



# Rural Community and Environment Development Organization RCEDO

## **External Evaluation Report on Community Livelihood, Decentralization, Democracy and Peace Building**

**December, 2009**

**By: Mr. KUY Sophal and Mr. CHAN Sarin**

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
List of Acronyms	2
Acknowledgement	3
Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction	5
1.1. RCEDO Background	5
1.2. Evaluation Objective	5
1.3. Evaluation Team	5
1.4. Evaluation methodologies	6
2. Family livelihood and income sources	7
3. General Health Care, HIV/AIDS Protection and Social Service Support	8
4. Decentralization, human rights, democracy and peace	10
5. Gender Equity and the Preservation of Natural Resources	11
6. Program Impact	12
7. Conclusions and Recommendations	13
7.1. Conclusion	13
7.2. Recommendations	13
7.2.1. General recommendation	13
7.2.2. Specific recommendations	14
APPENDICES	15
Appendix 1: Terms of Reference	15
Appendix 2: Evaluation schedule	18
Appendix 3: List of People attended in interview	20

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

ARV	Anti-Retroviral
CBO	Community Based Organization
CC	Commune Councillor
CDC	Cambodian Development Council
CNGO	Cambodian Non Governmental Organization
CRT	Commune Research Team
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
PLHA	People Living with HIV/AIDS
RCEDO	Rural Community and Environment Development Organization

## **Acknowledgement**

The evaluation team wishes to acknowledge to the organizers for this evaluation for their inputs into the evaluation process as well as their valuable support to the evaluation team. We would like to thank all RCEDO key staff and the field staff who provided the opportunity for us to learn about the activities of the project.

We would like to express our special thanks to Mr. **Sam Serey Wathana** and RCEDO Management staff for their supports and assistance, including appointments for interviews and other arrangements that make this work possible.

We also wish to thank to the community members who participated in the focus group discussions, and individual who provided information to the evaluation team.

Finally, we would like to express our deep gratitude to the local authorities such as commune chief, village chief, Provincial Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Planning, Environment, other CNGOs Commune Councilors for their significant inputs and opinions relating to the Community Livelihood, Decentralization, democracy and peace building. Without them, this report cannot be written.

### **Consultants**

Mr. Kuy Sophal

Mr. Chan Sarin

## Executive Summary

Rural Community and Environment Development Organization called RCEDO is an independent Cambodian Local Non-Government Organization registered at the Ministry of Interior of Kingdom of Cambodia since 13 July 1998. The project actively engages the participation of stakeholders from communities and government agencies, the evaluation gears towards seeking a breadth of opinions, perceptions and inputs.

An independent external evaluation was carried out at project end phase to evaluate the effectiveness and emerging impact of the project based on its 2007-2009 goal and objectives and to draw conclusions and make recommendations for the future. While maintaining independence/neutrality, the evaluation will be carried out using a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all parties.

In general RCEDO has completed the planned activities and produced the planned outputs. The outputs contributed to produce the outcomes of increasing knowledge of agriculture for the target families' income generation, awareness of family health care and not only reducing of discrimination but also increasing on PLHA.

The target beneficiaries have knowledge and skill in decentralization, local governance, democracy, natural resource management and environment and advocacy and they used it for influent CC, government line department and other NGO to solve their problems of land crabbing and improving government public services. The program also considers gender mainstreaming and domestic violent awareness raising that could lead to gender equality promotion.

The above outcomes are really contributed to the program impact of food security, preservation and management of natural resource in the target area.

Based on the evaluation findings, there are the following general recommendations that RCEDO should consider for future:

1. RCEDO should continue to keep good relationship with the government line departments and other NGOs in the province
2. RCEDO should consider to change the staff division of work from sectors to geographical are responsibilities
3. RCEDO should continue the current project by strongly emphasize on community organizing and right based approaches
4. RCEDO should study the possibility of current target beneficiaries for establishing the certain type of Community Based Organization (CBOs)
5. RCEDO should prepare the exit or phasing out plan from the certain type of CBOs and implement it accordingly

And the specific recommendation should be seen in 7.2.2.

# **1. Introduction**

## **1.1. RCEDO Background**

Rural Community and Environment Development Organization called RCEDO is an independent Cambodian Local Non-Government Organization registered at the Ministry of Interior of Kingdom of Cambodia since 13 July 1998. RCEDO has formed by a volunteer group of 10 Cambodian members which consisting of 3 women since October 1997. RCEDO staffs have willing and commitment to work and helping the vulnerable group and poor families at grass-roots level in rural communities and/or isolated areas in all provinces of Cambodia.

In April 23, 2003, RCEDO has signed a Memorandum of understanding with the Ministry of Rural Development (MRD) of the Royal Government of Cambodian. This agreement means that RCEDO is complying with the legal requirement and is properly registered to work as a development partner in Kingdom of Cambodia for humanitarian assistance and the public benefit. RCEDO also has officially registered with the Council Development of Cambodia (CDC) of Royal Government of Cambodia in 22 April 2003. RCEDO was working development activities since 1999, to support rural people in 2 provinces at the Northwest provinces of Cambodia, especially in Banteay Meanchey and Oddar Meanchey.

The project ensures that the evaluation design is based on the principles of learning, participation, information sharing and systematic approach. The project actively engages the participation of stakeholders from communities and government agencies, the evaluation gears towards seeking a breadth of opinions, perceptions and inputs.

## **1.2. Evaluation Objective**

An independent external evaluation will be carried out at project end phase to evaluate the effectiveness and emerging impact of the project based on its 2007-2009 goal and objectives and to draw conclusions and make recommendations for the future.

## **1.3. Evaluation Team**

The evaluation team consists of two people, Mr. KUY Sophal and Mr. CHAN Sarin.

## **1.4. Evaluation methodologies**

The methods selected for data collection and analysis were based on the Terms of Reference (TOR) (please see *Appendix I*). The Evaluation was conducted over the course of 10 days. The initial half day was spent in preparation, reviewing documents and planning. The team members were able to sit together to develop the draft guide questions, schedules and plans for the field work and spend half day to discuss and confirm the schedule and plan with RCEDO key staff.

The evaluation team spent half day for evaluation preparation plan and another half day for finalizing the plan with RCEDO key staff. Three days were spent in the field research of the programme target areas; half day in RCEDO office for interviewing with key and operational staff; one day with other NGOs and provincial line departments in Bantheay Meanchey. The team spent one day for data consolidation and compilation for debriefing. A half day debriefing of draft evaluation findings was conducted with all RCEDO staff and board members in RCEDO office. Three days were spent for drafting the report and submit draft report to RCEDO staff for final comments and the finally was submitted to RCEDO. (*See Appendix II for the Evaluation schedule*).

A purposive random sampling method was used to select the following eight villages:

1. Pongror Village, Tapho Commune
2. Kokkei, Tapho Commune
3. Yearng, Phkoam Commune
4. Phaam, Phaam Commune
5. Kouk Phlou, Saroung Commune
6. Pheas Tbong, Saroung Commune

In every village interview, at least one RCEDO staff was accompanied the evaluation team during the entire field visit.

Data was collected using qualitative research methods such as focus group discussions, semi-structured, and unstructured interviews with different stakeholders. Data was collected from the following stakeholders:

1. Training/workshop participants
2. Village project committees
3. Beneficiaries
4. Village chief and commune council

5. RCEDO operational staff
6. RCEDO management staff
7. Other NGO staffs working in Banteay Meanchey and
8. Provincial government line departments

## **2. Family livelihood and income sources**

The activities to achieve this objective are selecting the target village, training on vegetable growing; establish demonstration plot, compost-making training with providing practice materials, rice production training, rice bank and exposure visit. Aside from that cow and pig banks have also been established.

RCEDO has close relationship with provincial department of Agriculture for implementing the project activities. The department assigned their staff to collaborate with RCEDO in water analysis and providing training. RCEDO also assist the department on Self Help Group organizing. As the result vegetable growing groups were formed with 15 to 20 members in each group. The group members were trained on vegetable production. Growing materials such as watering tanks, hoe, vegetable seeds and additional loan were also provided if needed. Cash credit has been provided up to 500,000 with 2% of interest per month. As the result of the training course, most of participants have used the knowledge and skills from the training in their production such as botanical pesticide and compost. Most of the participants interviewed grow two crops per year and consider that it is the main business for them. The income from vegetable is about 10,000 per day. Most of the vegetable growers have their own weigh for selling. Most villagers buy their vegetable because they think that the product is non-chemical. The vegetable group conduct bi-monthly meeting to share experiences and also in the purpose of saving money. The group members commit to increase saving for expanding the group activities.

RCEDO also provided cow through this group because it could increase the number of beneficiaries that lead to difficulties of management. The group members received the cow by lucky draw method. Cow bank policy was developed by RCEDO with consultation with beneficiaries. The policy demand the beneficiaries to save 50 Kgs of rice per year but for people living with HIV/AIDS (PLHA) demand only 20 Kgs per year. RCEDO also provide about two tones of rice for each village for rice bank with 30% of interest for consumption rice and 40% interest for seedling rice. Around 50% of interviewees understand cow bank policy and procedures because few cow were distribute to each village and the beneficiaries are living in the disperse manner except in

Tapho commune is better because more cows were provided and beneficiaries living in cluster manner. Pig bank is similar to rice bank. There is also village veterinary volunteer (VTV) for supporting animal bank. As the result cow and pig are not yet split to the other members in this year and it will be in the future.

The committee were elected with average three members. However there should be a member from local authorities in the committee especially in rice and cow bank. RCEDO staff and the committee are responsible for purchasing cow. The beneficiaries who get the cow did not involve in purchasing and sometime some of them did not happy with the appearance of the cow. Policies and procedures were not developed by community. The committee were trained on committee roles and responsibilities, bookkeeping and income and expenditure. Project related documents are not well keeping and difficult to find because they think that RCEDO will keep for them. For saving, all records are with the group leaders because the members said they are with their leader. There is clear for the loan provided by RCEDO to the community in the future.

Based on the above, RCEDO has completed it planned activities with the outputs of beneficiaries received trainings, improved farming practices and has fund for their family income generation. Aside from cropping, beneficiaries had cow for preparing their land, borrowed rice with low interest rate and had pig for growing. These outputs are contributing to achieve the objective of increasing the opportunities to access knowledge, pig, cow and financial support for family income generation activities.

*There are also some considerations' points that RCEDO should take into account like the project related documents did not well keeping with the community, most of committee members are local authorities that could be conflict of interest between the civil society and local government roles, cash saving are not clear management policy and procedures.*

### **3. General health care, HIV/AIDS protection and social service support**

The activities to achieve this objective are health education, awareness on HIV/AIDS prevention, experiences sharing with PLHA, PLHA Self Help Group Establishment, home-based care and event celebration.

RCEDO has close collaboration with health center. The health center assigned staff to collaborate with RCEDO on health education. There are significant outputs producing by these activities. Health education has been done three-monthly in each village and some time with collaboration with health center. The education is mainly focused on general health care, HIV/AIDS and bird flue. Most of the beneficiaries aware of primary health care, especially on the effect of clean water and HIV/AIDS. Community members understand clearly the situation of PLHA and encourage them to involve actively in the project. Discrimination to PLHAs has been reduced.

PLHAs have been supported to receive RVA and consultation from RCEDO staff regularly. Aside from that they received health education materials, food in every six months and also cow for growing. They said that RCEDO not only supported materials but also non-materials that most of community members are reducing discrimination to them. Now their living condition is improving. Providing cows to vulnerable families are very important to increase another business and also have time to take care the patient. For family who have few members are a bit difficult because they need time to take care the cow, but even that they are happy because it is really contribute to improve their family income.

Most villagers in Tapho commune are using clean water produced by a clean water organization. The water source is from the pond that was constructed by RCEDO in the previous year. Most villages that conducted interviewed except in Tapho commune did not use boiled or clean water because they do not have time and some said it is their habit of using un-boiled water. People used to receive some materials such as mosquito net, water filter tanks from RCEDO. Even people used those materials but they are still facing with many diseases that caused by water. Most of people seem do not have any initiative to prevent that causes. They are asking for RCEDO to assist pond, latrine and water filter tank for them. Based on the response of RCEDO staff, they emphasized that those area are far from the health center, health agents could not conduct regular visit and few activities were provided that lead to low attendance in health education.

Providing ponds and wells are responding to the real needs. It is reducing women workload and giving them the opportunities to improve family sanitation and hygiene and also provide water for home gardening and animal growing. However villagers in Yieang village have limited initiative for solving water issue such as mobilizing of resources to repair and maintain the pond.

RCEDO is receiving a lot of outputs of awareness of target beneficiaries on primary health care and HIV/AIDS, PLHA health care support and income generation. This could contribute to improving health situation of the target beneficiaries.

*There are also some considerations' points that RCEDO should take into account like community initiative in mobilizing and maintenance of pond and the community that has not clean water are facing water born diseased.*

#### **4. Decentralization, human rights, democracy and peace**

The activities to achieve this objective are Commune council meeting with other stakeholders, building capacity, establishment of Commune Research Team (CRT), organize public forum and follow up the action after public forum.

RCEDO has close relation ship with CC. RCEDO participated in every consolidation plan with local authority and submitted quarterly report to them regularly. The following are the process and outputs of the activities.

CC meeting has been conducted monthly. CC gives the opportunities to all stakeholders to attend. The quality of the meetings is improving. Community representatives are encouraged to attend the meeting. It seems less participation of community representatives in the meeting because most people often receive information from the villager leader by loud speaker announcement. CRT is active only for the commune that have conducted public forum because the research results were used to present in those public forum. For the commune that do not have public forum, CRT is not so active because the information gathered was just sharing in pre forum and then send to RCEDO for consolidation and presenting at the provincial level. The results of health center service research were not allowed to present by the provincial health department, they need to read first before presentation. However Tapho CC satisfies on CRT research because there were explored the weak points for improvement.

There are a lot of changes in term of behavior, transparency and accountability for the Commune that has public forum. Those changes are giving the opportunities to community to participate in CC meeting, understand the commune income and expenditure, commune achievement and the result found by CRT for improvement.

The capacity needs of CC related to planning, proposal writing was supported technically by RCEDO. However the quality of CC planning capacity is still limited and most commune activities planned are focused mainly on infrastructure.

Based on the above, RCEDO achieve a lot of outputs of the participation of all stakeholders in decentralization and local governance, people could raise their concerns in the public forum and CC and to the upper level of governmental line departments were heart the concerns and have some action for improvement. Aside from that the increment of CC knowledge in report writing, project planning and proposal writing also improve.

*There are also some considerations' points that RCEDO should take into account like there is less interesting of community on the result of CRT in the commune that do not have public forum and the less participation of community representative in CC meeting.*

## **5. Gender Equity and the Preservation of Natural Resources**

The activities to achieve this objective are awareness raising and training on gender mainstreaming and domestic violent, awareness raising on natural resource management and environment protection, training on the management of community forestry and establishment of community forestry. The following are the process and outputs of the activities.

Gender awareness was done through community meeting and direct household visit. Most of the respondents said that they received gender awareness raising from RCEDO, but most of them are not clear except village committee has some understanding. It seems not clear on written methodologies and process and less activities on gender mainstreaming.

Environment education was done annually with the collaboration with provincial environmental officer. Village Cleaning Day also celebrated with the commune that health center is existed. Most of villagers in Phkoam commune where the community forestry existed received education on natural resource right and advocacy. People are using advocacy skill with a group of soldier that is occupying the community forestry land. The complain letter has been submitted to the provincial governor. RCEDO has closely collaborated with provincial NGO network and close collaboration with ADHOC, one of the leading Human Right organizations in Cambodia, by organizing NGO exposure visit to the conflict forest area and reported the issues to the relevant stakeholders for

solving this problem. There is still tense situation. The group of soldier took 200 of 350 hectares of the forest land and through away the community forestry bill board installed by the villagers and CC. The village leader and CC are actively participated in solving the issue but it still unsuccessful. The activities that have been done are the community forestry protection but not organizing. Even there is the formation of community forestry committee and bill board installation; there was not any official participation and recognition from Forestry Administration. The community could not be sustainable if there were not forming the official community forestry because the forestry area is situated between the mountainous valleys that could attract powerful people to take it.

A lot of outputs have been achieved such as some awareness of gender concept, community forestry protection activities done, collaboration with provincial NGO network and relevant expertise institutions and taking action on advocacy.

*There are also some considerations' points that RCEDO should take into account like unclear methodologies and process and few activities on gender mainstreaming and there are the protection of community forestry activities but was not recognized by Forestry Administration.*

## **6. Program Impact**

In general RCEDO has completed the planned activities and produced the planned outputs. The outputs contributed to produce the outcomes of increasing knowledge of agriculture for the target families' income generation, awareness of family health care and not only reducing of discrimination but also increasing income with PLHA.

The target beneficiaries have knowledge and skill in decentralization, local governance, democracy, natural resource management, environment protection and advocacy and they used it for influent CC, government line departments and other NGOs to solve their problems of land crabbing and improving government public services. The program also considers gender mainstreaming and domestic violent awareness raising that could lead to gender equality promotion.

The above outcomes are really contributed to the program impact of food security, welfare preservation and management of natural resource in the target area.

## **7. Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **7.1. Conclusion**

RCEDO implemented the Community Livelihood, Decentralization, Democracy and Peace Building Program effectively. RCEDO has a good relationship with provincial line government departments and others NGOs in the province. RCEDO also provided venue for provincial NGO meeting for sharing experiences and collaboration of action for common purposes. The activities under each objective were implemented as planned. The outputs were obtained that lead to contribute to the program outcomes and impacts.

The program has formed the groups and committees for ensuring self management, providing technical and some management support to development actors and there is also some contribution from community in the projects. Livelihood project provide more service to the target community rather than strengthening them to be the self sustainable community based organization. However this is a sign that lead to program sustainability. There will be the needs to continue the project in order to be fully sustainable in the next phase. There is the room for improvement for the next phase by considering the focus on community organizing and right based approaches. RCEDO staff division of work is mainly based on sectors that are difficult for staff to implement the community organizing approach.

### **7.2. Recommendations**

#### **7.2.1. General recommendation:**

Based on the above conclusion there are the following general recommendations that RCEDO should consider for future:

1. RCEDO should continue to keep good relationship with the government line departments and other NGOs in the province
2. RCEDO should consider to change the staff division of work from sectors to geographical are responsibilities
3. RCEDO should continue the current project by strongly emphasize on community organizing and right based approaches

4. RCEDO should study the possibility of current target beneficiaries for establishing the certain type of Community Based Organization (CBOs)
5. RCEDO should prepare the exit or phasing out plan from the certain type of CBOs and implement it accordingly

### **7.2.2. Specific recommendations:**

To implement the general recommendations above, RCEDO should consider the following specific recommendations:

#### *Livelihood:*

1. RCEDO should discuss with community to come up with sufficient related project documents such as saving and credit policy and procedures and encourage them to use it regularly rather than keeping it with the staff
2. RCEDO should consider the local authority in the project committee to be the advisor of the project in order to avoid the conflict of interest between the civil society and local government roles.

#### *Health:*

3. RCEDO should encourage people to come up with initiative of mobilising and maintenance the water sources in Yeang village and in other places if there is the same problem existed.
4. RCEDO should discuss with community on construction community ponds by discussing with construction companies and advocate CC to include it in the commune plan.
5. RCEDO should continue to collaborate with Health Centre to raise health awareness in the areas that is far from health centre

#### *Commune council*

6. RCEDO should continue to encourage community representative to participate CC meeting and raise their concerns in the commune plan

#### *Gender:*

7. RCEDO should discuss with community to mainstream gender issues into project policies and procedures in order to promote gender equality

#### *Natural Resource Management:*

8. RCEDO should continue to collaborate with the relevant stakeholders for solving the land crabbing issue and than officially establish the community forestry

# APPENDICES

## Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

### **1. Background**

Rural Community and Environment Development Organization (called RCEDO) is an independent Cambodian Local Non-Government Organization registered at the Ministry of Interior of Kingdom of Cambodia since 13 July 1998. RCEDO has formed by a volunteer group of 10 Cambodian members which consisting of 3 women since October 1997. RCEDO staffs have willing and commitment to work and helping the vulnerable group and poor families at grass-roots level in rural communities and/or isolated areas in all provinces of Cambodia.

In April 23, 2003, RCEDO has signed a Memorandum of understanding with the Ministry of Rural Development (MRD) of the Royal Government of Cambodian. This agreement means that RCEDO is complying with the legal requirement and is properly registered to work as a development partner in Kingdom of Cambodia for humanitarian assistance and the public benefit. RCEDO also has officially registered with the Council Development of Cambodia (CDC) of Royal Government of Cambodia in 22 April 2003. RCEDO was working development activities since 1999, to support rural people in 2 provinces at the Northwest provinces of Cambodia, especially in Banteay Meanchey and Oddar Meanchey.

Since 1999 to present, RCEDO has working to support rural communities through safe drinking water, agriculture production skills, credit scheme through self-help Group system, health/hygiene and HIV/AIDS prevention education, vocational skills training, Community Rice bank, literacy education, Decentralization training, family violence, trafficking for women and children. In the several years, RCEDO received funds from Netherlands Embassy, Canada Fund, Ockenden International, AusAID, Embassy of Japan and New Zealand Embassy, Diakonia at Cheang Mai and JSAC/Japan. The total annual budget has been implemented amount of US\$ 80,000- \$100,000 per yearly.

The project ensures that the evaluation design is based on the principles of learning, participation, information sharing and systematic approach. The project actively engages the participation of stakeholders from communities and government agencies, the evaluation gears towards seeking a breadth of opinions, perceptions and inputs.

## 2. Objectives and methods of the external evaluation

### Objective

An independent external evaluation will be carried out at project end phase to evaluate the effectiveness and emerging impact of the project based on its 2007-2009 goal and objectives.

- Deliverables

1. The evaluator will prepare an evaluation report that describes the evaluation processes and puts forward the evaluator's findings and recommendations. Evaluation reports must be in English and Khmer.
2. A verbal presentation and explanation of results will be made by the evaluator to the project.

- **Scope of the work**

- The evaluator will review and analyze existing project documents provided by the Project Implementers.
- The process of evaluation will include the conduct of interviews and focus group discussions with relevant community stakeholders.

- **Method:** While maintaining independence/neutrality, the evaluation will be carried out using a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all parties. The activities include:

- Reading of project related papers provided RCEDO
- Meeting with RCEDO for finalization of the plan
- Study of relevant information provided by RCEDO
- Field trip to RCEDO office and community
- Debriefing
- Write evaluation report

- **Evaluation Time Frame**

The external evaluation will be conducted in December 2009, 10 days in total including report preparation and submission.

### **3. Qualifications and Requirements for the external evaluator, roles and responsibility of Evaluators and RCEDO**

3.1. The external evaluator must be an expert in the field of Rural Development and Participatory approaches and should have the following qualifications:

- At least 5 years experience in Rural Development
- Adequate knowledge on participatory approaches
- Knowledge of programming and project cycle management -desirable
- Experience as an evaluator of projects preferably in the field of Participatory Evaluation
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills
- Experience in producing high quality written reports

3.2. The roles and responsibilities are identified as follows:

1. Review and confirm with RCEDO management the objectives of the evaluation, process and methods to be used, expected outcomes, and the format for the presentation of the results.
2. Become familiar with the RCEDO program by reviewing all relevant documents and discussions with staff.
3. Develop appropriate interviewing techniques, presenting preliminary findings to RCEDO staff and to RCEDO target beneficiaries.
4. Coordinate the activities of the Evaluation and keep RCEDO management informed of the progress.
5. Use a participatory approach that encourages discussion of the findings, and ownership of the conclusions and recommendations by all primary stakeholders.
6. Upon completion of the final draft, discuss the results with RCEDO management.
7. Complete the final evaluation report, following the outline agreed upon with RCEDO management.

#### **3.3. The Roles and Responsibilities of RCEDO**

RCEDO Executive Director, Program Manager and staff will be available to the Evaluation Team for consultation on the general direction of the program evaluation and to address any issues/concerns arising during the exercise.

The following is intended as a guide to the times estimated for each component of the work. The Evaluation Team will be required to prepare and submit a detailed work plan at the beginning of the

evaluation process. The evaluation is scheduled to begin on (07/12/2009) and it is expected to take 10 days.

#### 4.1. Time frame

1 days (7/12/2009): Meet with RCEDO management, study relevant program documents provided by RCEDO, design evaluation process and methods, select sample target beneficiaries, develop guide questionnaires with team, finalize and submit work plan.

1.5 days (8-9/12/2009): Interview RCEDO staff, representatives of NGOs and representatives of concerned government officials and meeting with board of RCEDO.

2.5 days (10-11/12/2009): Interview \_\_\_\_\_project beneficiaries and meeting other community stakeholders

1 days (12/12/2009): Findings consolidation and compilation for debriefing

1 day (13/12/2009): Conduct one day debriefing workshop with RCEDO staff.

3 days (14-5/12/2009): Finalizing the final evaluation report

(The above schedule will be flexible)

Total Working Days: 10 days.

### **Appendix 2: Evaluation schedule**

<b>Date and time</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Resource person</b>	<b>Where</b>
1 December, 2009	Preparation evaluation plan	Sophal, Sarin	PP
2 December, 2009	Meeting with RCEDO management staff to finalize evaluation plan	Sophal, Sarin	BMC
11 December 2009 AM  PM	Meeting with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agricultural Department</li> <li>▪ Environment Department</li> <li>▪ Planning Department</li> <li>▪ Rural Development Department</li> <li>▪ Provincial NGO Network member</li> </ul>	Sarin	BMC
12 December, 2009 AM	Meeting with RCEDO staff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Program manager</li> </ul>	Sarin	BMC

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agriculture Officer</li> <li>▪ CC, Gender and NRM Officer</li> </ul>		
14 December 2009 AM  PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meeting with Villager in PongRor Village, Tapho Commune</li> <li>▪ Meeting with Villager in Kokkei, Tapho Commune</li> </ul>	Sarin	BMC
15 December 2009 AM  PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meeting with Villager in Yearng, Phkoam Commune</li> <li>▪ Meeting with Villager in Phkaom, Phkaom Commune</li> </ul>	Sarin	BMC
16 December 2009 AM  PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meeting with Villager in Kouk Plou, Saroung Commune</li> <li>▪ Meeting with Villager in Pheas Tbong, Saroung Commune</li> </ul>	Sarin	BMC
18 December 2009	Finding consolidation and compilation for debriefing	Sophal, Sarin	BMC
07 January 2010 <sup>1</sup>	Debriefing draft evaluation findings to RCEDO	Sophal, Sarin	BMC
8-10 January 2010	Finalizing the evaluation report and submitting the report to RCEDO	Sophal, Sarin	BMC

---

<sup>1</sup> Because of the board members are busy and want to attend the debriefing, so the presentation was decided to delay to January 7, 2010.

## **Appendix 3: List of People attended in interview**

### **1. RCEDO Key staff**

1. Mr. Sam Serey Wathana, Executive Director
2. Mao Manel, Program Manager
3. Mr. Peng Sovann, D&D Project Officer
4. Ms. Rith Vanna, Officer Assistant
5. Mr Mao Nanin, Project Officer
6. Ms Yoeung Sileap, CD Officer
7. Mr. On Sovan, Health Project Officer
8. Mrs. Roeung Minh Admin / finance Officer

### **2. Other NGOs in the Province**

1. Mr. Som Chankea, ADHOC program Coordinator
2. So Theavy, RIDA Executive Director
3. Mr. Hout Longdy, RAHDO ED
4. Mr. Choung Meng, KIEDO ED

### **3. Provincial line government department officers**

1. Mr. Pang Vanna Setha, Deputy Director of Provincial Department of Agriculture
2. Mr. Mao So, Director of Provincial Department of Rural Development
3. Mr Ros Sophon, Director of Provincial Department of Planning
4. Mr. Yim Ly, Director of Provincial Department of Environment
5. Mr. Chhay Thorn, Deputy Director of Provincial Department of Environment

### **4. Community members**

1. Hy Trik, Community Committee in PongRo village, Tapho commune
2. Sam Soeum, Cow bank member in Pong Ror village, Tapho commune
3. Yem Hoeut, pong Ror village leader
4. So Sros, Community Committee in Pong ro village Tapho commune
5. Thoeung Svot, Latrine member in Pong Ror village
6. Bun Sap, CRT in Khmeas village
7. Thai Sina, CTR in Tapho village
8. Nhem Sot, Cow bank member in Pongro village
9. Han Youk, Latrine member in Pong Ror village
10. Hok Veout, CC chief in Tapho commune

11. Svay Thoeun, 2<sup>nd</sup> deputy CC chief in Tapho commune
12. Sam Chenh, CC member in Tapho commune
13. Klad Dy, 2<sup>nd</sup> deputy CC chief in Tapho commune
14. Pok Moey, Cow bank member in Kok Key village Tapho commune
15. Koey Saroeun, Cow bank member in Tapho village
16. Ton Yet, Vegetable group member in Prich Key village
17. Boes Choen, Vegetable group member in Prich Key village
18. Ngoy Chea, RCEDO working group member
19. Nam Lay, Community members in Yeang village
20. Pan Chou, Community member in Ponley village
21. Pann Dout, Community member in Ponley village
22. Soeung Sothy, Community pig member in Yeang village
23. Leou Phean, Community pig member in Yeang village
24. Bloey Mao, CRT in Yeang village
25. Chhem Chhap, F, Cow bank member in yeang village
26. Hel Touy, F, Well member in Yeang village
27. Tiev Pek, F, Well member in Yeang village
28. Ngoy Chak, Well member in Yeang village
29. Suy Moch, F, Cow member in Yeang village
30. Nhem Samnang, F, Well member in Yeang village
31. Mov Hing, F, Well member in Yeang village
32. Sman Toeun, F, Well member in Yeang village
33. Khoeu Soth, F, Well member in Yeang village
34. Sorn Chout, Well member in Yeang village
35. Te Bunchun, PHLA in Tamao village Phaam commune
36. Large Pharn, 2ND cc CHIEF IN pHAAM COMMUNE
37. Tha Roeun, F, well member in Phkaom village
38. Chhout Chhin, F, well member in Phkaom village
39. Choey Chanroeun, Latrine member in Phaam village
40. Mao Mout, Latrine member in Phkaom village
41. Poy Dam, Well committee in Phkaom village
42. Thoeb Thoeun, Latrine member in Phkaom village
43. Dith Seth, Vegetable group leader in Kok plu village Sarong commune
44. Him Choup, Vegetable deputy group leader in Kokplu village
45. Lem Moch, Vegetable member in Kokplu village

46. Vath Thoey, Vegetable member in Kok plu village
47. Bok Ngek, Vegetable member in Kok plu village
48. Bou Uy, Vegetable member in Kok plu village
49. Chum Yan, Vegetable member in Kokplu village
50. Phom Kimchun, Vegetable member in Plas Korng village
51. Soun Vanna, Deputy vegetable group leader in Chrung village
52. Yeang Soeung, Vegetable group leader in Plas Kong village
53. Lam Kim Se, CRT in Pheas Tbong village
54. Lao Phao, Vegetable member in Pheas Tbong village
55. Sam Mida, Vegetable member in Pheas Tbong village
56. Inn Koen, F, Cow member in Pheas Tbong village
57. Neav Loun, Vegetable member in Pheas Tbong village
58. Him Thida, Latrin member in Pheas Tbong village