’

---

2 DCA/CA’s FSP supports the national Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (SFFSN) 2008-2012 which is incorporated into the National Strategic Development Plan 2006 - 2010 and is in harmony with the Cambodia Millenium Development Goals on Food Security and Nutrition. It is also consistent with DCA Programme Policies and Guidelines entitled “Rights-Based Commitment,” “The Right to Food,” and “Gender And Equality,” (all approved May 2007), “DCA Climate Change Guidelines for Programme 2008,” and CA’s 2005-2010 Strategic Framework “turning hope into action: A vision of a world free from poverty” approved Sep 2006
Four Immediate Objectives under this overall development objective are:

1. Sustainable integrated farm management, disaster preparedness, savings, incomes and the nutritional status of the primary target groups are improved.
2. Local community structures (CBOs, VDCs and others), empowered poorest household and women work in solidarity to claim and advocate for the fulfillment of the constitutional right to food.
3. Increased accountability and transparency of Government structures and implementation of policies in relation to land tenure and sustainable and equitable natural resource management, and
4. DCA/CA have been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities and facilitating linkages to advocacy campaigns and information work.

These objectives were selected after a context analysis had been undertaken. The context analysis found that the main barriers to poor Cambodians’ food security were the monocropping culture, and limited agricultural diversification with an overall dependence on rice production which gave a low yield per hectare. Moreover, the lack of agricultural variation and cultural preference for rice had resulted in a lack of diet diversification and malnourishment, particularly of women and children (such as female heads of households and their offspring). Key factors contributing to food insecurity were the population pressure on land and unequal access to land, exacerbated by poorly implemented land reform measures, incidences of land grabbing, and large scale concession of land. These events had in turn resulted in small-holders’ rights to land being seriously violated, and in many cases, farmers had been driven into landlessness.

4.2 Partners contributing to the FSP

Seven partners, selected for their collaborative strategies which combine working with communities and community structures to bring about a more just society, operate RB related projects throughout Cambodia under DCA/CA’s FSP. The partners and their areas of focus are LWF - local empowerment; Church World Services (CWS) - Disaster Risk Reduction; Helen Keller International (HKI) - nutrition; the NGO Forum - National Advocacy; Development and Partnership in Action (DPA) - local empowerment and advocacy; Star Kampuchea (SK) - sub-national advocacy; and Banteay Srei (BS) - women’s empowerment. A summary of each partner’s contribution to the Programme as well as summaries of four 2008 evaluations of LWF, NGO Forum, DPA and HKI Programmes, appear in Appendix E and F respectively.

4.3 Previous FSP reviews and evaluations

A January 2008 internal mid term review of the FSP found that significant progress had been achieved towards its objectives. However a need to improve strategies for creating synergy among projects within the Programme as well as with other DCA/CA Programmes, and for expanding the FSP’s partner base, were identified. The review also found that Programme

---

3 For the purpose of this report, the term “food security” as determined by stakeholders interviewed, means enough food to eat over a 12 month period, every year
4 Cambodia Food Security Programme Document 2005-2008 p 28
administration must support more effective and efficient data collection for outcome monitoring at Project as well as Programme level. The current evaluation found that these constraints continued to challenge the Programme till its closure in December 2009. Recommendations to assist the FSP design team in these areas can be found in Sections 2 and 5.

A perusal of FSP Annual Programme Reports and other documents indicate that over the last five years, the FSP has achieved the following main results:

- At the local level, more villages and partner households have ‘graduated’ indicating their ability to manage development projects by themselves. Communities have increased capacity to prepare for and cope with disaster risks, so they are more resilient to natural disasters; and especially vulnerable ‘partner’ households have improved capacity and confidence to participate in and benefit from development intervention.

- At sub-national level, improved communication between communities and DBs at commune, district and provincial levels have contributed to promoting mutual understanding between RHs and DBs; and a greater number of people have exercised their rights to request and claim services from DBs, to protect their own property, and to access common property resources. In cases of land-grabbing or seizure of natural resources by outsiders, beneficiary communities are reportedly more able to analyse the situation and plan actions to claim their rights.

- At national level, significant advocacy outcomes have occurred. For example forums have challenged the government on issues of transparency and accountability in managing public property, and partners have collaboratively contributed to regular meetings with Donors and Government agencies on Joint Monitoring Indicators that monitor progress on government commitments on implementing policy reform. Overall, synergy between projects within the FSP and mutual understanding among partners has improved.

While this final evaluation confirms much of the above, it also found that there was room for improvement at each of these levels, (see Section 5).

4.4 Impact of the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) on the new FSP phase

Document research indicates the following key impacts of the current GFC on Cambodia: the price of food and food related commodities has risen sharply; unemployment and rural drift has increased as a consequence of factory closures, a drop in tourism, and a decline in the building industry; and the gaps between rich and poor have begun to widen. Early in 2009, in response to civil society advocacy efforts requesting the Cambodian Government to tackle the problems caused by the GFC, the Government put in place a special budget to implement measures targeting redundant workers, as well as more budgets to accelerate agriculture growth. At the same time, the Government reportedly asked all donors to concentrate on alleviating the

---

5 DANCHURCHAID op cit 2008
6 ibid and FSP Annual Programme Reports for 2005-9
7 Ministry of Planning/UNDP, Cambodian Human Development Report 2007, Expanding Choices for Rural People
immediate consequences of the GFC as a priority, rather than focus on advocacy based programmes, particularly if the GFC continues. In response to this directive, some of the bigger donors like the Asian Development Bank (ADB) have changed their focus to provide more tangible deliverables like food handouts and food related infrastructure and agriculture extension services. This direction takes precedence over targeted behaviour change efforts which challenge the government to be more accountable, especially regarding land issue resolution.

The GFC offers a challenging new food security context which the design of the next FSP phase will need to take into account. In addition, informal discussions with staff, indirect partners, and document perusal, indicate that the Government has continued to tighten its control over civil society, thus making implementation of development projects, particularly those encompassing advocacy activities, difficult and sometimes dangerous. There have also been signs of increasing restrictions on, and even outright threats by police and military to, communities claiming rights of access to land and natural resources, as indicated by one of the target groups interviewed. Nevertheless, some NGOs are continuing with RB and Community Empowerment approaches because they believe that strengthening DB accountability and transparency, and advocating for better laws and sub-degrees in this regard, will have a deeper and longer term positive impact for more people, than a focus just on service delivery.

5. MAIN FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS
This section presents the findings from a comprehensive desk study, stakeholder interview analysis, and field visits, of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the FSP. To facilitate reading and easy cross-referencing to the TOR which asked the Evaluation Team to use the revised 2008 FSP matrix as an evaluation tool, the findings, their conclusions, any suggestions for improvement, lessons learned, and subsequent recommendations have been grouped under the objectives to which they relate.

Note: In some questions, respondents were asked to rank various aspects of the FSP from 1 to 10, (with 1 being the lowest rank and 10 the highest). The findings below show average ranks.

5.1 Objective 1: ‘Sustainable integrated farm management, disaster preparedness, savings, incomes and the nutritional status of the primary target groups are improved.’ Interventions include Farmer Field Schools promoting sustainable agriculture; Improved nutrition; Potable water supply; Disaster Management; Village Banks.

RELEVANCE
Village level RH/DBs said all interventions were relevant because they met villagers’ needs, but suggested an additional intervention of health services, education, and youth could have made the interventions more relevant to their lives. All other respondents agreed FS interventions were relevant to Objective 1 and gave an average relevance ranking of 8.
EFFECTIVENESS
DCA/CA’s effectiveness in achieving Objective 1 was ranked an average of 9. All FGs reported positive outcomes from all interventions apart from Disaster Management in Battambang where there was no improvement in the villages and provincial office visited. Overall, FG respondents reported the number of FS months increased from 6 - 9 months in 2005, to 11-12 months in 2009, across the three provinces visited. Document research reflects that this trend is widespread where Programme partners have been working for some time. However, a few families still experienced food insecurity and required continued efforts to help meet their FS needs because of the high costs of ceremonies, travel and health expenses, and extreme climatic events.

Positive changes were access to potable water, improved agriculture output, access to credit, income, health; and reduced impact of natural disasters. Most significant changes were better health, nutrition and water supply (save time and effort for women); VBs give more income (especially for women); agriculture techniques giving better FS (men and women).

IMPACT (longer term)
All stakeholder respondents said the FSP had improved living conditions; improved nutrition and health; lessened the risk of disasters; exposed RHs to new skills; increased their knowledge across all components; increased the ability to send children to school; improved relationships with other stakeholders; helped the community to understand that community contribution to projects increases the feeling of ownership and responsibility; increased income (especially for women) and given them a stronger voice in the community; and stimulated greater community structures for self functioning.

EFFICIENCY of delivery
All respondents felt this was generally very good.

SUSTAINABILITY when FSP finishes
All RH/DBs felt they would continue with the FS projects in the future, because activities met their needs and had positive effects on their lives. Some planned to mobilize individual or community resources, seek continued partner or other donor/private sector support, and obtain commune/government funding. Other respondents thought the FSP would be sustainable at village RH/DB level because people have infrastructure assets such as irrigation and DRR methods which can last well into the future; and have the ability to design projects and the confidence to lead a process of forming visions and goals, strengthening capacity, networking, and fund raising. However, some villagers referred to FSP interventions like VBs in terms of “NGO assets” suggesting that ownership is not clear. In addition, some Commune and District level DBs said that perhaps they could take over these NGO assets and thereby derive an income, indicating that they would like ownership.

CONCLUSION
Strengths: Objective 1 was seen as very relevant, effective, efficient, impacting positively on peoples’ lives, and had good potential for sustainability. People have been able to realize many tangible benefits which will last into the future and have the know how to access funding source
options and support services. RH/DB comments on most significant changes reflect different gender roles and needs (water and VBs being most commonly reported by women) and agriculture techniques (by both men and women).

**Weaknesses:** Disaster Management Committees in the 3 villages visited in Battambang, reportedly needed some improvement. Improving DM Committee capacities through training; increased collection of field data; quicker response times; and meeting the needs of all farmers rather than just a few, could have made this component more effective. A lack of clarity over ownership (and maintenance) of FSP assets was evident.

**LESSONS LEARNED**
Basic needs of food, water and income continue to be most important to poor rural people. As long as people can see positive short and longer term results from the FSP, they will be more likely to continue with the activities on a self-funding basis, or on a basis which includes funding from other sources. However, the fact that some RH/DBs requested partner NGOs to stay on after the FSP has finished, reflects a continued dependency on partners. This mentality is not surprising when some partners have been in villages for a long duration. Clear entry and exit strategies as well as clear guidelines for ownership and maintenance of assets, enhances sustainability.

**5.1.1 RECOMMENDATION:** that FSPs which improve the basic needs of food, water and income be promoted by Partners and funders, because they yield significant outcomes and impact for the village level target groups.

**5.1.2 RECOMMENDATION:** that FSPs have clear entry and exit strategies to clarify the ownership, ongoing maintenance and management of structures and interventions, in order to avoid confusion between stakeholders.

**5.2 Objective 2:** ‘The FSP aims to help strengthen local community structures such as CBOs, VDCs, VBs and others, to empower the poorest households and women to work in solidarity, and to claim and advocate for the fulfillment of their constitutional right to food’ Interventions include 1) Capacity building of local structures; 2) Establishment of farmers’ networks marketing cooperatives; 3) Advocating for women’s involvement; 4) Gender based issues incorporated in plans; 5) Participatory household development planning; 6) VDCs development planning; 7) Capacity building regarding rights; 8) VDCs in organising advocacy campaigns; 9) Establish and strengthen networks throughout the province; 10) Strengthening VDCs/CBOs to access to CDPs funds

**RELEVANCE**
RH/DB and other respondents thought the interventions were relevant to achieving FS but no FG interviewed, reported having had experience with forming marketing co-operatives. However, document research indicated that the marketing intervention was being undertaken in other selected villages across target areas where it was considered relevant to people’s needs.
EFFECTIVENESS
All RH/DBs reported positive outcomes, especially the ability to make development plans, to advocate for rights; and to form and run community structures. However, across the villages visited, VDC/CDC/DDCs were only ranked an average of 6 out of 10 with a range from 3 - 8 for their effectiveness and efficiency in responding to requests from the community. Furthermore, a lack of money to support grassroots transport, food, lawyers, etc for community activities and advocacy campaigns limited the effectiveness of these activities.

IMPACT (longer term)
All FG respondents reported positive longer term impacts on their lives. The most significant changes were increased empowerment and solidarity (especially for women) through forming groups; and RH/DBs' needs being met through joint development planning and access to more funds to support communities. RHs also reported a raised awareness of claiming rights from DBs, especially for infrastructure; and awareness of gender issues which increased women's participation in meetings, planning, and leadership; empowered them to work in the private sector; gave women more access to, and control over, family finances, and generally resulted in a decrease in domestic violence.

EFFICIENCY of delivery
All respondents felt the interventions had been delivered efficiently. However they suggested that clarifying the benefits of forming groups to motivate more people to join; meeting more regularly; continuing to strengthen women's participation; and more refresher trainings and study tours, could have made Objective 2 more efficient.

SUSTAINABILITY when FSP finishes
All DBs wanted to continue with the FSP in the future because of the good results. While most did not appear to have a clear strategy for sustainability, they suggested finding another NGO to support them; using village group structures to raise funds; and gathering individual and government support. Most other respondents felt the Programme could be sustainable because of improved DB knowledge to implement their work; the FSP support had been practical and useful for the future and followed government strategies; networks with other stakeholders had been improved, and there was potential for funding from the government and other donors.

CONCLUSION
While the FSP has strengthened RHs to advocate to the government for services, and has trained the government DBs to better respond to villager requests, government DBs accountability is still only low to moderate. This limited response is unlikely to improve dramatically in the short to medium term because of the ongoing problems with D&D, low government wages and support for activities, and slow progress on anti corruption policies.

Strengths: Setting up various community structures using gender sensitive and empowerment approaches was positive, especially for women. These methods reportedly led to stronger planning ability, community development and advocacy, and better relationships with authorities.
Weaknesses: Funding constraints hindered RHs from undertaking leadership roles in time consuming community and advocacy activities, particularly if these roles were undertaken voluntarily and took RHs away from their normal income generating activities.

LESSONS LEARNED

Forming groups in gender sensitive ways is an effective way to empower men and women, particularly poor women, to plan and advocate for the achievement of food security. Meeting regularly, having refresher trainings and study tours, and showing clear benefits of forming groups, motivate more people to join them.

Effective management of community structures is difficult to maintain without adequate compensation to village based DBs. Community structures with income streams such as VBs or Water User Groups have the opportunity to raise funds to compensate leaders by charging additional interest on loans or by increasing fees. It is more difficult to compensate leaders in other groups that do not generate income, although group participants may consider paying a small membership fee if being in the group is of real benefit to them. Some NGOs have paid community leaders and commune, district and provincial authorities to enable them to fulfill their DB duties. While this is effective in the short term, when the NGO leaves, the leaders often stop work, unless more sustainable compensation sources are found. Perhaps partners should in the first instance encourage voluntary leadership, but when this is not effective, encourage a system of a fee for service. This may require the partner NGO to pay leaders at the beginning of the formation of group structures and linkages with authorities, and then phase in a self payment scheme when the group participants see the benefits of participation, as a practical way of overcoming the problem. These options should be discussed at the beginning of the intervention (entry point) so that it is clear that partner funding for this will phase out as part of the partner’s exit strategy.

Partner FS project models which encompass a balance of self-help, networking with support services outside of the government, such as Rice Millers, Agriculture Input Suppliers, and Produce Traders, and advocating for improved government DB accountability, could help to improve expected Programme outcomes and lessen the risk of inactivity while RHs wait for government DBs to become accountable.

5.2.1 RECOMMENDATION: that FSP partners discuss alternative ways of compensating leadership efforts of village and higher level DBs and put in place strategies to enable their continued effective management of community, commune, district and provincial DB structures.

5.2.2 RECOMMENDATION: that partners include the local community group formation and empowerment approach models which encompass a balance of self-help, networking with others outside of the government, and advocating for improved DB accountability, in future FSP design and implementation because of its very positive impact on target groups, especially the most vulnerable.

5.3 Objective 3: ‘Increased accountability and transparency of Government structures and implementation of policies in relation to land tenure and sustainable and equitable natural resource management’ Interventions include: establishing and strengthening Land Law Implementation Network Platform with a focus on a coordinated approach to monitor the performance of the Cadastral Commission; capacity building of the member organisations of the Network Platform in issues of land titling; and engaging with
Commune Councils in selected communes to discuss and provide input on roles and responsibilities, planning and financial management.

RELEVANCE
All CDC/DDC DBs and other respondents considered the interventions relevant to Objective 3 and gave an average rank of 7. Some respondents suggested that a higher relevance might have been achieved if the words “natural resource allocation” and “investment in agriculture” had been incorporated in the interventions.

EFFECTIVENESS
CDC/DDC respondents ranked the effectiveness of all interventions at 7 and reported a greater understanding of rights, gender and land law. All indicators showed a positive change from 2005 to 2009. The most significant changes were improved CDC/DDC roles; planning and management; DDPs/CDPs allocation of government funds to solve FS problems, land rights issues and NRM; allocation of resources from PDPs to DDPs/CCDPs; and increased security. Suggestions to make these interventions more effective included having clearer responses by CDC/DDC DBs concerning funding of village plans.

The effects of DCA/CA channeling funds through NGO network organizations to support advocacy, research, and capacity building on land issues, NRM, and advocacy efforts, have been mixed. On the one hand, network NGO respondents said that their target groups understand their rights, know how to advocate, and can solve land and NRM issues, so have fewer problems to deal with. As a result, RHs reportedly know the benefits of forming groups; farmers are less fearful about their land being taken away; less arguing between farmers and the government occurs; target groups know who is making the quarrel and how to deal with it; and CDCs are more supportive of RH claims.

On the other hand, some land and NRM disputes may take many years to settle. A RH group which had received relevant training, said that while they had raised their land concerns through the appropriate channels from the Village Leader, through sub-national levels, and right up to the Prime Minister every year for the past four years, their land dispute remained unresolved. This groups’ land had reportedly been forcibly taken by the military in 2005. Though RHs had been advised that national level DBs had instructed provincial authorities to deal with the case, no title or compensation had yet been obtained. Instead, many RHs had received death threats from the police and military for agitating as they had. Some of the group reported feeling like “eggs pushing stone” and said that the more they agitated for land rights, the more their land had been taken from them. Others however, reported feeling stronger because of their ability to advocate as a group for land rights. Moreover, they had been encouraged by RHs in other provinces obtaining success in terms of compensation or substitute land, and said they would continue to fight for their land rights until they died.

The fieldwork also revealed that sometimes training on land issues and land titling is ineffective and inappropriate to group needs. One RH group interviewed said they had received training
about how to get land titles, but were not interested as they had no land issues, didn’t want land title because it cost too much, and in any case, the land titling process would take too long. In addition, another NGO who had trained communities in NRM and land issues, reported limited ongoing long term support for project activities with these target groups. This was demoralizing for the network members as they could not continue to work with their selected communities, and could not put their training to good effect.

**IMPACT (longer term)**

Document research\(^6\) indicates that after capacity building, some RHs felt more empowered to advocate for land issue resolution, and those who were successful were more secure with regard to FS and had an asset to pass on to their children. During the fieldwork, commune level DBs said they recognized their responsibilities to fulfill RH needs; respected these needs more; had the opportunity to work more closely with the poor; had improved capacity in fundraising and management; and had better networking and linkages with other stakeholders. The most significant changes included less destruction of natural resources leading to a feeling that limited resource use can be legal and sustainable; increased ability in solving land issues; and becoming more empowered through improved knowledge and skills in CDC/DDC roles, planning and management, resulting in DBs meeting peoples’ needs. In addition, the training they had received had increased their knowledge of the different needs of males and females and a realisation that females can now get jobs in local government authority structures.

**EFFICIENCY of delivery**

While all CDC/DDC respondents reported the delivery of interventions as very good, suggestions to improve the efficiency of delivery included improving communication between VDC/CDC/DDC and PDs; more trainings for these DB levels, especially for newcomers after elections; and more support for CDC/DDC and PD members for material and travel costs so they could fulfill their roles and responsibilities better. CDC members said the 2,000 Riel per day they received as field per diems from the government to cover transport costs to activities outside their local area, was totally inadequate, even though they would like to participate more in such activities. The partner NGO networking groups interviewed in Battambang, reported they did not have enough funding and quality support for on-going project work beyond short term inputs.

**SUSTAINABILITY when FSP finishes**

Most of the DBs expressed a desire to develop and maintain a higher standard of accountability and transparency when the current Programme support is finished because the activities they are involved in are part of their duty, important for development, and fit in with government policy. They also stated they wished to maintain their current achievements and help poor families. Their suggestions as to how to be sustainable included asking for contributions from villagers; using funds from the CDC; and finding new NGO/IO donors. Other respondents were

---

not sure of sustainability because of uncertainty about the impact of government policies and politics on decentralization and de-concentration, which in turn will affect DBs’ ability to act. Network partner NGOs felt the results of capacity building were more likely to be sustainable if these efforts were complemented by additional funding and support for longer term NRM/land issues and FS interventions.

CONCLUSION
While some success in forming NRM communities and receiving land titles was reported in the literature and interviews, there are many ongoing land and NRM issues that remain unsolved because of continued problems with unclear laws, uncooperative government authorities and land title office staff, and weak advocacy efforts by uneducated farmers.

Strengths: Objective 3 interventions were considered relevant to CDC/DDC roles and responsibilities and to those RHs who had NRM and land issues. Positive changes were strengthened Commune and District planning and management capabilities, increased empowerment of females and males, and opening up opportunities for responsible and accountable leadership (for both sexes). A positive shift in attitude towards women being able to fill more roles in local government, reflects greater gender sensitization.

Weaknesses: The partner NGO network respondents reportedly only received funding for limited land related advocacy interventions but not for broader follow up interventions, such as teaching agriculture techniques once land has been claimed. This limits the effectiveness of the advocacy support they are able to provide. In addition, the uncertain government direction of decentralization and de-concentration, as well as a widespread lack of enforcement of anti-corruption frameworks, especially with regard to NRM and land issues weakens the impact of the FSP.

LESSONS LEARNED
The types of activities in Objective 3 not only meet selected stakeholder needs, they foster greater appreciation of the land title process, promote good conservation practices and pave the way for longer term success through gender sensitization and the promotion of good governance practices. However, sustainability of accountable and transparent NRM and land issue practices cannot be assured when the government operating environment is unclear. DCA/CA partner NGO networks require adequate support and ongoing funding to maximize the FSP impacts.9

5.3.1 RECOMMENDATION: that DCA/CA maintains FSP efforts to strengthen accountability and transparency of Government structures, but broadens its focus from land title issues to other priority causes of food insecurity as determined by an up-to-date contextual analysis.

5.4 Objective 4: ‘DCA/CA have been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities and facilitating linkages to advocacy campaigns and
information work’ Interventions include: establishing and strengthening FS partner platform; capacity building in RBA, monitoring and relevant theme areas; exposure trips; supporting research on Land issues and result dissemination; documenting outcomes of projects financed by Parish Collection; linking FSP work with DCA/CA advocacy, campaign and fundraising work on climate change; co-ordinating with stakeholders to develop proposals for funding; and submitting proposals to external donors.

Note: Due to the large number of Programme issues investigated under Objective 4, for ease of reference and to avoid repetition, the findings have been grouped together and presented under two headings: **Objective 4 Interventions** and **General Programmatic Matters**. Where possible, conclusions, suggestions for improvement, lessons learned, and subsequent recommendations have been written for groups of findings rather than single findings.

While most responses for Objective 4 questions came from Programme Managers (PMs), wherever possible other respondents’ answers and desk study findings have been included.

**OBJECTIVE 4 INTERVENTIONS**

5.4.1 Partner Platform

**Effectiveness of the operation of the Partner Platform**

Mixed reviews were given for the effectiveness of the Partner Platform, even though it scored an average effectiveness rank of 8. Respondents who gave a high ranking felt the Platform facilitated good partner to partner visits and motivated participants to be responsible; partners were able to share ideas amongst colleagues and take some action; and had a common FS goal. Respondents who gave lower rankings said the Platform didn’t work so well because different partners had different expertise and interests and that efforts were complementary (working in parallel) rather than synergistic (working together). Suggestions to improve effectiveness included making platform meetings shorter; better targeting of discussion on common issues; and sharing achievements and plans to update partners.

**CONCLUSION**

For the operation of the Partner Platform to be successful, partners need to see mutual benefits in working together. Using the platform as an arena to present different partner models of entry and exit strategies, or to share success stories as well as lessons learned on contentious issues like land titling, could assist partners to work in synergy and further assist advocacy efforts. Desk study findings revealed that Star Kampuchea has had a number of success stories concerning land issues which could be shared meaningfully in this type of setting. A review of the Partner Platform operation which asks questions about how it should be run, who should be involved, and what added value it might bring to the partners, could assist with making this forum more effective.

5.4.1 **RECOMMENDATION**: that the Partner Platform process be reviewed by all relevant stakeholders to improve its effectiveness and efficiency.
5.4.2 Capacity Building

**Effectiveness of DCA/CA’s capacity building**

The effectiveness of DCA/CA’s capacity building was ranked as follows:

Table A: Rankings of effectiveness of DCA/CA’s partner capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>RANKING RANGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights Based Approach</td>
<td>3 – 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>3 – 8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>6 – 8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross cutting issues</td>
<td>3 – 8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness in supporting partners to write proposals**

This process scored an average effectiveness ranking of 7.

**CONCLUSION**

Only moderate rankings were received for capacity building in the topics listed on Table A. Making training on topics more responsive to needs, rather than generic training; partners making the time to attend training; and having better skilled trainers; were suggested measures to enhance capacity building. Improving partner’s ability to write funding proposals is particularly important since success in obtaining funds is essential to sustainability.

5.4.2 **RECOMMENDATION:** that DCA/CA reviews its capacity building process to ensure the selection of trainers with appropriate skills and knowledge, and undertakes Training Needs Analyses so that the training delivered meets the specific needs of target groups.

5.4.3 Cross-Cutting Issues

**Relevance of Cross-cutting Issues Objective 4**

The table below shows the relevance of gender, governance, climate change, advocacy, empowerment, RBA, migration, and HIV/AIDS to Objective 4.

Table B: Relevance rankings of Cross-cutting Issues to Objective 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROSS CUTTING ISSUES</th>
<th>RANKING RANGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4 – 10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>5 – 8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>3 – 7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>6 – 8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights Based Approach</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION
In Table B, a lower ranking for HIV/AIDS suggests that this cross-cutting issue is not as relevant to Objective 4 as other cross-cutting issues. Respondents’ rankings of effectiveness of delivery of cross-cutting issues also scored HIV/AIDS lower than the other issues. HIV/AIDS was ranked 6 for effectiveness of delivery while all other issues were ranked at an average of 7.5.

Prioritizing cross-cutting issues in future FSPs and deciding how to give more attention to HIV/AIDS and perhaps migration so that all issues/themes can be better connected and support each other, could be a worthwhile exercise. This decision will largely depend on the new context and target group analyses which should indicate which issues need to be addressed in the target areas selected.

5.4.3 RECOMMENDATION: that DCA/CA considers prioritizing the relevance of cross-cutting issues to FSP Objectives, according to target group priority needs in future FSPs to enhance outcomes.

5.4.4 Adding Value

**DCA/CA’s Effectiveness in adding value to the FSP**
PM’s rankings of DCA/CA’s effectiveness in adding value to the FSP follows: Partner capacity building; networking; and helping with funding applications all had a ranking of 7, while supporting advocacy; and research components, had a ranking of 6. Only one respondent mentioned gender mainstreaming as an additional Added Value Component, giving an effectiveness ranking of 7. Other respondents’ suggestions concerning the ways in which DCA/CA could have more effectively added value to the FSP included having a greater focus on gender equity.

CONCLUSION
DCA/CA could improve its effectiveness in adding value, by making gender more visible throughout the FSP. The fact that gender was only mentioned by one PM as a way of adding value, indicates that gender mainstreaming is perhaps not as visible to PMs as DCA/CA’s gender equality frameworks might like it to be. Furthermore, while gender responsive outcomes were reported by FGDs, these only came out after a great deal of probing by the Evaluation Team indicating that gender issues were not paramount in villagers’ thinking. In order to keep gender mainstreaming visible and ensure it is indeed taking place at all levels within the FSP, a separate gender component that clearly develops a conducive environment to achieving gender equality could play an important role in future FSPs.

5.4.4 RECOMMENDATION: that DCA/CA and partners consider setting up in the next FSP, a separate, well resourced gender component that clearly develops a conducive environment to achieving gender equality through capacity building of partners to have a similar vision and plan, formulating appropriate gender indicators, and earmarking funds specifically for gender mainstreaming.
5.4.5 Land Issue Research and Dissemination

**Effectiveness of DCA/CA supporting land issue research and dissemination**

PMs gave the above activities a low average rank of 6. Earmarking funds for good quality research and dissemination, publishing the results of land issue research, especially success stories, and presenting it to all partners through avenues such as the Partner Platform, and a wider range of media methods for information dissemination, could have made this process more effective.

**CONCLUSION**

The low ranking for effectiveness suggests a lack of sound evidence based research and information sharing on land issues, to inform the Programme. However, given the lack of land reform progress and the fact that land issues are so contentious and need to be dealt with on a case by case basis, it could be difficult and sometimes dangerous to collect and broadcast accurate information about these issues. Covering a broader range of research topics (not just land issues) would help meet the needs of more stakeholders.

**5.4.5 RECOMMENDATION:** that DCA/CA reviews its research support and dissemination process to make it more effective and efficient and includes a wider range of research topics in line with stakeholder needs.

5.4.6 Facilitating linkages

5.4.6.1 Target Groups

**Effectiveness in reaching target groups**

Effectiveness in reaching target groups as specified by respondents, was ranked as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET GROUP</th>
<th>RANKING RANGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victims of natural disaster</td>
<td>7 – 8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers and young children</td>
<td>8 – 9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest Partner Households</td>
<td>8 – 8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled/Marginalized</td>
<td>8 – 8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commune Councils</td>
<td>7 – 7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village DBs CBO/VDCs</td>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District level DBs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial level DBs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>8 – 8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

The fact that no respondents mentioned the national level DBs, indirect partners, (including IOs such as Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and World Food Programme (WFP), other NGOs, private sector), or International Partners as target groups, suggests that links are not strong with any of these groups. A similar conclusion can be made for linkages with district and
provincial DBs, for whom only low rankings were given. The lack of networking with provincial
DBs was borne out by the fieldwork when the Evaluation Team interviewed a selection of
Provincial DBs - Provincial Women’s Affairs (PDWA), Provincial Department of Rural
Development (PDRD) and Provincial Disaster Management Committee (PDMC).

These respondents from across the three provinces, had virtually no links with the FSP partners
but wished to be involved in future FSPs. PDWA staff suggested they could assist with target
group selection and possible gender awareness training of RH/DBs through Women Commune
Focal Points (WCFPs). PDRD staff wished to link by giving infrastructure support to rural
communities and facilitating the formation, training and support of the decentralized network of
VDC/CDC/DDC and provincial level structures. The PDMC requested joint planning and the
sharing of information be developed with the FSP to improve stakeholder effectiveness. All
Provincial DBs could also be involved in the advocacy effort to the national level.

Enabling the community, local authorities, and provincial DBs to participate in selecting target
groups; and carrying out better PRA using primary and secondary data collection and analysis;
could have enhanced the effectiveness of reaching all stakeholders.

5.4.6.2 Stakeholder Partnerships
Effectiveness of stakeholder partnerships as a result of the FSP
Respondents’ ranks concerning the effectiveness of stakeholder partnerships are given below:

Table D: Rankings of stakeholder partnerships as a result of the FSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNERSHIP TYPE</th>
<th>RANKING RANGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCA/CA and Partners</td>
<td>8 – 9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners and Duty Bearers</td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners and Rights Holders</td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner to Partner</td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Bearers amongst themselves</td>
<td>4 – 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights Holders and Duty Bearers</td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Partners with Programme Partners</td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSION

Strengths: Reported examples of how partnerships have worked well included: a participative
working style discussing all stages of the project cycle; giving and sharing honest feedback;
quarterly meetings with local authorities; living in the villages has established trust and a good
working relationship; partnership responsibilities are clarified through clear TOR for structures
(CBOs, CDC etc.); good community empowerment and ownership exist; and greater community
monetary input into projects has strengthened local ownership and partnerships.
Weaknesses: A reluctance of partners to work outside of the community/commune/NGO context (e.g. with indirect partners, provincial DBs, or private sector actors) was reported.

Respondents’ suggestions for strategies which could have developed more synergy between the FSP and FS actors outside the Programme included having better coordinated strategic planning; including a wider range of participants in the Partner Platform; participating in other forums, and national meetings; and forging stronger links with, and advocating to, the Ministry of Agriculture and IOs like FAO, Council of Agricultural and Rural Development (CARD), and WFP.

LESSONS LEARNED

Linkages are important for achieving more effective and efficient outputs. However implementing meaningful links between partners/projects within the FSO and with indirect partners and other stakeholders is challenging to all development organizations, as they are focused on their own work and often don’t make the time to network. Determined steps have to be made to help stakeholders realize the benefits of working together, and then to practically implement meaningful working partnerships. Strengthening partner linkages is particularly relevant to Objective 4.

5.4.6 RECOMMENDATION: that DCA/CA considers incorporating a separate component within the new FSP focusing on implementing effective linkages, with appropriate indicators which clearly identify direct and indirect partners and measure meaningful engagement with them; and training on this as a crosscutting activity.

GENERAL PROGRAMMATIC MATTERS

5.4.7 Programme Design and Implementation

Relevance of the Rights Based Approach to the FSP

Most RHs and DBs at village, commune, district and provincial levels, stated that the right to food merely meant having enough food to eat, while some respondents outside the village and government gave broader definitions like Food Security is a constitutional right; RHs can be empowered to claim their rights from DBs, especially concerning infrastructure; and the government should be challenged since it is the main actor to solve FS. Two PMs thought the RBA was a very useful framework for international NGOs with wider backing to uphold international Law, especially when it is difficult to advocate on internal policy from within Cambodia. Other respondents were unsure of the relevance of the RBA because they felt it is not accepted in practice by the Cambodian Government, and is seen as an imposition from outside, even though the Government has ratified a long list of Rights Based UN/International Treaties. Furthermore the fact that land ownership in many cases is not clear, makes it very difficult to advocate for land rights, even though this seems to be the priority of affected groups.
CONCLUSION
Lack of clarity at a conceptual, theoretical level about the RBA, suggests that it has not been clearly explained to, or internalized by stakeholders, notably lowly educated, poor target groups. The RBA is even more difficult to apply in practice, especially if it challenges the government.

LESSONS LEARNED
Experience from LWF and CWS projects has shown that talking about Rights in terms of Empowerment lessens the abstractness of the RBA to Food Security, particularly for poor, uneducated groups.

5.4.7.1 RECOMMENDATION: that partners review what makes up the RBA they wish to employ in the next FSP phase, agree upon a common definition at both a conceptual and practical implementation level, and attempt to make this understood by all stakeholders through initial and refresher trainings.

Relevance of DCA/CA’s Development Objective to the causes of food insecurity
Development Objective: ‘Enhancing the fulfillment of the constitutional right to food and sustainable livelihood systems for rural communities, particularly vulnerable groups and the disadvantaged (women headed-households and children).’

PMs gave an average rank of 8 for the above. Approximately 50 root causes of food insecurity were provided by all respondents (see Appendix G for this list). Respondent suggestions as to what could have made the Development Objective more relevant to the root causes of food insecurity were: making the Development Objective broader, as food security is a cross-cutting issue, by mentioning economic opportunity as well as sustainable livelihoods; incorporating improved co-ordination amongst stakeholders at all levels for a common goal, particularly at sub-national level; placing more emphasis on why women are the target group; and changing the wording to state the constitutional right to food and sustainable livelihood systems needs to be “defended and upheld” as well as “fulfilled.”

Relevance of Objective 4 to the Development Objective
The average relevance ranking of the above was 7. Respondents suggested changing the Objective 4 words “address” to “realize,” and “facilitating” to “supporting advocacy,” could have made Objective 4 more relevant to the Development Objective.

Relevance of Objective 4 interventions to achieving Objective 4
All respondents thought all interventions for Objective 4 were relevant to achieving Objective 4, and gave an average relevance ranking of 7 out of 10.

CONCLUSION
While the practical causes of food insecurity were mentioned frequently across all respondents, a lack of human rights with regard to entitlement to food as a constitutional and universal right, was hardly mentioned as a cause. This suggests that many stakeholders don’t see a strong...
causal connection between the non-attainment of rights to food, and food insecurity, even though the FSP promotes a RBA as a method of overcoming food insecurity. Any future FSP will require a new contextual analysis to be undertaken and a participative workshop to be held where a problem tree or similar analysis outlining causes and effects of food insecurity will need to be thoroughly discussed. Appropriate interventions to address the main causes of food insecurity can then be developed taking particular care with the wording.

5.4.7.2 RECOMMENDATION: that before formulating any future FSPs, DCA/CA holds a participative planning workshop with all relevant stakeholders to brainstorm the contents and wording of a new FSP logical framework. A new context analysis should be undertaken by the design team and selected interventions should address the identified constraints as well as the specific needs of target groups. Any interventions should also be in line with DCA/CA’s priorities, partner mandates, and the government’s Food Security Plans.

**Relevance of Partner’s project components to the 4 FSP Immediate Objectives**

Partners’ rankings of the degree of relevance of their Project interventions and/or themes to the 4 FSP immediate objectives are indicated in the following table.

Table E: Ranked relevance of Partner’s Project Components/Themes to the 4 FSP Immediate Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER and Project Component</th>
<th>OBJ 1: RANK</th>
<th>OBJ 2: RANK</th>
<th>OBJ 3: RANK</th>
<th>OBJ 4: RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DPA</strong>: Handpump wells (not ranked or allotted to an Obj)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HK-I</strong>: Nutrition &amp; homestead production</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS: DRR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWF (2 offices):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income generation</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights &amp; Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 &amp; 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCA FRAMEWORKS</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CA FRAMEWORKS</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Livelihood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountable Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION
While overall, the project interventions delivered by partners in Table E were considered highly relevant to their nominated Objectives, the comparatively low relevance scores for HIV/AIDS and Political Space ranked against Objective 4, suggest these elements or themes were not seen as being as relevant to this Objective as others were.

Effectiveness of Objective 4 interventions in achieving Objective 4:
DCA/CA’s effectiveness of interventions in achieving Objective 4 ranked an average of 8.

5.4.8 Monitoring
Effectiveness of the FSP’s monitoring system in providing feedback to partners
While PMs ranked the above with an average score of 8, a review of monitoring reports and informal discussions with Project staff in the field indicated that the standard of monitoring reports could be improved, and feedback did not always reach field level staff.

Effectiveness of DCA/CA’s management response
The effectiveness of DCA/CA’s management response to problems highlighted in monitoring reports scored an average of 7, while DCA/CA’s effectiveness as a manager, scored an average of 8. Reviewing the division of tasks among DCA/CA staff in terms of whether this should be theme (intervention) based or partner based, was suggested to enhance effectiveness.

Conclusion
DCA/CA could have improved the overall feedback process by carrying out more monitoring visits to partners, following up with more frequent reports, and ensuring that partners disseminate the feedback internally through debriefings with project teams. Developing a common set of gender disaggregated indicators amongst partners, which include more performance targets, measure results against the baseline, and record the progress of cross-cutting issues; could have made the monitoring system more effective. These suggestions should be included in the new FSP Design Document.

5.4.8 RECOMMENDATION: that a review of the FSP monitoring system, including DCA/CA staff roles, be undertaken during the new FSP design phase to improve the relevance and efficiency of information gathering as well as the effectiveness and impact of management response.

5.4.9 Programme verses Project Approach
Effectiveness of a Programme verses Project Approach
The majority of respondents thought the Programme Approach was a more effective way to help target groups achieve FS because working in a group is better than working alone; many projects within a Programme can link to meet widespread needs and a common goal; Programmes can save costs since one staff (eg an HK-I nutrition specialist) can work with many partner projects; and Programmes can have flexible resources to meet the needs of different
organizations. However, some respondents were not sure which type of Programme approach was better. For example, should DCA/CA operate through single organizations with large integrated Programmes and wide geographical spread, that don’t need to link as much with other Partners because they have their own technical expertise, and as a result, can be managed more easily? Or should DCA/CA support a larger number of smaller organizations that have a narrower focus but a comparative advantage in their particular specialization, and link these organizations together, along with other DCA/CA Programmes (Gender Based Violence, etc), to deliver a broader integrated FSP?

Conclusion
Working through one or more large, experienced and well resourced integrated programmes could be a more efficient and more effective way to deliver FSP outputs. DCA/CA has to decide whether to do this, or to expand its partner base by working with many smaller, inexperienced NGOs. The second option raises challenges of capacity building, co-operation, co-ordination, and management. The smaller NGOs often lack broader long term funding and may be geographically scattered which could also limit effectiveness. The fieldwork revealed that smaller NGOs such as Vigilance who are part of a large network sometimes operate inefficiently, with some respondents reporting difficulty in working in synergy together.

LESSONS LEARNED
The FSP has been largely effective in achieving its objectives because it has taken an integrated Programme approach which works at various levels through different partners delivering complementary FS components. Field visits and documentation have revealed that the FSP can be delivered 1) by directing funds through large relatively self-sufficient organizations to deliver complementary projects with a large scale geographical coverage; or 2) by selecting partners of smaller size who are willing to work together in synergy toward a common FS goal. Both of these are versions of a Programme Approach.

5.4.9 RECOMMENDATION: that the FSP continues to take a Programme Approach. In doing so, DCA/CA should develop a clear strategy as a result of discussing whether it is more effective and efficient to: 1) support a small number of large and relatively self-sufficient partners running complementary (parallel) projects; or 2) support a larger number of smaller NGOs working in synergy together; or 3) have a combination of both.

5.4.10 Partner selection and participation
**Effectiveness of Partner Selection**
DCA/CA’s process of selecting Partners was ranked an average of 8. Respondents’ suggestions as to how to make selection more effective included: mainly look at experienced NGOs but be more tolerant of the lower standards of proposals from less experienced or new NGOs in order to include them as potential partners; give priority to selecting NGOs who work directly with the community; visit potential NGO projects in the field to get to know them prior to selection rather than rely on concept papers, previous evaluations, and proposal assessments;
and if only funding a small part of a project, make sure that the NGO has enough funds to support the other parts.

**Conclusion**
While most PMs felt the partner selection process was highly effective, their suggestions for making it more effective included having a mix of large and small NGOs, and field visits to potential partners to see how they operate in practice and spot opportunities for synergy. The current partner selection criteria process appears to be comprehensive and incorporates the majority of suggestions made above.

**Effectiveness of partner participation in FSP planning and implementation**
While this process scored an average of 8 for design/planning, and 9 for implementation, respondents’ suggestions to increase partner participation included: making plans more responsive to stakeholder (including partner) needs, and holding an extensive partner design/planning workshop, starting from a general concept and then moving on to specific activities ideally including more partners.

**5.4.11 Geographical spread**

**Effectiveness of geographical spread in promoting FSP objectives**
An average rank of 7 was given to the above with most respondents reporting that the current geographical spread made it easy to work in synergy together. However others felt the scope should be extended to the poorest areas in provinces already covered by the Programme, or in new provinces, based on the target population, perhaps using poverty statistics from UN agencies and National Statistics Databases. Looking at areas where there is a clear potential for improvement using agro-ecosystem analysis and considering working in areas where there are other DCA programmes such as HIV/AIDS, Gender Based Violence and Emergency Response to foster more synergy with these projects, were additional suggestions.

**CONCLUSION**
Any changes to the current geographical spread should be considered carefully by the FSP design team, since a spread which becomes too wide may result in the FSP losing focus and partners finding it difficult to work together because of sheer distances. The context analysis should assist with this decision.

**5.4.12 Impact**

**Impact (longer term) of the FSP on DCA/CA and partners**

**DCA/CA:** has gained Programme development experience to carry forward, and maintained a good network and relationship with stakeholders

**Partners:** have gained greater experience with Food Security issues; improved the quality of the Programme and partner capacity in managing it; facilitated more co-operation and linkages with stakeholders (although linkages could be improved) and increased sharing towards a
common goal; stimulated new initiatives; increased the partners’ ability in proposal writing, M&E and budgeting; and improved overall knowledge.

**Indirect partners:** While partners such as the NGO Forum, sits on various Technical Working Groups with relevant ministries and development partners and represents the voice of a large number of NGOS to advocate at a national level for FS, land, NRM, and other development issues, the impact of the FSP on indirect partners has been limited in comparison to the other levels.

**CONCLUSION**

Whilst the FSP’s impact has been positive at the DCA/CA, and partner level, it has been more limited at the indirect partner level because of weak linkages. There is room for improvement in the following areas: advocacy and linkages at the national and international level; joint participation between partners; linkages with other potential partners and with different levels of government; gender mainstreaming through the Programme, particularly concerning women’s real empowerment (women need to speak, not just sit on committees, and action be taken about their concerns); the need to bridge the gap between research and practical application on the ground, and sharing research results more fully with all stakeholders.

5.4.13 Efficiency of Programme Delivery

**Efficiency of DCA/CA supplying resources to implement the FSP**

The degree of efficiency with which DCA/CA has supplied resources, and how the response could have been improved is outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>AVGE RANK</th>
<th>SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of inputs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project grants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Need more grants (3 – 5 yrs) to whole components, not just specific parts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to be more tolerant of a low standard of proposal writing from NGOs with limited capacity to write them;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should shorten the time for making a funding decision;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should have better feedback for failed proposals to EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ staff time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO staff time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Should spend more time on support for proposal writing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should network more with partners and government;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should spend more time monitoring at the community level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are not enough staff in DCA/CA to be effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds for cross cutting activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Need more activity on gender and the environment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need more support overall for cross cutting issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of inputs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONCLUSION

The rankings above indicate that the efficiency and effectiveness of delivery of resources to implement the FSP ranges from moderate to highly efficient, with more improvement being required in the areas of quantity, quality and timing of funds for cross-cutting activities and headquarter (HQ) staff time. Respondents felt that making funding more flexible by allowing the carry over of funds for activities from one year to the next, if these funds have not been used in the allotted time period due to external controlling factors, could have improved the efficiency of delivery.

**Effectiveness and Efficiency of cost of the FSP**

With regard to the FSP being implemented more effectively and efficiently at less cost, one PM said it could be, four said it couldn’t, and the others didn’t know. With regard to the FSP being implemented more effectively and efficiently at the same cost, two PMs said it could, three said it couldn’t, and the others were unsure. Having joint proposals; following a process of quotation, bidding, contracting; form a procurement committee; setting guidelines for procurement; and asking for greater community contributions, were suggestions to improve cost efficiency. Some smaller NGOs felt they could operate at lower cost because they used motorbikes instead of cars.

### CONCLUSION

While most respondents felt the FSP could not have been implemented more effectively and efficiently at less cost, they were more divided about whether it could have been implemented more efficiently or effectively at the same cost. Respondents’ suggestions above concerning ways to improve the delivery process could be considered by DCA/CA in a review.

**5.4.13 RECOMMENDATION:** that DCA/CA reviews its Programme delivery process to improve its effectiveness and efficiency, particularly in funding delivery, for example by considering the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project grants</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ staff time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO staff time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Need to be quicker in following up with the back donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds for cross-cutting activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Funds need to be directed to issues that meet priority needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing and delivery of inputs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project grants</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Require long term funds 3-5 years;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slow to follow up with the back donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ staff time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO staff time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RO staff need more time spent on training - 3 times per year as well as resresher trainings on RBA, Advocacy, and Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold co-ordination meetings quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds for cross-cutting activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Need to be on time with clear objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
carry over of funds for activities from one year to the next, if these funds have not been used in the allotted time period due to external controlling factors.

5.4.14 Sustainability

Sustainability at each stakeholder level once the FSP has finished

The positive impact of the FSP on RH/DBs at village level and DBs at commune and higher levels, has been mentioned previously under the findings for Objectives 1, 2 and 3. For example, improved agriculture techniques; potable water; the strengthening of community structures for self functioning; and knowledge of rights and planning are real benefits which have good potential for FS sustainability. However, the external operating environment of uncertain D&D systems, lack of funding for activities, as well as climatic extremes, challenge sustainability. A fuller discussion of the potential for the interventions’ sustainability for these groups is also presented under the above mentioned objectives.

The impact of the FSP on DCA/CA, partners, and indirect partners, has been noted under 5.4.6.2 and 5.4.12. A discussion of the potential for the benefits of the FSP being likely to continue for these levels follows:

**DCA/CA level:** All PMs except one felt the FSP would be sustainable at this level because DCA/CA has acted as a catalyst in helping Partners to establish networks and links with other donors; it has established credibility by helping Programme partners projects to be sustainable; and the success of the Programme will live on through other donors replicating it because of a shared vision and mission. One respondent felt that the benefits to DCA/CA were largely during the life of the Programme serving as a source of case studies for successful campaigning, advocacy and fund raising.

**Partners:** All respondents thought the Programme would be sustainable at partner level because the capacity of partners has been strengthened to apply for funds from other partners/donors; the FSP has a similar goal to goals of other partners/donors so it is likely to carry on; partners will be able to utilize DCA/CA training in a practical way to help with sustainability and work together in the future; and research done on crosscutting issues will continue to provide evidence for advocacy use.

**Indirect partners:** All respondents noted that indirect partners could carry on in their FS efforts because they had other sources of funding; collaborate with other partners; and have useful and complementary strategies to others’ FS efforts.

**CONCLUSION**

There are many benefits likely to continue after the FSP finishes, especially stakeholder empowerment; knowledge about accessing funding avenues; and structures in place to implement plans and RB processes.
LESSONS LEARNED: Integrated FSPs which build the capacity of target groups to become empowered to help themselves, particularly with regard to networking and knowing how to access funds for future plans, have a higher chance of sustainability.

5.4.15 Other actors’ efforts outside of the FSP to improve food security
The Government’s Rectangular Strategy/Livelihood policies\(^{10}\) outline Cambodia’s Food Security direction. Relevant Ministries and actors like FAO contract NGOs to do FS work. Some organisations undertake research and strengthening of government ministries. Others do FS work via relief type development, large scale irrigation projects, or follow a community empowerment RB approach. The ADB has a big Ton Le Sap FSP but does not support advocacy because government policy efforts on land reform and unequal distribution of land is taking too long to see any results.

As mentioned previously, in early 2009 the Cambodian Government reportedly asked all donors to concentrate on alleviating the consequences of the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) as a priority, rather than focus on advocacy based Programmes, particularly if the GFC continues. In response to this, some of the larger donors have changed their focus to provide more tangible deliverables like food handouts and food related infrastructure and agriculture extension services. However, other actors are continuing with RB and Community Empowerment approaches because they believe that strengthening DB accountability and transparency, and advocating for better laws and sub-degrees in this regard, will have a deeper and longer term positive impact for more people, than a focus just on service delivery.

CONCLUSION
The evaluation findings have revealed that DCA/CA’s dual focus of service delivery (approximately 68% of funding) and advocacy (approximately 25% of funding), has been appropriate and largely successful, particularly at the village, commune and partner support levels over the last 5 years. A new contextual analysis which takes into account the impact of the GFC; the current social, political and economic operating environment; and the resources available to DCA/CA and partners; should guide DCA/CA in determining what combination of RBA and service delivery interventions might be appropriate for the next FSP phase. A thorough discussion with relevant stakeholders as to how DCA/CA should continue with the dual pronged approach, will be necessary prior to the next phase.

5.4.15 RECOMMENDATION: that the results of a new contextual analysis be used to guide DCA/CA and relevant stakeholders in determining what combination of RBA and service delivery interventions might be appropriate in the next FSP phase.

\(^{10}\) The Rectangular Strategy for Growth, Employment, Equity and Efficiency in Cambodia, 2004’ and National Strategic Development Plan NSDP 2006-2010
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of evaluation:</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the evaluation:</td>
<td>The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the achievements of the Food Security Programme against its objectives and make recommendations for the design of the next Food Security Programme Phase 2010-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementing partners:
- Helen Keller International (Cambodia), HKI
- Lutheran Word Federation - Cambodia (LWF-C)
- Church World Service-Cambodia (CWS-C)
- NGO Forum on Cambodia
- Star Kampuchea (SK)
- Development and Partnership in Action (DPA)
- Banteay Srei (BS-new partner)

Evaluation Team members
Core team members:
- External evaluation team will be hired to undertake this assignment

DCA/CA Staff available for support:
- Phung Sila, DCA/CA Cambodia Food Security Programme Officer
- Sam Pagna, DCA/CA Cambodia, Programme Officer
- Phat Ponnary, DCA/CA Cambodia, Project Officer

Staff available for advice:
- Jonas Nangedekaer, DCA Country Coordinator for Asia
- Nadia Saracini DCA/CA Cambodia Programme Coordinator
- Ray Hasan, CA Head of Programmes, Policy and Strategy
- Mette Lund Sørensen, DCA Programme Type Advisor

1. BACKGROUND
1.1 Country Background
The Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) has made many promises to combat poverty, malnutrition and food insecurity in the country through the adoption of a National Poverty Reduction Strategy (NPRS), Socioeconomic Development Plan (SDP) and Millennium Development Goals (MDG), yet despite this verbal and written commitment, it has failed to mobilize adequate time and resources to promote real results. Although the government has committed to improvement and reform, institutional and human resource capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Rural Development are reported to be considerably weaker than the ministries in charge of the other priority sectors.

Cambodia’s economic growth reached a peak of 13.4 percent in 2005 fuelled by rapid expansion in garment exports, construction and tourism, but these sectors are now in marked decline. This fairly narrow economic base is supplemented by agriculture, a sector which is crucial to pro-poor economic
growth but which has grown only relatively slowly at around 5.5 percent per year in recent years. Growth in agriculture is constrained by lack of infrastructure support such as irrigation schemes and rural roads, limited agriculture techniques, market information, insecure land tenure and dependency on rain-fed agriculture.

The nutritional status of children in Cambodia improved considerably between 2000 - 2005 according to the report from the Cambodia Demographic and Health Survey (CDHS) of 2005 released by the National Institute of Statistics (NIS). For children under 5 years the rate of acute malnutrition (wasting) reduced from 15% to 7.3%. This was in line with progress made with regard to exclusive breast-feeding and other nutrition related behavioral change as well as with the improvements in the access to safe water and improved sanitation. However, a worsening of children’s nutritional status was identified by a nationwide survey carried out by National Institute of Statistics with assistance from UNICEF in November 2008 in order to follow up the impact of high food prices on nutrition and health of children under five. The survey result showed a slight increase in acute malnutrition of children under five with a rate of 8.9% by end of 2008. For several Provinces acute child malnutrition was critical at a rate of more than 10%. Malnutrition generally is more prevalent in rural than urban areas, but according to a UN FAO Factsheet (2006) a gender-specific bias does not seem to exist. The percentage of undernourished population was between 2002-2004 33%.

Soaring prices of fuel and the global financial crisis have adversely affected Cambodia's economy with high inflation rate of 20.06% (according to National Institute of Statistics). The high food price situation affected a wide range of poor and vulnerable groups and it is feared it could exacerbate household debt, lead to more children dropping out of school in order to work and increase pressure to migrate. Persistence of these issues could seriously undermine poverty reduction gains and increase inequalities.

It has been estimated that 85% of rural livelihoods in Cambodia depend on agriculture, fisheries and/or forest resources. Most agricultural activities in Cambodia occur on small farms that rely exclusively on rainfall as their source of irrigation. Cambodian paddy yields are the lowest in the South East Asian region. Rice has shown to be an inefficient crop that accounts for a mere 14% of the national GDP, it relies heavily on seasonal rainfall and is diminished by 50% after having been processed or milled. Dependency on rice prevails throughout the country and many families sell or trade more nutritious fruit and vegetable that are grown or foraged in forested areas in order to buy rice which negatively affects their diet.

Crop failure is seen to occur due to droughts and floods that in recent years have occurred more frequently and more seriously. It is globally recognized that the current climatic changes are far more rapid and more intense than previously seen. Many individuals and organizations document that poor people are likely to be hardest hit by their impact. In Cambodia it is obvious that especially small farm holders are affected by more frequently occurring natural disasters to which their only possible response is selling land or other assets and/or taking up non-farming occupations which for the poor families often involves unsafe migration often leading to labor exploitation and exposure to commercially sexual exploitation.

Land has become tradable at a time where the foundation for the land market is still not fully in place. Lack of clarity over land ownership and poor governance in relation to land has resulted in high levels of displacement of poor rural communities by more powerful individuals and companies often acting illegally or without transparency. Pressure for land is being exacerbated by international investment in land for
food/fuel production for export; mining prospecting; and the poorly regulated granting of Economic Land Concessions. Cambodia has a land law; however it is not often enforced in favour of the poor. Cambodia is moving further and further from equitable land distribution. These problems often occur in the areas with great potential for business and rapid urbanization, areas with high population density or with good economic prospects. The negative implications have had adverse impact on sustainable development of the agricultural sector.

As part of national effort to combat poverty and mal-nutrition, the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) 2006-2010 was officially launched of which the Food Security and Nutrition (FSN) Strategy is one of the core components. The key point of the FSN objective is to enhance Good Governance at the national level, to create the institutional and policy environment for achieving improved food security and nutrition among food-insecure households in Cambodia.

As component from NSDP, the National Programme for Household Food Security and Poverty Reduction 2007-2011 targeting 2 million poorest Cambodian was launched in order to increase and ensuring food availability, improving food accessibility including incomes and affordability and also ensuring optimal food use and utilization through health and nutrition education. The Programme has a strong focus at the household and community level, with 83 percent of the total budget of 51 million US$ over 5 year period. The Programme will be guided by the coordination committee consisting of all major stakeholders, including donors and chaired by Council of Agriculture and Rural Development (CARD). The committee also monitors the overall implementation, assesses outcomes and ensures coherence with the NSDP. The National Executive Committee is chaired by the Minister of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries who will oversee the implementation. At the field level the Programme will be implemented through Field Agents who may be Government agencies, projects (UN or Bilateral donors) NGOs or private companies. They will be asked to submit proposals to scale up their already effective activities.

1.2 Background of the Programme
Guided by principles of empowerment and social justice; a concern for reaching the poorest people; and a partnership approach, DCA/CA Cambodia take a rights based approach to development. The current Food Security Programme period from June 2005 to December 2009 was therefore focused on supporting approaches to promoting human rights and advocacy in order to achieve fulfillment of the right to food. The FS Programme strategy and matrix were developed in March 2006 by DCA. The FS Programme subsequently became a joint programme with Christian Aid when DCA and CA merged their programmes in Cambodia in 2008. It was as a result of this merger that former CA partner DPA was absorbed into the FS Programme.

The FS Programme matrix was revised following a mid-term programme review in January 2008. The review was fully documented so is mentioned only briefly here. The review acknowledged the significant achievements of the Programme but identified the following challenges:

- Unclear strategies for creating synergy among projects within the Programme and between the Programme and other DCA/CA programmes in Cambodia (Gender Based Violence and HIV/AIDS and a regional programme on Safe Migration and Trafficking);
- Lack of a clear strategy for how to expand the partnership base as well as the balance between partnership strengthening and Programme development;
- Identifying and securing effectiveness and efficiency of the data collection for outcome monitoring at project as well as programme level.
In addition to the key findings it examined how the strategic approaches and expertise on the various aspects of food security in both Christian Aid and DanChurchAid will be able to complement each other in future cooperation on food security in Cambodia.

Finally it can generally be concluded that while the team identified a range of issues to be followed up the Programme in Cambodia is running well and contributing to the objectives in the Programme.

**Development Objective of the Programme:**
Enhancing the fulfillments of the constitutional right to food and sustainable livelihood systems for rural communities, particularly vulnerable groups and the disadvantaged (women headed-households and children)

**Immediate objectives of the Programme are:**

5.5 Sustainable integrated farm management, disaster preparedness, savings, incomes and the nutritional status of the primary target groups are improved.

5.6 Local community structures (CBOs, VDCs and others), empowered poorest household and women work in solidarity to claim and advocate for the fulfillment of the constitutional right to food.

5.7 Increased accountability and transparency of Government structures and implementation of policies in relation to land tenure and sustainable and equitable natural resource management

5.8 DCA/CA have been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities and facilitating linkages to advocacy campaigns and information work.

**Description of the Implementing Partners and their contribution to the Programme**
The seven implementing partners have contributed according to their mandate and field of expertise in order to contribute to achieving the Programme objectives including:

- Promotions of sustainable livelihood systems; which is mainly implemented by LWF).
- Building communities toward more resilient to natural disasters which are being executed by LWF and CWS.
- Empowerment of the poor through organization and awareness raising which is being executed by LWF; Star Kampuchea and DPA
- Grassroots advocacy implemented by LWF and ADHOC.
- Advocacy on land rights being implemented by NGO Forum and recently also by Star Kampuchea focusing on natural resources management;
- Promotion of nutritional status of the target groups carried out by HKI.
- Development Education and Advocacy as cross-cutting issues implemented by DPA
- Gender based empowerment project implemented by Banteay Srei:

**The key achievements obtained during the implementation period are:**

1. Sustainable integrated farm management, disaster preparedness, and income generation as well as the nutritional status of the primary target groups are improved:
   - Increased crop yield particularly through farmer field school approach,
   - Increased income among members of village banks,
   - LWF staff and key community leaders trained by HKI to mainstream the concept and methodologies to improve nutritional status to villagers with particular focus on women and children.
   - Increased capacity of communities to cope with disaster hazards through training and mitigation projects.
2. Improved capacity of Village Development Committees (VDCs), and empowered poorest household and women to claim and advocate for the fulfillment of the constitutional right to food

- Increased capacity of Village Development Committees (VDCs) who are the focal points to mobilize communities to manage and sustain their rights-based development process which encompasses diversifying crops;
- Partner households supported to initiate and implement their development plans and
- Advocacy campaigns to address human and women right and request to duty bearers for better social services delivery.

3. Improved capacity to farmers to claim their land rights and strengthened advocacy and networking at National level to improve implementation of land tenure system as specified in the land law

- The NGO Forum has established the Land Action Network for Development (LAND) to address the issues of land tenure security and build the capacity of its relevant stakeholders on land law and coordination efforts. The project has successfully facilitated dialogue between national LAND members and the newly established National Authority for Land Dispute Resolution (NALDR) as well as with donors’ agencies focusing on social land concession and other aspects of the current land reform agenda.
- SK began to build the capacity of its stakeholders to claim their rights to access to natural resources with special focus on land while establishing and strengthening the advocacy network at provincial level.

4. DCA been instrumental in facilitation increased capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities particularly the food insecure households.

- The first Food Security Programme Steering Committee meeting was organized in January 2007
- Two partner platform meeting were organized each year stating from 2007 participated by all DCA partners. As the results, partners have become familiar with the Programme strategies, their roles and responsibility to contribute to the whole Food Security Programme including possible Programme Cross-Cutting activities.

2. PURPOSE AND PROGRAMME EVALUATION OBJECTIVE

The Programme evaluation is external and part of the programme assessment and organizational learning.

2.1 The purpose of the evaluation:

The purpose of the evaluation is to gain better understanding of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the Programme; and to examine what can be learned from this to inform the development of the next Food Security Programme Document.

2.2 Objectives:

1. To evaluate the relevance and impact of the Food Security Programme in relation to its objectives, as well as the appropriateness of individual project strategies in contributing to this.
2. To assess the complementarities and synergy between projects within the Food Security Programme
3. To provide recommendations for future scope and design of the new Food Security Programme Phase, including the potential role of DCA/CA in contributing to partner capacity building and to advocacy for rights-base approaches to food security.
The evaluation team will present the findings and recommendations in terms of lessons learned and what might have been done differently to more effectively achieve Programme objectives.

3. SCOPE
The scope of the evaluation does not extend to an in-depth analysis of the projects that are included in the programme. The focus should be on the extent to which the projects and the cross-cutting activities contribute to the programme objectives and indicators, and all the cross-cutting activities such as the capacity building, the partner platforms (a.k.a. programme steering committee), and the joint advocacy efforts etc. (i.e. the added value of DCA/CA in the partnerships we participate in and the management of the programme).

The Programme evaluation will consider information from the programme and project monitoring, including project reviews and evaluations, monitoring reports etc, as well as comments from stakeholder interviews, to highlight any gaps within the Programme.

Some key documents include:

- The Programme Document (include initial and revised programme matrices)
- The Mid Term Review of the DCA Food Security Programme and in particular the revised programme matrix contained within that.
- Documents relating to the Partner Platform
- Plans relating to the Programme’s crosscutting activities organised by DCA/AC
- Programme Monitoring Reports
- Project evaluations
- Relevant DCA and CA policy documents including the DCA Right To Food Policy; the DCA Crosscutting Rights Based Commitment; the CA Secure Livelihoods Strategy and the CA Accountable Governance Strategy

Other documents will be supplied as requested.

The geographical scope will be as set out in DCA Food Security Programme Document for 2005 – 2009.

The evaluation will focus on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the Programme with particular focus on:

- Contribution and relevance of projects to the overall Programme objectives
- Relevance of the immediate objectives to the development objectives; and relevance of these to the wider context from 2005-2009 (with reference particularly for key concerns for the DCA/CA Cambodia programme: gender inequality, governance, HIV/AIDS, international migration and climate change)
- Quality of relationships built with and between partner agencies, with a particular focus on the added value of bringing the partners together within the Programme
- Strengths of relationships built with all relevant stakeholders including right holders and moral and official duty bearers.
- Relevance and quality of the crosscutting activities to strengthening the capacities of partners to manage projects, contribute to Programme objectives and to build a sense of ownership of the Programme among partners
- Relevance and quality of the crosscutting activities to support partners’ and DCA/CA campaigning and advocacy on policy issues of relevance to the Programme
- The Programme’s relevance and contribution to DCA and CA organisational objectives as set out in relevant policy documents such as the DCA Rights to Food Policy, Rights-based Commitment and Gender policies, the CA Sustainable Livelihoods and accountable Governance Strategies.
- The Programme’s contribution to empowerment and the realisation of relevant human rights norms, including the extent to which it has addressed gender inequalities.
The evaluation report will make recommendations concerning the design of the next phase of the Food Security Programme in Cambodia as appropriate. The evaluator(s) are free to make recommendations concerning future interventions or approaches that are not currently part of the Food Security Programme.

Although the 'key questions' must be addressed, the sub-questions are intended purely as a guide. Those most relevant to the focus areas outlined above may be addressed.

4. KEY QUESTIONS

4.1 Relevance

To what extent is the Programme strategy relevant to the need identified? Especially related to the structural causes of rights violations in the given context?

Sub questions:
- Was the context analysis relevant and appropriate? Is it still?
- What is the added value of DCA and the programme approach (as opposed to project approach) in this particular?
- Is there a relevant and meaningful synergy and cohesion between the projects in the Programme? i.e. in what way do the projects complement each other in achieving the Programme goals? (Geographically, targeting, thematically, etc.)
- In what way have the different partners contributed to the Programme?
- Is there synergy with other DCA programmes in the country, and with the efforts of other funding agencies?
- In what way does the Programme strategy contribute to the strategic goals of DCA, particularly Rights based Approach and Gender equity as established in Vision and Plan?

4.2 Effectiveness

1) To what extent were the Programme objectives achieved at outcome (and if verifiable at impact level?) Why and why not? Are there any unintended results of the Programme?

Sub questions:
- To what extent were the activities implemented according to relevant DCA policy, especially related to RBA and gender?
- To what extent did the cross cutting activities, particularly the capacity building efforts achieve their objectives? Why and Why not?
- To what extent has the monitoring undertaken in the course of the Programme provided management with sufficient information to follow progress towards the desired results? Did management act accordingly?
- Is DCA (RO and HQ) an effective manager of this particular programme? (Strategic planning, staffing, resource management, monitoring, partnerships, etc.)

2) How have partnerships been enhanced as a result of the Programme? (DCA and Partners, partners and rights holders, rights holders and duty bearers, and partners among themselves?)

Sub questions:
- How (with what criteria) were the partners selected? And how are they involved and what is their decision-making power in the planning and implementation of the Programme including the cross cutting activities? Does the Partner Platform fulfill its purpose as identified by the Programme?
- Does DCA deliver an adequate support, particularly with regards to capacity building, to the partners involved in the Programme, and is DCA responsive to needs identified by partners? Does the support affect in a positive way the partners’ capacity to implement its projects? Has DCA and the programme approach contributed to the organizational strengthening of the partner? In what way?
- Do the partners have the right skills to contribute to the achievement of the goals in the Programme? And has the programme approach contributed to the effectiveness of the partners?
An important part would be the capacity of the partner to influence the processes that the Programme aspires to reach at the levels of the rights-holders, and the local and national authorities.

- Has the Programme facilitated the link (access) between the rights-holders and duty bearers? Has it had a positive effect on the relationship between beneficiaries and partners?
- Has the Programme enabled the partner’s and DCA’s advocacy works with other relevant actors, e.g. facilitation of networks?
- Has the Programme stimulated relations between partners in any significant way? Has this in turn had an effect on the Programme?

4.3 Efficiency
Has the Programme approach, in this case, been a cost-efficient way to implement development assistance?

Sub questions:
- Could we have achieved the same with fewer resources? Or could we have achieved more results with the same resources?
- What are the overall costs of the Programme compared to the number of beneficiaries?

4.4 Impact
What has been the impact at rights-holders level (outcome)? And at other levels that was supposedly addressed by the Programme?

Sub questions:
- What are the most significant changes in the lives of the rights holders, their relation to the duty bearers, or the practice of the duty bearers that can be attributed to the Programme?
- Did the Programme approach enhance impact and focus of DCAs’ work as envisioned when the transition from project approach was initiated? In what way?
- Could the same impact have been achieved through project approach?

4.5 Sustainability
- Are the benefits from the Programme, especially at rights holders level likely to continue after the finalization of the Programme? Why and why not?

4.6 Recommendations
Can the above be rewritten as:
Recommendations should focus on:

- lessons learned and what might have been done differently to more effectively achieve Programme objectives from 2005-2009.
- relevance of immediate objectives
- impact of past activities and possible continuation of these or introduction of new activities
- the appropriateness of the partner portfolio and any obvious gaps
- effectiveness of DCA/CA partnership approach and crosscutting activities to support advocacy and capacity building

5. STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT
Food Security in Cambodia is an issue of concern to many institutions, organisations and individuals. Therefore, stakeholders that should be considered as important for the programme evaluation include:

- DCA/CA HQ level:
Relevant staff who indirectly contribute to achieve the programme objectives and particularly technical staff who analyse and disseminate the lessons learned from our Programmes

- At National level:
  
  NGOs: Implementing partners, their networks, Commune Council Support Project (CCSP)
  Government: Ministry of Rural Development; Ministry of Environment (National Adaptation Programme of Action to Climate Change).
  International Organisations: Food and Agriculture Organization, Delegation of European Union in Cambodia. Danish Embassy/Danida, UK DFID

- At sub-national level (Province and District)
  Provincial and District Officers from Rural Development, Agriculture and Local Administration,

- At Local level (Commune and Village)
  Commune Councilors, Village leaders, VDCs, CBOs and individuals/households.

6. METHOD
The overall methodology and process for which the evaluator(s) will be responsible will include the following:

1. Desk review and analysis of documents. DCA/CA Cambodia shall make all relevant documents available for the team prior to evaluation take place.
2. The evaluator(s) shall develop a methodology for the evaluation making use of available tools such as the DCA evaluation matrix as appropriate.
3. Using participatory approaches the evaluator(s) shall conduct field visits to dialogue with field staff, management teams, rights holders and duty bearers targeted within the programme as well as right holders and other stakeholders not targeted. DCA/CA Cambodia will facilitate coordination of meetings with implementing partners and other relevant actors.
4. The evaluator(s) shall analyze all the findings and write up the report which should be maximum 30 pages long.
5. At the end of the evaluation, the evaluator(s) with participate in a debriefing meeting with programme partners to present preliminary findings and discuss recommendations with the programme partners.

Food Security Reference Materials:
- Cambodia Food Security Programme document 2005-2009
- Food Security Programme matrix (Original and Revised Feb. 2008)
- Mid-Term Review DCA Cambodia, Food Security Programme, January 2008.
- Six month Cambodia Food Security Programme reports: 2006-2007
- ToR for the Programme Steering Committee
- Star Kampuchea evaluation 2009.
- LWF evaluation of the Strategic Plan, FFS evaluation, Sustainable Assessment.
- HKI Nutrition Initiative Project: baseline and end-line study
- Monitoring reports
- DCA/CA Cambodia food security programme achievement matrix
- Assessment report for potential new partners
- Evaluation reports of the Community Based Disaster Preparedness and Mitigation Projects: 2005-06 and 2007-08
- Minutes of the programme steering committee meetings
- Draft justification for extension of the programme period
### List of Projects implemented (completed and on-going) during 2005 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LWF Cambodia, 2002-05 Food Security Program</td>
<td>Co-funding (EU)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LWF Cambodia, IRDEP2002-05</td>
<td>Danida</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LWF Cambodia, DipECHO 2005-06</td>
<td>Co-funding (ECHO)</td>
<td>1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PACT, Grassroots Advocacy 2005-06</td>
<td>Danida</td>
<td>1327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PK, Safe drinking water, 2005-06</td>
<td>Own fund</td>
<td>1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LWF Cam, Samakimeanchey Drinking water 2005-06</td>
<td>Own fund</td>
<td>1402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NGO Forum, Land Issues project, Cambodia 2005</td>
<td>Own fund</td>
<td>1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LWF Camb, IRDEP 2006-08</td>
<td>Danida</td>
<td>1517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DCA, Cambodia-Cross-cutting 2005-08 (8 projects)</td>
<td>Danida</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HKI, Cambodia Nutrition capacity building (05-08)</td>
<td>Danida</td>
<td>1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LWF Camb, AZEECON Support Project 2006-07</td>
<td>Own fund</td>
<td>1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LWF Cambodia, Drinking water project 2006</td>
<td>Own fund</td>
<td>1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LWF Cambodia, Drinking water project 2007</td>
<td>Own fund</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LWF Cambodia, DipECHO 2007-08</td>
<td>Co-funding (ECHO)</td>
<td>1683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NGO Forum, Land Issues project 2006-08</td>
<td>Danida</td>
<td>1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Star K, rights to Access to Natural Resources 2007-09</td>
<td>Danida</td>
<td>1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>DPA, Support to DEA Unit 2007-2009</td>
<td>DCA/CA</td>
<td>2488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>DCA, DipECHO 2008-09</td>
<td>Co-funding (ECHO)</td>
<td>2677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LWF, DipECHO 2008-09</td>
<td>Co-funding (ECHO)</td>
<td>2445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CWS, DipECHO 2008-09</td>
<td>Co-funding (ECHO)</td>
<td>2676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>LWF Camb, AZEECON strengthen 2008-09</td>
<td>Own fund</td>
<td>2464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>DPA, WATSAN 2008</td>
<td>Own fund</td>
<td>2622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>PK, Water and Farming 2008</td>
<td>Own fund</td>
<td>2659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>LWF Camb, credit for women 2008-09</td>
<td>Own fund</td>
<td>2616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>LWF Camb, IRDEP II 2009-11</td>
<td>Danida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>DPA DEA 2009-11</td>
<td>Danida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>NGO Forum Action plan 2009-11</td>
<td>Danida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. TEAM COMPOSITION

Core team members:
- External evaluation team will be hired to undertake this assignment

DCA/CA Staff available for support:
- Phung Sila, DCA Cambodia Food Security Programme Officer
- Sam Pagna, DCA Cambodia, Programme Officer
- Phat Ponnary, DCA Cambodia, Project Officer

Staff available for advice:
- Jonas Needdakaer, DCA Country Coordinator for Asia
- Nadia Saracini DCA/CA Cambodia Programme Coordinator
- Mette Lund Sørensen, DCA/CA Programme Type Advisor

http://www.foodsecurity.gov.kh/
The support and advisory staff will be responsible to review Report writing according to agreement with the external team.

8. TIME TABLE AND REPORTING
The evaluation is scheduled to start as soon as possible and it is anticipated to take up to 4 weeks:

- First week: Analyzing relevant documents and reports and finalising methodology and workplan.
- Second and third weeks: Field interviews and investigation
- Fourth week: Presentation of preliminary finding and recommendations, consolidate comments and submit the report.

Standard reporting format is attached as annex to this ToR

The time schedule will be developed jointly with the evaluator(s). The aim is to complete the evaluation as soon as possible and ideally by end of November 2009 in order that the recommendations may inform the development of a new Food Security Programme to designed by early 2010.

9. FOLLOW UP WORKSHOP
The evaluation process could culminate in a workshop in Cambodia with key stakeholders where the recommendations are discussed, and agreement is reached on how to follow up on the recommendations. This will be discussed with the Consultant and will depend on the timing of the evaluation process.

Annexes to this ToR:

Annex 1: Standard format for evaluation reports

By following a uniform format, evaluation reports tend to be easier to read and use. The format also facilitates syntheses of different reports for broader learning purposes, such as suggested in DCAs evaluation policy. The format could be included as an annex to the contract with the consultant’s thus providing early instructions on how the report should be prepared and what is expected to be delivered.

The report should not be longer than 30 pages exclusive of annexes. Following is a format for the report structure with explanation of the content in each section.

1. Executive summary
The executive summary of maximum two pages provides information about the evaluation and its purpose, emphasizing main findings, evaluative conclusions, recommendations and lessons to be learned. The summary should be self-contained and self-explanatory. Special care should be taken to prepare the executive summary, as it is may be the only part of the report that some people have time to read.

2. Introduction
The introduction presents the background and overall purpose and scope of the evaluation, including how and by whom it is intended to be used, (focus on accountability and learning, whether it is terminal or in preparation of a new phase, etc.) as well as the evaluation criteria employed and the key questions addressed. A brief summary of the methods applied with specific reference to how rights-holders and
other stakeholders have been involved should also be included here. It also outlines the structure of the report and provides guidance to readers.

3. Background
This chapter describes the main characteristics of the evaluated intervention and its given context including location, history, organization and stakeholders. It should cover the focal problem addressed by the intervention, the objectives and the logic of cause and effect of the intervention. A description of activities carried out, key outputs delivered and overall costs should be included. The chapter should also cover the policy and development context of the evaluated intervention, including the assumptions about external factors that were part of intervention planning. When preparing the chapter, the evaluators should summarize the findings and conclusions of any earlier evaluations of the same intervention.

4. Findings and conclusions
Findings are empirical data that the evaluators present as evidence relevant to the evaluation questions. The findings are systematically presented in objective terms so that readers can form their own opinion about the strengths and weakness of the conclusions of the evaluation. They can be presented in various ways that can be decided upon by the RR and the team leader. It is of course important the author of the report is comfortable with the presentation. A couple of suggestions are:

- According to the standard ToR (i.e. according to evaluation criteria)
- According to an operation logic e.g. Design & planning, Implementation, Results, Cross cutting issues
- According to the logframe of the operation (by objective, activity or other)

The evaluative conclusions are the evaluators’ concluding assessments of the intervention based on the findings. They provide answers to the questions in the ToR and if possible, based on the data available, they pass an evaluative judgment as to whether the operation was relevant, effective, efficient, and sustainable. The evaluative conclusions are often best presented together with the underlying findings on which they are based, and not in a separate section as sometimes seen.

5. Lessons learned
Lessons to be learned are findings and conclusions that can be generalized beyond the evaluated intervention. In formulating lessons, the evaluators are expected to examine the intervention in a wider perspective and put it in relation to current ideas about good practice in the given context.

6. Recommendations
Recommendations indicate what actions the evaluators believe should be taken on the basis of the evaluation. Recommendations to DCA may cover the whole spectrum of aid management, including resource allocation, financing, design and planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. Recommendations should always identify their respective addressees and be tailored to the specific needs and interests of each addressee. They should be clearly stated and geared to facilitate implementation.

7. Annexes
The report should include as a minimum following annexes: ToR, bibliography, list of people and institutions interviewed, description of methodology applied, (including research design, sampling, data collection instruments (surveys, checklists, interview guides, etc.), and analytical procedures. It should discuss the limitations of the selected methods as well as their strengths.
### APPENDIX B: 2008 FSP Revised Matrix

**DCA/CA Cambodia Food Security 2005-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Enhancing the fulfilment of the constitutional right to food and sustainable livelihood systems for rural communities, particularly vulnerable groups and the disadvantaged (women headed-households and children)**

**Long-term impact indicators** (list not exhaustive)

1. Decrease with 50% the no. of months of food insecurity for target group
2. Nutritional status improved
3. National and provincial level networks strengthen their voice as advocates for the poor and marginalized

**Risks:**
The government of Cambodia strengthens and tightens its control over civil society, thus making implementation of development projects as well as advocacy activities difficult or even dangerous for the organisations as well as for the individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objectives</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Intervention/activities</th>
<th>Partner(s)</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sustainable integrated farm management, disaster preparedness, savings, incomes and the nutritional status of the primary target groups are improved.</td>
<td>1. FFS established and supported leading to increased diversified farm output and</td>
<td>1.1 Establish and work with community based farmer field-school incl. activities focussing on the application of sustainable agricultural techniques, organising groups, group-training and facilitation towards households with special focus on women.</td>
<td>LWF HKI DPA?</td>
<td>- Partners' bi-annual reports.  - Monitoring field visit.  - End-line survey.  - Food Security and Vulnerability information System, National Institute of Statistics.  - Report on disaster by National, provincial, commune disaster management</td>
<td>- Major natural disasters does not occur  - The security and political situation remain stable.  - The position of National and provincial line departments is positive to cooperate with partners and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
community members in disaster preparedness activities and work with government structures and call on them to protect and respect the rights holders’ right to food.
4. Village Bank Committee activities have proved financially viable and sustainable.
5. Measurable improvements in household nutritional status

diversified food crops and improved nutritional practices at household levels.
2.1 Provide technical assistance to diversified food crops as well as technical assistance to access potable water and improvement of households’ nutritious food practices.
3.1 Facilitate establishment and work with community based disaster preparedness committees to improve disaster management
3.2 Train community members in disaster risk reduction and disaster mitigation.
4.1 Facilitation and training of viable community based Village Bank Committees focusing on sustainable Village Bank savings and loans schemes and small business skills training to loan-takers.
5.1 Nutrition training of LWF staff and monitoring of the nutritional status in selected target areas by HKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objectives</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Interventions/activities</th>
<th>Partner(s)</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increased number of local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Partners annual report.</td>
<td>- Major natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Objectives</td>
<td>Outcome Indicators</td>
<td>Interventions/activities</td>
<td>Partner(s)</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local community structures (CBOs, VDCs and others), empowered poorest household and women work in solidarity to claim and advocate for the fulfilment of the constitutional right to food.</td>
<td>community structures and households implement their long term development plans resulting in a reduction in food insecure months.</td>
<td>1.1 Capacity building of local structures in taking responsibility and action on village development affairs and advocate for women to become involved at decision-making levels of Village and higher political levels.</td>
<td>LWF NGO F Star DPA</td>
<td>- Monitoring field visit. - End-line survey. - Reports on the results of District Integration Planning Workshop. - Annual Commune Council Development Report.</td>
<td>- disasters doesn’t occur - The security and political situation remain stable. - The position of National and provincial line departments is positive to cooperate with partners and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased number of gender related food security issues addressed in local community structures.</td>
<td>1.2 Facilitate development of participatory household development plans and provide support to the poorest and women headed households in implementing such plans.</td>
<td>1.3 Engage with and provide assistance to VDCs in establishing long term development plans and rolling budgets, also addressing the most vulnerable groups and relevant gender based issues.</td>
<td>2.1 Capacity building and awareness raising of rights and gender to local community structures (with focus on the VDCs) and village members 4.1 Provide training and assistance to VDCs in organising advocacy campaigns towards relevant duty-bearers for rights issues in relation to sustainable livelihood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Objectives</td>
<td>Outcome Indicators</td>
<td>Interventions/activities</td>
<td>Partner(s)</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increased accountability and transparency of Government structures and implementation of policies in relation to land tenure and sustainable and equitable natural resource management</td>
<td>1. Increased response by duty-bearers to allocate resources to implement existing legislation on food security at all levels as raised by members of the networks. 2. Commune Development Plans (CDP) increasingly include activities relevant to food security as requested by communities. 3. Resources are allocated to the CDPs and reflect gender and rights issues.</td>
<td>4.2 Establish and strengthen provincial networks working with locally based NGOs and CBO on land issues at household and village level. 4.3 Support for establishment of farmers networks marketing cooperatives or other appropriate structures to facilitate information sharing and access to markets and coordination of joint action. 5.1 Work with VDCs/CBOs to empower them to engage in a participatory process to develop the CDPs and allocation of funds</td>
<td>LWF NGO F Star</td>
<td>- Partners annual report.  - Monitoring field visit.  - Land grabbing monitoring database.  - End-line survey/evaluation Report.  - Province-District-Commune poverty monitoring information system database (National Programme on Decentralised and de-concentration).</td>
<td>- The security and political situation remain stable.  - The position of National and provincial line departments is positive to cooperate with partners and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Objectives</td>
<td>Outcome Indicators</td>
<td>Interventions/activities</td>
<td>Partner(s)</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relevant land rights issues</td>
<td>Other relevant land rights issues</td>
<td>Other relevant land rights issues</td>
<td>Other relevant land rights issues</td>
<td>Other relevant land rights issues</td>
<td>Other relevant land rights issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Engage with Commune Councils in selected communes to discuss and provide input on roles and responsibilities, planning and financial management</td>
<td>2.1 Engage with Commune Councils in selected communes to discuss and provide input on roles and responsibilities, planning and financial management</td>
<td>2.1 Engage with Commune Councils in selected communes to discuss and provide input on roles and responsibilities, planning and financial management</td>
<td>2.1 Engage with Commune Councils in selected communes to discuss and provide input on roles and responsibilities, planning and financial management</td>
<td>2.1 Engage with Commune Councils in selected communes to discuss and provide input on roles and responsibilities, planning and financial management</td>
<td>2.1 Engage with Commune Councils in selected communes to discuss and provide input on roles and responsibilities, planning and financial management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4. DCA/CA have been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities and facilitating linkages to advocacy campaigns and information work. | 4. DCA/CA have been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities and facilitating linkages to advocacy campaigns and information work. | 4. DCA/CA have been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities and facilitating linkages to advocacy campaigns and information work. | 4. DCA/CA have been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities and facilitating linkages to advocacy campaigns and information work. | 4. DCA/CA have been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities and facilitating linkages to advocacy campaigns and information work. | 4. DCA/CA have been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities and facilitating linkages to advocacy campaigns and information work. |

<p>| 1. Capacity of partners’ organisations to address the right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized groups improved. | 1. Capacity of partners’ organisations to address the right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized groups improved. | 1. Capacity of partners’ organisations to address the right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized groups improved. | 1. Capacity of partners’ organisations to address the right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized groups improved. | 1. Capacity of partners’ organisations to address the right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized groups improved. | 1. Capacity of partners’ organisations to address the right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized groups improved. |
| 2. DCA/CA Cambodia facilitate identification of common advocacy issues across the programme | 2. DCA/CA Cambodia facilitate identification of common advocacy issues across the programme | 2. DCA/CA Cambodia facilitate identification of common advocacy issues across the programme | 2. DCA/CA Cambodia facilitate identification of common advocacy issues across the programme | 2. DCA/CA Cambodia facilitate identification of common advocacy issues across the programme | 2. DCA/CA Cambodia facilitate identification of common advocacy issues across the programme |
| 3. DCA/CA facilitate the process of addressing food security issues through regional and international advocacy campaigns and information work in Denmark and the UK. | 3. DCA/CA facilitate the process of addressing food security issues through regional and international advocacy campaigns and information work in Denmark and the UK. | 3. DCA/CA facilitate the process of addressing food security issues through regional and international advocacy campaigns and information work in Denmark and the UK. | 3. DCA/CA facilitate the process of addressing food security issues through regional and international advocacy campaigns and information work in Denmark and the UK. | 3. DCA/CA facilitate the process of addressing food security issues through regional and international advocacy campaigns and information work in Denmark and the UK. | 3. DCA/CA facilitate the process of addressing food security issues through regional and international advocacy campaigns and information work in Denmark and the UK. |
| 4. Proposals developed with partners and submitted to external donors | 4. Proposals developed with partners and submitted to external donors | 4. Proposals developed with partners and submitted to external donors | 4. Proposals developed with partners and submitted to external donors | 4. Proposals developed with partners and submitted to external donors | 4. Proposals developed with partners and submitted to external donors |
| 1.1 Establish and strengthen Food Security partner platform | 1.1 Establish and strengthen Food Security partner platform | 1.1 Establish and strengthen Food Security partner platform | 1.1 Establish and strengthen Food Security partner platform | 1.1 Establish and strengthen Food Security partner platform | 1.1 Establish and strengthen Food Security partner platform |
| 1.2 Capacity building/training within the areas of Rights Based Approach, monitoring with special focus on outcome, and other relevant themes/areas defined by DCA FS partners. | 1.2 Capacity building/training within the areas of Rights Based Approach, monitoring with special focus on outcome, and other relevant themes/areas defined by DCA FS partners. | 1.2 Capacity building/training within the areas of Rights Based Approach, monitoring with special focus on outcome, and other relevant themes/areas defined by DCA FS partners. | 1.2 Capacity building/training within the areas of Rights Based Approach, monitoring with special focus on outcome, and other relevant themes/areas defined by DCA FS partners. | 1.2 Capacity building/training within the areas of Rights Based Approach, monitoring with special focus on outcome, and other relevant themes/areas defined by DCA FS partners. | 1.2 Capacity building/training within the areas of Rights Based Approach, monitoring with special focus on outcome, and other relevant themes/areas defined by DCA FS partners. |
| 1.3 Exposure trips | 1.3 Exposure trips | 1.3 Exposure trips | 1.3 Exposure trips | 1.3 Exposure trips | 1.3 Exposure trips |
| 2.1 Support researches on Land issues and disseminate the results | 2.1 Support researches on Land issues and disseminate the results | 2.1 Support researches on Land issues and disseminate the results | 2.1 Support researches on Land issues and disseminate the results | 2.1 Support researches on Land issues and disseminate the results | 2.1 Support researches on Land issues and disseminate the results |
| 3.1 Documenting and communicating outcome of projects financed by Parish Collection (hunger theme) in close cooperation with involved partners | 3.1 Documenting and communicating outcome of projects financed by Parish Collection (hunger theme) in close cooperation with involved partners | 3.1 Documenting and communicating outcome of projects financed by Parish Collection (hunger theme) in close cooperation with involved partners | 3.1 Documenting and communicating outcome of projects financed by Parish Collection (hunger theme) in close cooperation with involved partners | 3.1 Documenting and communicating outcome of projects financed by Parish Collection (hunger theme) in close cooperation with involved partners | 3.1 Documenting and communicating outcome of projects financed by Parish Collection (hunger theme) in close cooperation with involved partners |
| 3.2 Linking FS programme work in Cambodia with DCA and CA | 3.2 Linking FS programme work in Cambodia with DCA and CA | 3.2 Linking FS programme work in Cambodia with DCA and CA | 3.2 Linking FS programme work in Cambodia with DCA and CA | 3.2 Linking FS programme work in Cambodia with DCA and CA | 3.2 Linking FS programme work in Cambodia with DCA and CA |
| All | All | All | All | All | All |
| - DCA monitoring field visit. | - DCA monitoring field visit. | - DCA monitoring field visit. | - DCA monitoring field visit. | - DCA monitoring field visit. | - DCA monitoring field visit. |
| - Minutes from Partners Platform Meetings | - Minutes from Partners Platform Meetings | - Minutes from Partners Platform Meetings | - Minutes from Partners Platform Meetings | - Minutes from Partners Platform Meetings | - Minutes from Partners Platform Meetings |
| - Support and cooperation of FS programme partners. | - Support and cooperation of FS programme partners. | - Support and cooperation of FS programme partners. | - Support and cooperation of FS programme partners. | - Support and cooperation of FS programme partners. | - Support and cooperation of FS programme partners. |
| - Cooperation and support from DCA and CA HQ. | - Cooperation and support from DCA and CA HQ. | - Cooperation and support from DCA and CA HQ. | - Cooperation and support from DCA and CA HQ. | - Cooperation and support from DCA and CA HQ. | - Cooperation and support from DCA and CA HQ. |
| - Positive policy of government toward NGOs. | - Positive policy of government toward NGOs. | - Positive policy of government toward NGOs. | - Positive policy of government toward NGOs. | - Positive policy of government toward NGOs. | - Positive policy of government toward NGOs. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objectives</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Interventions/activities</th>
<th>Partner(s)</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                      |                    | advocacy, campaign and fundraising work on climate change  
4.1 Coordinate with GFU, DCA information department and implementing partners to develop proposals for funding.  
4.2 Submission of proposals to external donors. |            |                      |             |
APPENDIX C: Methodology

1.1 Tools used to elicit information
The following information gathering techniques as requested by the TOR were used during the evaluation:

- A comprehensive literature study of relevant documents provided by DCA/CA, and material from other sources
- Six questionnaires targeting six levels of stakeholders, including semi-structured, face to face individual and focus group discussions (FGD) with:
  - Village level male and female Rights Holders/Duty Bearers (RH/DBs) such as farmers, members of Community Business Organisations (CBOs), and Village Development Committees (VDCs);
  - Duty Bearers (DBs) at Commune level and above, such as Commune Development Committees (CDCs) and District Development Committees (DDCs);
  - Provincial Ministry DBs (Women’s Affairs and Rural Development).
  - the NGO Advocacy Network for Development (NAND), and two Vigilance supported LAND groups of villagers;
  - Individual Programme and Project Managers and staff from the seven partners; and
  - Country Representatives of individual Projects and from DCA/CA and Indirect Partners such as DANIDA
- Field observation from ‘walk and talk’ visits with farmers, VDCs and LWF Community Empowerment Officers and Community Empowerment Facilitators,
- Informal discussions with DCA/CA Programme staff
- Feedback discussions with study team members and from stakeholders who attended a participative workshop at which the findings and recommendations were presented, and
- Drawing on ideas from the Consultant Team, who have 30 years of experience and knowledge of Food Security issues and Agriculture Extension Methods used in Cambodia to improve farmer livelihoods.

User-friendly tables in English on A3 sized paper to record respondents’ translated answers from Khmer to English, were also developed to assist in the processing and analysis of the data.

1.2 Rationale for Research Methodology
Since Programme and Project planners make plans for the majority of the community rather than for individuals, it was important to obtain consensus opinions from FGD respondents concerning the impact of DCA/CA’s FSP and the process of delivery on their lives and that of their families. Furthermore, to make the overall study and subsequent data analysis as meaningful as possible within the study time limitations, collecting opinions from as wide a range of relevant stakeholders as possible, individually and collectively, was deemed necessary. In some cases, questionnaires were emailed to stakeholders who could not be interviewed personally. The Consultants also asked Programme Managers to answer their
questionnaires anonymously to encourage honest opinions without fear of reprisal. The particular study methodology chosen, caters to all of the above factors. Approximately 360 respondents were interviewed during the study and a further 20 or so people participated in informal discussions during village ‘walk and talk’ visits and at NGO offices.

1.3 Consultant Team composition and consultancy schedule
The Consultant Team was made up of two International (one male and one female), and two Cambodian Consultants (one male and one female) with good English language skills. The first week of the Consultancy was taken up with document research which guided the questionnaire development. During the second week, three days were spent formulating semi-structured questionnaires relating to the four objectives and revised matrix given in the TOR; one day was set aside to pilot the two types of FGD questions in Kampong Chnaang, and one day was spent reworking these for the actual fieldwork. This fieldwork took place during the third week and comprised two days in Kampong Chhnang, three days in Kampong Speu, and seven days in Battambang. The Team split into two to save time, with the two male Consultants going to Battambang and the two female Consultants going to Kampong Chnaang and Kampong Speu. The fourth and fifth weeks were spent interviewing stakeholders in Phnom Penh; reading and analysing the data; writing up a draft report; and preparing for a participative workshop where the findings were presented. Comments from stakeholders attending the workshop were incorporated into this final report.

1.4 Selection of Target Groups interviewed and logistics
The Consultant Team was assisted by DCA/CA staff in the selection of the target groups. The following requirements were requested by the Team:

- All stakeholder groups are to be at least 5 years with the Programme
- Village level stakeholder focus groups are to be single sex groups, ie male only or female only (10-20 in each group), with a mixture of projects (if possible), and a mixture of community group members eg. VDC, VB, Women’s Group, Marketing Group etc.
- Government structures such as CDC and DDC should have a mix of male and female (5-10) members
- Provincial level stakeholders should be male or female individuals or small groups
- Travel times must be realistic between the accommodation of the consultants and the village, and the village to the Government Duty Bearers locations
- There is a need for one partner’s staff to go to the village earlier to arrange the groups and another partner’s staff should go with the car to guide the driver to the right location
- It would be ideal to select villages/projects which are not so good so that we can learn from the mistakes

*Males and Females were to be interviewed separately to take account of possible gender differences in needs, priorities, and constraints, and by same sex enumerators to facilitate a freer flow of information, since males often speak on behalf of females.
It should be noted that although a balance of single sex (male only and female only groups) was requested for the village level FGDs, during the fieldwork two male only groups, five female only groups, and one mixed group were interviewed, according to whomever actually turned up on the appointed day of interview. In addition, three other groups (one female group of villagers (LAND network), one mixed group of villagers (supported by Vigilance), and one NGO network group (NAND), were interviewed about LAND and/or Natural Resource management issues.

The list of people interviewed appears in the next Appendix.

1.5 Design of the six Questionnaires
The village level RH/DB questions in 2 parts relating to Objectives 1 and 2 respectively, and the Commune/District Council level DB questions relating to Objective 3, were developed in English and translated into Khmer, then verbally verified back into English to confirm their original meaning. The Programme Manager questions relating to all objectives, and more general questionnaires for Country Representatives and Indirect Partners, were developed in English only, as DCA staff advised the Team that these levels of stakeholders should be able to speak English well. Nevertheless, these respondents were given the option of answering in English or Khmer. Provincial Ministry staff and NGO Network groups were asked questions modified from the questionnaires already developed, in Khmer. The different levels of questionnaires were approved by DCA/CA staff, trialed in the classroom and during the pilot, reworked, and finalized for the actual fieldwork.

The two types of FGD questionnaires, attempted to ask respondents short, simple, mostly open-ended questions about FS and RB components and to rank these from 1 to 10, with 1 being the lowest, and 10 the highest level of relevance to their needs. The questions were also formulated to discover the usefulness and impact (both quantitative and qualitative) of the FSP and RB approach, on respondents’ lives. Target group opinions on the sustainability of the Programme and ways to improve it to better achieve Food Security were sought as well, in order to highlight ownership, point to any gaps in the FSP, and provide possible suggestions for future Programmes.

The Programme Managers’ questionnaire ranked stakeholders’ opinions (from 1 to 10 as explained above) concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of the FSP’s delivery, including the relevance of the FSP and RB approach to the root causes of food insecurity, the Programmes’ Objectives, and stakeholders’ needs, over the life of the Programme. It also asked respondents to rank the FSP’s quantitative and qualitative impact on target groups, the level of stakeholder capacity building which had been undertaken, and the way that management ran and supported the Programme. Finally Programme Managers’ opinions regarding the degree of synergy between partners and the effectiveness of the partnership platform, as well as the FSP’s sustainability were sought.

The combined Country Representative and Indirect Partner Questionnaires were asked questions of a more general nature pertaining to the relevance of the FSP and RBA to the
Cambodian context during the life of the Programme; the FSP’s strengths and weaknesses; and the degree of synergy between the DCA/CA Programme and efforts of FS actors outside of the Programme.

The DBs at provincial level were also asked questions of a more general nature about the root causes of food insecurity over the last five years, their roles relating to food security, and potential avenues of linkage with the FSP.

Finally, the NGO network groups and villagers dealing with Land and Natural Resource issues (NAND and LAND groups) were asked questions about these problems and the effectiveness of taking a RB Approach to advocate about them to DB.

The questionnaires appear at the back of this Appendix.

1.6 Interviews

Pilot and actual Fieldwork in the three Provinces

The break up of respondent interviewed (including the Pilot) comprised the following:

- **Village level Rights Holders/Duty Bearers (1 questionnaire)**
  Village Level FGDs involved 121 females and 61 males in 8 villages across Kampong Speu, Kampong Chhnang and Battambang. The various village projects were facilitated by 3 NGOs (LWF 6 villages, Banteay Srei 1 village and DPA 1 village). The FGD respondents included village level individuals and members of CBOs, VDCs and Village Banks (RH/DB).

- **Duty Bearers at Commune, District and Provincial levels (2 questionnaires)**
  Mixed sex Focus Groups Discussions (FGDs) or individual interviews involving 11 females and 54 males were undertaken with 4 CDCs, 2 DDCs, 1 District Coordinating Committee (DCC), 1 Provincial Department of Rural Development (PDRD), 2 Provincial Department of Women’s Affairs (PDWA) and 1 Provincial Disaster Management Committee (PDMC) across the 3 provinces.

- **the NGO network groups and villagers dealing with Land and Natural Resource issues (NAND and LAND groups) (1 questionnaire)**
  were asked questions about these problems and the effectiveness of taking a RB Approach to advocate about them to DB.

- **Programme Managers Questionnaire (1 questionnaire)**
  PM questionnaires were filled in by 8 PMs including 3 Field managers from LWF, 2 from DCA, and 1 from each of Banteay Srei, DPA and CWS
• **Country Representative and Indirect Partner Questionnaire (1 questionnaire)**
  8 Country Representatives (and/or their deputies) and 1 Indirect partner answered this questionnaire.

During the Pilot, one FGD with male only village level RH/DBs taking 3 hours, and one FGD with mixed sex DBs (CDCs) taking 1.5 hours, were held in Kampong Chhnang at appropriate venues. During the actual fieldwork, the local female Consultant held FGDs with female RH/DBs in village meeting places, while the local male Consultant held FGDs with male RH/DBs and one mixed RH/DB group in similar locations. CDC and DDC DBs were interviewed at their Commune and District offices, and Provincial Ministry DBs were interviewed at their provincial offices. The Commune and District DB questions took between 1 and 2.5 hours to complete and the village level RH/DB FGD took between 2 and 3 hours. The Provincial DB interviews and NGO network groups took on average 2 hours to complete.

The local Consultants asked RHs and DBs questions which had been pre-written in Khmer on Flipchart Paper. This paper was taped to the walls of the venue in front of seated participants so that all respondents could clearly see the questions. Their answers were recorded on the Flipchart paper and later translated into English onto an A3 sized English template of the questions. While the local Consultants facilitated the RH FGDs, the international Consultants walked around the villages with a project staff member, VDC member, and/or farmers to observe home gardens, rice fields, wells, and any other types of Programme interventions that had been introduced over the duration of the Programme. Wherever possible, discussions were held between the international Consultants and project staff members at village sites to verify the FGD information gathered.

At the end of each day the international and local Consultants in their respective provinces, got together to translate the Khmer responses into English, discuss the answers, and go over any difficulties with the questionnaire process. Any questions which needed further clarification were discussed and/or rephrased in more simple language to facilitate stakeholder understanding. After the fieldwork had finished, both teams returned to Phnom Penh to analyse the responses from all FGDs.

**Phnom Penh interviews**

Whilst the Consultants were away in the field, DCA/CA staff in Phnom Penh followed up stakeholder responses to questionnaires sent out electronically to Programme Managers and their nominated staff who were asked to reply anonymously, and to any Partner Country Representatives unavailable for face-to-face interviews. The responses were forwarded to a confidential email address set up by the international Consultants. During the fourth week, the Consultants interviewed four Country Representatives available for personal interviews in Phnom Penh. One indirect Partner and one Country Representative had previously been interviewed during the first week.

**1.7 Analysis of questionnaires** (see Section 5).
## APPENDIX D: People Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>RESPONDENT LEVEL</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danida</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Indirect Partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA/CA</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Partner Rep Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWF</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Partner Rep Interview</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Partner Rep Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Partner Rep Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banteay Srei</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Partner Rep Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Kampuchea</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Partner Rep Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO forum</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Partner Rep Written Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA/CA</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Programme Managers Written Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWF</td>
<td>Field Offices</td>
<td>Programme Managers Written Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Programme Managers Written Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Programme Managers Written Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banteay Srei</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Programme Managers Written Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Kampuchea</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Programme Managers Written Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO forum</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Programme Managers Written Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDWA</td>
<td>BB and K Speu</td>
<td>Director/Deputy Interview</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDRD</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Director Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDMC</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Committee Interview</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMD</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilance</td>
<td>BB, K Speu</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Issue Group</td>
<td>K. Speu</td>
<td>Activists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Trained in Land Title Process</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Land Owners</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District &amp; Commune DBs</td>
<td>BB, KS, K.Chhnang</td>
<td>DDC, DCC, DCDM, CDC Duty Bearers FGD</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals and Duty Bearers</td>
<td>BB, KS, K.Chhnang</td>
<td>Village level Focus Group Discussions</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E: Questionnaires for Six Target Groups

Questionnaire 1: VILLAGE BASED RIGHTS HOLDERS and DUTY BEARERS QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1

Objective 1 of the Food Security Programme: (write on flipchart paper and ask villagers to read to focus their attention on this)
‘Sustainable integrated farm management, disaster preparedness, savings, incomes and the nutritional status of the primary target groups are improved’

Question 1: What have been the main causes of Food Insecurity over the past 5 years? (List on flipchart paper)

Question 2: a) Since the FS Programme started in this village, which of the following components/interventions of the Programme have you learned about/been involved with?
   1. Farmer Field School training in agricultural techniques
   2. Improved nutrition
   3. Potable water supply
   4. Disaster management
   5. Village Bank Committees
   b) Are there any other interventions that the Programme has introduced you to?
   c) Now please list any other components that you would have liked to have been included to help you obtain Food Security?

Question 3: a) According to the indicators given on the flipchart, how has the Programme changed your/the community’s lives?

Indicators from the matrix –

Intervention 1.
FFS operating
Diversified crops consumed
Food security

Intervention 2.
Nutritional status

Intervention 3
Access to potable water

Intervention 4.
Disaster Management Committees operating

Intervention 5.
Village Bank Committees operating

b) Ask **why** these changes came about and **how the impact could have been improved**

c) **What are the most important changes for you and your community?**

**Question 4:** Will you continue with the above activities/interventions once funding support from this donor has finished? Y/N If yes, why and how. If No, why?

**PART 2**

Objective 2 of the Food Security Programme:
‘**The FS Programme aims to help strengthen local community structures such as CBOs, VDCs, VBs and others, to empower the poorest households and women to work in solidarity, and to claim and advocate for the fulfillment of their constitutional right to food**’

**Question 5:** What does the Right to Food mean to you?

**Question 6:** a) Since the FS Programme started in this village, which of the following Rights Based Approach interventions have you learned about/been involved with?

List examples 1-10 from the FS Matrix 2008 and draw a line through the ones not acknowledged:

1. Capacity building of local structures
2. Establishment of farmers’ networks marketing cooperatives
3. Advocating for women’s involvement
4. Gender based issues incorporated in plans
5. Participatory household development planning
6. VDCs development planning
7. Capacity building regarding rights
8. VDCs in organising advocacy campaigns
9. Establish and strengthen networks throughout the province
10. Strengthening VDCs/CBOs to access to CDPs funds

b) Are there any other solidarity group support activities that the Programme has introduced to you? (List all of the interventions on the flipchart paper/code sheet)

c) **Now please list any other components that you **would have liked to have been included** to help you form effective groups.**
d) Please rank the interventions in 6 a) and b) according to their usefulness in helping to achieve Food Security.

**Question 7a)** According to the indicators given on the flipchart, how has the Programme changed your/the community’s lives?

**Indicators from the matrix** – (write these down next to the Programme interventions on the flipchart)

- **Intervention 1 & 2.**
  Number of local community structures
- **Intervention 3 & 4.**
  Number of gender issues addressed
- **Intervention 5 & 6.**
  Development plans implemented
- **Intervention 7 & 8.**
  Capacity building in rights
  Land rights issues addressed
  Natural resource management rights addressed
  Advocacy campaigns conducted
- **Intervention 9.**
  Networking and solidarity
  Engagement of local authorities
- **Intervention 10.**
  CDP accessed

(Record positive and negative changes, no change, and not applicable, next to summarized Outcome indicators taken from revised Matrix)

b) Ask why these changes came about and how the impact could have been improved

c) What are the most important changes for you and your community?

**Question 8a)** How effectively have the local authority structures (VDC/CDC/DDC) responded to your requests for support related to food security? Rank from 1 to 10 with 1 being the lowest level of effectiveness and 10 being the highest.

b) How might the response have been improved?

**Question 9** Do you/the community intend to use the community structures (organizations) to advocate in some way once support from the Programme has finished? Y/N If Y/Why & how? If N/why?
Questionnaire 2: DUTY BEARERS from GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES (DDC, CDC)

**Introduction:**
Objective 3 of the Programme aims to: Increase accountability and transparency of Government structures and implementation of policies in relation to Food Security, land tenure and sustainable and equitable natural resource management. List this objective on a flip chart sheet as a point of reference.

**Question 1a)** Since the FS Programme started in your District/Commune, which of the following Programme interventions have you learned about or been involved with?

*Interventions from the FS Matrix 2008:*
2. Capacity building of the Network in FS, Land Law and NRM
3. CC/DDCs training in roles and responsibilities, planning and financial management

**b)** Are there any other activities that the Programme has introduced to you?

**c)** Please rank these components according to their usefulness in helping to achieve Food Security

**Question 2a)** According to the indicators given on the flipchart, how has the Programme changed the way you conduct your Duty Bearer tasks? List indicators from the FS matrix 2008 in summarized form on flipchart

*Indicators:*

**Intervention 1**
DDP/CDPs allocate resources to food security, land rights and natural resource management.

**Interventions 2 & 3**
Resources from PDP are allocated to the DDPs/CDPs
Gender and rights issues are included in the DDP and CDC plans.
Improved CDC/DDC roles, planning and management

**b)** Ask *why* these changes came about and *how the effectiveness could have been improved*

**c)** What have been the most important (significant) changes for you and your colleagues?

**Question 3:** Do you/CDC/DDC intend to use the Rights Based Approach to help bring about increased food security, land tenure and sustainable and equitable natural resource management once support from the Programme has finished? Y/N If yes, why and how? If no/why?

**Question 4:** Are there any other components that you would have liked to have been included to help you provide effective Food Security Programme support, accountability and transparency in land tenure and natural resource allocation.
Questionnaire 3: PROVINCIAL DUTY BEARERS QUESTIONNAIRE:

Questions for Provincial ………………………… (Name the Respondent)

1. Over the period of the DCA/CA Food Security Programme (2005-2009) what have been the main causes of food insecurity?

2. During this period, what have been the main issues related to food insecurity?

3. What is your role in solving issues relating to food security?

Development Objective of DCA/CA’s Programme:
Enhancing the fulfilment of the constitutional right to food and sustainable livelihood systems for rural communities, particularly vulnerable groups and the disadvantaged (women headed-households and children)

Do you link with DCA/CA’s FS Programme? If yes, in what way?
If no, is there some way you could link with them in the future? If yes, how?

Questionnaire 4: LAND ISSUE NGO QUESTIONNAIRE

List on flipchart paper: DCA/CA’s Development Objective of the Food Security Programme: Enhancing the fulfilment of the constitutional right to food and sustainable livelihood systems for rural communities, particularly vulnerable groups and the disadvantaged (women headed-households and children)

Objective 3 aims to: Increased accountability and transparency of Government structures and implementation of policies in relation to land tenure and sustainable and equitable natural resource management

Question 1: What have been the root causes of food insecurity in Cambodia over the life of the FS Programme 2005-2009?

Question 2: What does your organisation do to help your target group achieve food security?

Question 3: In what way do these activities relate to DCA/CA’s Objectives?

Question 4:

a) What organisations/structures do you link with to address FS and LAND issues?
b) How could these links be improved?

Question 5: Are your concerns being raised at provincial and national levels? If so, how?

Question 6: What results (+ or -) have you attained by raising these issues?

Question 7: How has your involvement with Land issues changed your life? (+ or – changes?)

Questionnaire 5: PROGRAMME /PROJECT MANAGERS QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for participating in this evaluation. This questionnaire gives you the opportunity to give your views on lessons learned throughout the Programme. Your ideas will contribute to identifying successful Food Security strategies for the future.

Please fill in the following questionnaire to give your ideas on how the Food Security Programme could have been more relevant, effective, efficient, sustainable, and have had more impact. If possible, join with some of your colleagues to fill in the questionnaire. In this participative process, the consensus of more than one person’s views can be expressed in the one survey. Do not put your name on this paper. This questionnaire is to be completed anonymously to encourage you to document your true feelings about the questions. Answer the questions as best you can. Write NIL if you cannot answer the questions to show that you have at least read the question and have not left it out by mistake. If you need extra room to fill in the answers, write on the back of the paper. You can answer in Khmer if it is easier for you.

Please circle which type of staff you are:
Danish HQ staff -- DCA/CA RO staff – Partner RO staff – Partner Field Office staff

How many colleagues joined you in filling in the questionnaire? Number ………

Relevance (appropriateness/usefulness of the FS Programme):

Question 1.

What have been the root causes of food insecurity in Cambodia over the life of the FS Programme 2005-2009? List the causes below.

Questions 2 – 4 relate to DCA/CA’s FS Programme Objectives.

Question 2.

The FS Programme Objectives are listed below:

Development Objective of the Programme:
Enhancing the fulfilment of the constitutional right to food and sustainable livelihood systems for rural communities, particularly vulnerable groups and the disadvantaged (women headed-households and children)

**Immediate Objectives of the Programme are:**

1. Sustainable integrated farm management, disaster preparedness, savings, incomes and the nutritional status of the primary target groups are improved

2. Local community structures (CBOs, VDCs and others), empowered poorest household and women work in solidarity to claim and advocate for the fulfilment of the constitutional right to food.

3. Increased accountability and transparency of Government structures and implementation of policies in relation to land tenure and sustainable and equitable natural resource management

4. DCA/CA have been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities and facilitating linkages to advocacy campaigns and information work.

**a) Rank the relevance of the Development Objective to the root causes outlined in your answer to question 1.** Do this by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low relevance, 5 or 6 being moderate relevance, and 10 being very high relevance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Objective</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b) What improvements or additions could have been made to the Development Objective to make it more relevant to the root causes. Explain your answer.**

**Question 3.**

**a) To what extent are the Immediate Objectives relevant to the Development Objective?** Show the degree of relevance by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low relevance, 5 or 6 being moderate relevance, and 10 being very high relevance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objective 1.</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objective 2.</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objective 3.</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objective 4.</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b) What improvements or additions could have been made to each of the Immediate Objectives to make them more relevant to the root causes. Please explain your answer.**

**Immediate Objective 1.**

**Immediate Objective 2.**
Immediate Objective 3.

Immediate Objective 4.

Question 4.

How relevant were the wider cross cutting issues and approaches listed below to the FS Programme Objectives. Show the degree of relevance by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low relevance, 5 or 6 being moderate relevance, and 10 being very high relevance:

- Gender Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
- Governance Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
- HIV/AIDS Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
- Migration Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
- Climate change Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
- Advocacy Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
- Empowerment Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
- Rights Based Approach Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Question 5.

List and rank the relevance of the main components of your organisation’s Project(s) to the DCA/CA FS Programme Objectives listed in question 2. Show the degree of relevance by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low relevance, 5 or 6 being moderate relevance, and 10 being very high relevance. Then circle the Objective(s) to which your project component relates.

List your project components: Circle relevant Objective(s):

........................................ Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ........ Obj 1 2 3 4
........................................ Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ........ Obj 1 2 3 4
........................................ Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ........ Obj 1 2 3 4
b) Are there any additional components which would have made your project more relevant to the FS Programme Objectives?

Question 6.

a) DCA/CA use the Rights Based Approach (RBA) to justify/underpin the FS Programme. Do you think that the RBA was relevant to the development context in Cambodia during the life of the programme? Circle Yes or No

b) Why do you say this?

Effectiveness (extent of achievement of the desired outcomes):

Question 7.

Programme versus Project Approach

Simple definition:
A Programme Approach oversees and adds value to multiple projects which complement one another in some way (eg they have a common goal)
A Project Approach implements a series of activities, usually undertaken by the one organization, in order to create a product or deliver a service.

a) Which approach do you think was better for DCA/CA to deliver the FS Programme? Circle the best approach:

Programme / Project

b) Why do you say this?

c) List the ways in which DCA/CA added value to the Programme. Rank DCA/CA’s effectiveness in adding value to the list below by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1
showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:

List of components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner Capacity Building</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Advocacy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking/Links between partners</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding applications</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) How could DCA/CA have added value more effectively?

Question 8.

a) How effective has the DCA/CA FS Programme been in achieving the Objectives listed below? Indicate this by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:

Development Objective of the Programme:
Enhancing the fulfilment of the constitutional right to food and sustainable livelihood systems for rural communities, particularly vulnerable groups and the disadvantaged (women headed-households and children)

Immediate Objectives of the Programme are:
1. Sustainable integrated farm management, disaster preparedness, savings, incomes and the nutritional status of the primary target groups are improved
2. Local community structures (CBOs, VDCs and others), empowered poorest household and women work in solidarity to claim and advocate for the fulfilment of the constitutional right to food.
3. Increased accountability and transparency of Government structures and implementation of policies in relation to land tenure and sustainable and equitable natural resource management

4. DCA/CA have been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of the disadvantaged and marginalized communities and facilitating linkages to advocacy campaigns and information work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Objective</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objective 1.</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objective 2.</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objective 3.</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate Objective 4.</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Please give an example of the most significant change (+ or -) under each of the objectives?

Immediate Objective 1.

Immediate Objective 2.

Immediate Objective 3.

Immediate Objective 4.

Question 9.

a) How effective has the FS Programme been in dealing with the wider cross cutting issues and approaches listed below? Show the degree of effectiveness by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV/AIDS</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate change</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) How might the cross cutting issues and approaches have been dealt with more effectively?

Question 10.

a) How effective has the DCA/CA Programme’s monitoring system been in providing sufficient information/feedback for Partners to share in the progress of the Programme activities and outcomes? Show the degree of effectiveness by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:

Effectiveness of the monitoring/feedback system Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

b) Please make suggestions for improvements to the monitoring/feedback system?

c) Did DCA/CA management quickly respond to solving problems highlighted in the monitoring reports? Rank management’s response to solving problems by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:

Management response to problems Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

d) Is DCA/CA (HQ & RO) an effective manager of this Programme? Rank management effectiveness by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:

Management effectiveness Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

e) List suggestions for improvement

Question 11:

a) In general, how effectively have stakeholder partnerships worked as a result of the Programme? Show the degree of effectiveness by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:
DCA/CA and Partners  
Ranking  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Partners and Duty Bearers  
Ranking  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Partners and Rights Holders  
Ranking  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Partner to Partner  
Ranking  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Duty Bearers amongst themselves  
Ranking  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Rights Holders and Duty Bearers  
Ranking  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Indirect Partners with Prog Partners  
Ranking  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

b) Please give examples of how partnerships have worked well:

c) Please make suggestions for improvement in partnership working together:

Question 12:
a) How satisfied are you with DCA/CA’s process of selecting you as Partners? Show the degree of satisfaction by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low satisfaction, 5 or 6 being moderate satisfaction, and 10 being very high satisfaction:

Partner selection process  
Ranking  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

b) Please make suggestions for improvement in the partnership selection process:

Question 13:

How effectively were the partners involved in the design (planning) and implementation of the FS Programme? Show the degree of effectiveness by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:

Partner involvement in the design  
Ranking  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Partner involvement in the implement’n  
Ranking  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

b) Please make suggestions for improvement in the partnership design (planning) and implementation process:

Question 14:
a) How effective has the geographical spread been in promoting the achievement of Programme objectives? Show the degree of effectiveness by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:

Effectiveness of geographical spread  
Ranking  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
b) In particular, did the geographical spread of the programme make it easy for the Partners to work in synergy together?  Circle Yes or No

c) How could the geographical spread of the Programme have been improved to better achieve the Programme objectives?

Question 15:

a) List the target groups in the Programme and rank how effectively each target group has been reached by the Programme?

b) How could the Programme have reached the target groups more effectively?

Question 16.

a) How effectively has the Partner Platform been in bringing partners together and facilitating joint activities?  Show the degree of effectiveness by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:

b) Why do you say this?

c) How could the Partner Platform have been made more effective?

Question 17.

a) Rank how effectively DCA/CA has provided capacity building in the following topics. Show the degree of effectiveness by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:
Rights Based Approach Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Monitoring Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Advocacy Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Cross cutting issues Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

b) How could capacity building have been improved?

Question 18.
a) Rank how well DCA/CA has supported research on land issues and disseminated the information. Show the degree of effectiveness by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:

Research & info dissemination support Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

b) How could research & information dissemination support have been improved?

Question 19.
a) Rank how well DCA has supported Partners in writing proposals for funding. Show the degree of effectiveness by circling one number from 1 up to 10, with 1 showing very low effectiveness, 5 or 6 being moderate effectiveness, and 10 being very high effectiveness:

Support for writing proposals Ranking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

b) How could support for writing proposals be improved?

Efficiency (well run Programme achieving value for money)

Question 20:
How efficiently did DCA/CA supply resources in implementing its Programme? In the table below, please rank performance with a ranking number from 1-10 and give your suggestions to improve efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Rank 1 to 10</th>
<th>Ideas for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of inputs:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HQ staff time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO staff time</td>
<td>HQ staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds for cross-cutting activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of inputs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ staff time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO staff time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds for cross-cutting activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 21:
a) Could the Programme have been implemented more effectively at less cost?  
   Circle Yes or No

b) Could the Programme have been implemented more effectively at the same cost?  
   Circle Yes or No

b) If Yes to either of the above, give suggestions for improvement (why and how).

Impact (changes to stakeholder lives)

Question 22:
In what ways has the FS Programme changed the lives of:

a) DCA/CA

b) Partners

c) Duty Bearers

d) Rights Holders

e) Indirect Partners outside of the program

Sustainability (ownership and continuation beyond the life of the Programme):
Question 23:
Are the benefits of the Programme at each stakeholder level likely to continue after the Programme finishes?

Circle Yes or No and give an explanation of Why, How, or Why not.

a) DCA/CA If Yes then write WHY and HOW it will be sustainable

If No then write WHY not

b) Partners If Yes then write WHY and HOW it will be sustainable

If No then write WHY not

c) Duty Bearers If Yes then write WHY and HOW it will be sustainable

If No then write WHY not

d) Rights Holders If Yes then write WHY and HOW it will be sustainable

If No then write WHY not

e) Indirect partners If Yes then write WHY and HOW it will be sustainable

If No then write WHY not

Questionnaire 6: PARTNER COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVE and INDIRECT PARTNER QUESTIONNAIRE

Important Note: The answers to this questionnaire will be documented anonymously to encourage you to express your true feelings about the Programme

Question 1.
What have been the main causes of Food Insecurity in Cambodia over the life of the Programme from 2005-2009

Question 2.
The DCA/CA Programme has attempted to strengthen the capacity of partners to address the constitutional right to food of disadvantaged communities using a Rights Based Approach.

Main components include (in no specific order):
- Advocacy, particularly in relation to land rights
- Media, communications and information work
- Facilitating linkages
- Sustainable integrated farm management, disaster preparedness, savings, nutrition and income generation
- Empowerment of local community structures (CBOs, VDCs and disadvantaged groups, including poorest households and women), to claim their rights to food
- Governance accountability and transparency in relation to land tenure and sustainable and equitable natural resource management
- Cross cutting issues including gender equity, HIV/AIDS, migration and climate change

2a) How could the above Programme components have been improved?
2b) Should any additional components have been added?

Question 3. What have been the main strengths of the Programme?

Question 4.
4a) What have been the main weaknesses of the Programme?
4b) How could these weaknesses have been overcome?

Question 5.
a) What have other actors outside of the Programme been doing to improve Food Security in Cambodia over the last 5 years?

5b) How well has the DCA/CA Programme complemented these other FS efforts?

5c) What strategies could have been developed to create more synergy (working together and sharing information) between the Programme and FS actors outside of the Programme?
APPENDIX F: Summary of FSP Partners

**LWF** is a long-standing, multifaceted DCA/CA NGO which receives around seventy percent of DCA/CA funding. LWF has been actively assisting the Cambodian government and populace since 1979, initially with emergency aid and resettlement activities, especially in areas controlled by the former Khmer Rouge. LWF’s own FSP started with Integrated Rural Development Projects (IRDPs) and Demining and Resettlement Projects (DRPs) in 1996, which aimed to improve food security and long-term sustainability in some of the most remote parts of Cambodia. It has since developed an integrated approach to embrace empowerment and human rights advocacy and operates six Integrated Rural Development through Empowerment Projects (IRDEPs) in Battambang, Kampong Speu and Kampong Chhnang. IRDEPs seek to empower rural communities, especially vulnerable groups such as female headed households, returnees, Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and the disabled, to manage development processes themselves. Key integrated project components include community organisation and human rights awareness raising, water and sanitation, food security, income generation, health, education, environment and disaster preparedness. In late 2008, LWF implemented a Community Based Disaster Risks Management Project (CBDRM) in collaboration with CWS under the DC/CA Programme umbrella.

**CWS** has also been actively assisting the government and people of Cambodia since 1979, with an integrated development approach which focuses on participation and capacity building of local institutions and the poorest communities, particularly women. Since 1996 it has been operating integrated Community Development Programmes (ICDPs) in Kandal, Svay Rieng and Kampong Thom. Major project components include community organisation, water and sanitation, food security, income generation, health, education, environment and disaster preparedness, and natural resource management planning. In response to recent droughts CWS began implementing relief and rehabilitation interventions in affected project areas and redirected resources towards emergency response activities.

**HKI** provided technical assistance to LWF on the nutrition components of DCA/CA’s FS Programme from late 2006 till June 2009. This technical assistance enabled LWF staff to deliver training and awareness raising on nutrition to target populations in IRDEP communities in Battambang, Kampong Speu and Kampong Chhnang. HKI focused on project design and implementation; training of LWF trainers on basic nutrition and survey implementation; behaviour change communication materials for LWF trainers and community partners (such as village health support groups and village development committees) to raise awareness and provide information on basic nutrition as well as promote good nutritional practices (e.g. exclusive breastfeeding for children up to 6 months, appropriate complementary feeding.

---

11 Discussions with DCA Country Representative and FSP Coordinator
13 Ibid
practices, dietary diversification to include more and different types of micronutrient-rich food in household food intakes; household surveys and project monitoring, and regular field supervision and advice.\textsuperscript{14}

The \textbf{NGO Forum} is a membership organisation for local and international non-government organisations (NGOs) based in Cambodia and acts as the voice of Cambodian civil society. Its purpose is information sharing, debate and advocacy on priority issues affecting Cambodia such as development policy, gender mainstreaming, environmental protection, and land rights. Its advocacy strategy is to dialogue with the Cambodian Government and Cambodia’s multilateral and bilateral donors to ensure that the rights of poor and vulnerable groups are recognised and supported by the development policies and practices of the Government and donors and by the wider community.\textsuperscript{15} DCA/CA’s funds assist NGO forum partners with local empowerment and advocacy.

\textbf{DPA} is a Cambodian NGO and FSP partner whose implementation strategies focus on community organisation and a RBA. Formed in 2006, DPA originated from an alliance of 16 Catholic development organisations from Europe and North America known as Cooperation Internationale pour le Developpement et la Solidarite, (CIDSE) which first came to Cambodia in 1979. Over the next 25 years, CIDSE shifted its focus from initial relief and infrastructure assistance to integrated community development (ICD), and Partnership Programme work to respond to the needs of local NGOs. In 1994, it set up a Development Education and Advocacy (DEA) unit which took a lead role in advocacy on banning landmines and promoting human rights and environmental protection. In 1997, CIDSE restructured its organisation and mainstreamed advocacy into all its programmes, dissolving the DEA. With the localisation of CIDSE in 2006, DPA reformed its DEA Department to support the ICD and Partnership Programmes in implementing a RBA in its development activities. In co-ordination with other networks and groups such as the Advocacy Support Group (ASG), DPA lobbies policy makers and high-ranking government officials to address such issues as land grabbing, illegal logging, and extractive industry impacts, and to demonstrate resource revenue transparency. It also seeks to educate and empower communities, especially indigenous groups, to advocate for access to their lands, forests and fisheries. DPA works directly in Kampot, Mondulkiri, Stung Treng and Ratanakiri, and indirectly in six more provinces in partnership with 25 local NGOs and Community Based Organisations (CBOs).\textsuperscript{16}

\textbf{SK} is a Cambodian non-profit and non-partisan advocacy network and service organisation, set up in late 1997 by a group of men and women who were former staff of the Federation of Ponleu Khmer. A number of donor organisations including DCA/CA, fund various SK’s Programmes which focus on strengthening civil society through advocacy efforts to build a just,

\textsuperscript{15} NGO Forum on Cambodia Final Term Evaluation of the 2006-2008 Programme
peaceful and democratic Cambodia. SK implements its Programmes in partnership with 11 Co-operating Organisations in five provinces, and 12 advocacy networks in 11 provinces and Phnom Penh. It also co-ordinates the Advocacy Team (AT), a group of representative from 35 Co-operating Organisations, and links with trade unions and union federations in support of workers’ rights. SK has been working with some of its partners for 10 years helping to support communities to gain access to land, forest and fish resources through capacity building, advocacy, networking and legal representation. Its strategies include public education, capacity building, networking, technical and financial support, and legal support.17

BS’s main development objective is to empower vulnerable women in the development and decentralisation process, especially with regard to increasing their participation in, and election to, commune council positions. BS’s objectives also include activities aimed at improving the livelihoods of vulnerable families through developing women’s skills in sustainable agriculture, micro-entrepreneurship and natural resource management, and through the promotion of increased shared household decision making amongst men and women. BS’s contribution to the Programme is its implementation of food security from a strong gender perspective.

---

APPENDIX G: Summary of Final Evaluations for LWF, NGO Forum, DPA and HKI

LWF
A 2008 final external evaluation of the LWF Country Strategy revealed a clear contribution to empowerment and sustainable and improved livelihoods. In order to achieve further improvements in the next programme phase it was recommended that accountability and transparency should be incorporated as core values; that LWF should scale up its work with Commune Councils which have devolved responsibility of rural development; and that strengthening networking and enhancing advocacy strategies should improve the ability to raise issues from local level to the national level.\(^{18}\)

The NGO Forum
A 2008 external mid-term review of the NGO Forum concluded that voices of Cambodian civil society had been amplified through its work to coordinate information sharing, capacity building and advocacy for a wide range of local and international agencies; and that good relations with bilateral and multilateral donors, and government departments had been established. It also highlighted the importance of setting realistic goals for affecting policy change.\(^{19}\)

DPA
A 2008 external evaluation of DPA found that the capacity, experience and confidence of focal persons and target beneficiaries to engage in advocacy work are still limited and that DPA needs to create regular opportunities to reflect on the meaning of advocacy given the current social, economical and political context.\(^{20}\)

HKI
A 2008 HKI final evaluation found that the nutrition training of LWF staff by HKI had been well accepted and applied in the field, but that coordination between the partners and information sharing of training should be improved, especially with regard to further strengthening the technical capacity of community based agents. More research on ways to improve the stable availability and accessibility of recommended foods and supplementary agriculture/health services was suggested; as well as a revamp of the M&E system by formulating and applying indicators to measure and track nutritional and health status of beneficiaries, and to use for evidence-based advocacy work. An assessment of the underlying causes of poverty in changing contexts to inform any future projects was also recommended.\(^{21}\)

\(^{19}\) NGO Forum on Cambodia Final Term Evaluation of the 2006-2008 Programme
\(^{21}\) External Evaluation of the DCA-funded Nutrition Initiative Project, 2006-2008
APPENDIX H: Causes of Food Insecurity

The causes of Food Insecurity listed by the different levels of respondents in order of prevalence, were: low agriculture technical knowledge and practice; Natural Disasters (particularly flood/drought); landlessness; limited government support for services; lack of irrigation; lack of marketing knowledge; low health; no business opportunities outside of agriculture; poor education; poor infrastructure; low yields; gender inequality; domestic violence; land issues (grabbing, no title, rights); mines; low natural resource management; low community commitment; low agriculture input quality; small land; and the lack of co-ordination between agencies.

Additional causes only mentioned once included: 1 crop per year; unequal access to resources; climate change; inability to absorb shocks such as health problems leading to the sale of land; lazy; HIV; deforestation; low nutrition; migration; low access to loans; low labor availability in families; low level of budgeting; not aware of Human Rights; drugs; early age for getting married; big families; low water and sanitation; food exported overseas; only government support when a disaster; short term mentality; post war issues; high input cost; poor budgetary control (spending too much money on ceremonies); agro industrial approach by government/foreign investors taking land; lack of employment opportunities in the agriculture sector to absorb the growing unemployed.
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