

Implementation Plan of Recommendations

Project Title and Reference No.: “Improving Ecosystem Management for Sustainable Livelihoods within the Framework of Lancang-Mekong Cooperation” (PIMS ID 02101) 2021 – 2022

Contact Person (TM/PM): Makiko Yashiro, Programme Management Officer, UNEP ROAP

	PLANS			
RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED (YES/NO/PARTIALLY)	WHAT WILL BE DONE?	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE	REPOSIBLE OFFICER/ UNIT/ DIVISION/ AGENCY
Recommendation #1: Projects should not only include quantitative, implementation-based indicators, but should also include qualitative indicators that are indicative of change brought about by projects instead of only measuring delivery of activities.	Yes	When Asia and the Pacific Office (ROAP) contributes to the designing of future projects of UNEP, this recommendation will be followed.	Continuous	All programme officers of ROAP and UNEP-IEMP
Recommendation #2: Support should be provided to the Cambodia Ministry of Environment to secure seed funding to maintain/expend on pilot site intervention until the approval and	Partially (it depends on whether UNEP will manage to develop new projects that give a scope for supporting Cambodia	When UNEP designs and implements relevant projects in the future that provide a scope for including Cambodia, UNEP will prioritize the inclusion of Cambodia as one of the participating country.	December 2024	UNEP ROAP and UNEP IEMP teams

Management-Led Terminal Review, UNEP

	PLANS			
RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED (YES/NO/PARTIALLY)	WHAT WILL BE DONE?	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE	REPOSIBLE OFFICER/ UNIT/ DIVISION/ AGENCY
implementation of the next phase.	in continuing with additional activities)			
Recommendation #3: For increased local communities' ownership and future sustainability of interventions, the nexus between ecosystem management and livelihoods needs to be strengthened, and market assurance is needed. Local communities should be consulted and involved from the project development stage, rather than towards the end of the project.	Yes	When Asia and the Pacific Office (ROAP) contributes to the designing of future projects of UNEP, this recommendation will be followed.	Continuous	All programme officers of ROAP and UNEP-IEMP
Recommendation #4: Gender needs to be addressed in a more comprehensive manner, showing how project interventions affect men and women differently, and not be limited to the number of women	Yes	When Asia and the Pacific Office (ROAP) contributes to the designing of future projects of UNEP, this recommendation will be followed.	Continuous	All programme officers of ROAP and UNEP-IEMP

Management-Led Terminal Review, UNEP

	PLANS			
RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED (YES/NO/PARTIALLY)	WHAT WILL BE DONE?	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE	REONSIBLE OFFICER/ UNIT/ DIVISION/ AGENCY
participating in project activities.				

The following is a summary of lessons learned from some of the project’s experiences and based upon explicit findings of the review. They briefly describe the context from which the lessons are derived, and the potential for wider application:

Lesson Learned #1:	The economic/livelihoods aspect should not be underestimated when working with local communities and engaging them in processes that imply a drastic change in how they use the land they live and work on. Private sector involvement is crucial.
Context/comment:	Local communities were originally reluctant to apply new ways of working the land and to diversify/integrate new activities. However, once they realized this would enhance their livelihoods and provide them with new sources of income, they embraced the changes and are now keen on pursuing these activities. The involvement of other partners (including private sector) provided the beneficiaries with a way to sell their produce (black ginger and honey), and has been instrumental in bringing around the way the intervention was viewed.

Lesson Learned #2:	The involvement of national and local partners and communities is crucial to the successful implementation of interventions.
Context/comment:	With the COVID-19 travel and meeting restrictions, the project could not have been delivered in the short implementation period without the national actors involved. The IPs and counterparts involved were instrumental in the timely implementation of the interventions, and their bringing their commitments and national and local networks to the plate were what allowed the Project’s success.

Management-Led Terminal Review, UNEP

Lesson Learned #3:	Three years of project development leaving only a little over a year for implementation is not a good ratio. Projects need to be developed/approved faster and allow for a longer implementation time frame.
Context/comment:	It has been challenging for the UNEP teams to maintain interest and momentum of partners and stakeholders over the three years it took for the Project to be finalized and approved. The lengthy process left a very short timeframe for implementation, putting incredible pressure on the IPs. The short implementation period also didn't allow for project interventions at the pilot site to go over more than one turn of the seasons cycle and to monitor their continued success over time.