

MORODOK Organization

Terms of Reference for Rapid Evaluation of Community Wetlands & Mangrove Management Project

Contents

1. Background of the Evaluation	1
2. Purpose of the Evaluation.....	1
3. Methods, Timetable and Evaluation Questions	2
3.1 Methodology.....	2
3.1 Timetable	2
3.2 Evaluation questions for CPAs.....	2
3.3 Evaluation questions for Environment Officials	3
4. Secondary Sources of Information.....	4
5. Profile of the evaluator	4
6. Responsibilities and duties	4
7. Evaluation Outputs	4
7.1. Presentation to staff	4
7.2. Evaluation Report.....	4
8. Budget	5
9. List of Acronyms	5

1. Background of the Evaluation

In April 2020, Morodok began a 21-month mini-project, funded by FELM¹, which aims to strengthen Morodok's work with 5 community protected areas (CPAs) and to reduce the destruction of mangrove forests. FELM is an agency of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland which works to promote human dignity and justice around the world.

The CPAs are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Environment and are managed by local communities. The 5 CPAs cover 4,205 hectares and consist mainly of mangroves, which are important for carbon sequestration, fish breeding, fish nutrients, and coastline protection. Each CPA is led by a committee, elected by the community, consisting of 5 to 15 members. The CPAs have a total membership of 777 households (consisting of 3,890 family members) from 15 villages.

The project helps to build the capacity of the CPA committees to protect the natural environment, to network with the authorities and each other, and to build awareness of natural resource management in the wider community.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide a rapid *qualitative* assessment of the mini-project, in order to provide feedback to Morodok and FELM as to the project's **relevance** and

¹ See list of acronyms at end of this Terms of Reference

effectiveness. In keeping with the small scale of this project (the project budget is approximately EUR 15,000 per year), a full evaluation encompassing all OECD criteria is not proposed.

3. Methods, Timetable and Evaluation Questions

3.1 Methodology

The evaluator will hold focus group discussions (FGD) with key members of each of the 5 CPA committees in order to obtain feedback on the project’s relevance and effectiveness from their perspective. Each FGD is expected to take about 1.5 hours. At least one environmental official will also be interviewed. The evaluator will then discuss the findings with Morodok staff (in Khmer) and prepare a short report on the evaluation’s findings (in English).

3.1 Timetable

The evaluation shall be conducted at a mutually agreed time in October 2021 over a period of 6 days, with timetable as follows:

- Monday: travel to Sre Ambel, orientation, preparation;
- Tuesday: visit the field, meet 3 CPAs separately;
- Wednesday: visit the field, meet 2 CPAs separately; meet environment official(s);
- Thursday: prepare a presentation, share findings with staff in the afternoon;
- Friday: prepare the evaluation report, return to Phnom Penh;
- Post-visit: complete the report, request feedback from Morodok staff, make corrections if needed, and submit the final report.

3.2 Evaluation questions for CPAs

Below are evaluation questions which may be used to guide the discussion with each CPA committee. The evaluator will translate these questions to Khmer before beginning the field work, and decide how to best ask the questions in order to communicate clearly and effectively.

3.2.1 Relevance

1. What are the objectives of your CPA, and what problems have you faced in achieving your objectives?
2. Over the last two years, what assistance has the CPA committee received from Morodok to help you achieve your objectives?
3. Over the last two years, have you received assistance from any other sources? If so, from who and what kinds of assistance did they provide?
4. Was the assistance received from Morodok relevant to your needs, or would you like Morodok to provide different kinds of assistance in future?

3.2.2 Effectiveness

The researcher will ask questions related to each of the project indicators as listed below, encourage discussion, and try to achieve a qualitative assessment of the effectiveness of Morodok’s intervention and how it could be improved. Only brief answers are needed for each question, depending on time available.

Expected Results (Results Statements)	Interview question
IMPACT: Community groups effectively protect mangrove forest in 5 coastal areas around Kampong Som Bay.	1. Over the last 2 years, to what extent has the rate of mangrove deforestation in the CPA increased or decreased? Why?
<u>CAPACITY BUILDING</u>	

<p>OUTCOME 1: The 5 CPA communities have used their improved capacities to prepare and implement management plans regarding the protection and sustainable management of natural resources.</p>	<p>2. Over the last 2 years, did you prepare CPA management plans? What problems did you face in preparing the plans and getting them approved?</p> <p>3. Over the last 2 years, what violations of NRM laws did you detect and resolve? What difficulties did you face when trying to prevent violations?</p>
<p>Output 1.1: The organizational development capacity and management structure of the 5 CPAs have been enhanced.</p>	<p>4. Over the last 2 years, what was the quality of the NRM training organized by Morodok? How could it be improved?</p>
<p>Output 1.2: The 5 CPA communities' capacity to bring NRM challenges/issues to the attention of authorities has been enhanced.</p>	<p>5. Over the last 2 years, what NRM challenges/issues did you bring to the attention of authorities? What response did you receive?</p>
<p>Output 1.3: Communities have gained knowledge of CBET and know how to begin an initiative and market it.</p>	<p>6. Over the last 2 years, what was the quality of the assistance provided by Morodok regarding CBET?</p>
<p><u>COMMUNITY AWARENESS & INVOLVEMENT</u></p>	
<p>OUTCOME 2: Community members have used their increased awareness to become actively involved in sustainable management of natural resources.</p>	<p>7. Over the last 2 years, how often did you do patrols, and how did Morodok assist?</p> <p>8. How effective were the patrols in reducing illegal activity?</p>
<p>Output 2.1: Community members have increased awareness on their roles in natural resource management.</p>	<p>9. Over the last 2 years, how has the CPA committee tried to increase awareness of natural resource management in the community, and how did Morodok assist?</p> <p>10. How effective was the awareness raising?</p>
<p>Output 2.2: The 5 CPA committees have developed and implemented plans for patrolling.</p>	<p>11. Over the last 2 years, what problems did you face when planning patrols?</p>
<p><u>STRENGTHENING NRM NETWORK</u></p>	
<p>OUTCOME 3: CPA community leaders have improved coordination with environment officials, local authorities, and other CBOs for better law enforcement.</p>	<p>12. Over the last 2 years, in what ways did you coordinate with other CBOs to raise issues of concern with environment officials or local authorities?</p>
<p>Output 3.1: The CPA communities' participation in the network around Kampong Som Bay is strengthened.</p>	<p>13. Over the last 2 years, in what ways did you cooperate with other CBOs in the Kampong Som Bay region?</p>

3.3 Evaluation questions for Environment Officials

As environment officials may have less time to answer questions, the questions below are shorter and more general. The evaluator may probe further depending on the time available, or raise issues arising from the CPA focus groups.

3.3.1 Relevance

1. Can you please tell us about the support Morodok is providing the CPA committees?
2. Do you feel Morodok is providing the right kinds of assistance? Are there other ways in which you feel Morodok should assist the CPAs?
3. How do Morodok, the Environment Department and other agencies cooperate to assist the CPAs? What is the role of each?

3.2.2 Effectiveness

1. How effective is the assistance Morodok provides to the CPAs?
2. How could Morodok improve its effectiveness in this regard?

4. Secondary Sources of Information

The researcher will be provided the following sources of information to be read before starting the field work:

1. Project Activities & Results Planning Matrix
2. Project report 2020
3. Project report January-June 2021
4. Morodok Annual Report (for context about the whole Morodok program)

5. Profile of the evaluator

The evaluator will be experienced in conducting qualitative evaluations, fluent in Khmer (written and spoken), proficient in English writing, and have experience and knowledge related to community-based natural resources management.

6. Responsibilities and duties

The evaluator will work under the direction of the Executive Director of Morodok. The evaluator will be responsible for his/her own accommodation, meals, and transport to and from Sre Ambel town, and will bring his/her own laptop computer. Morodok will provide meeting arrangements/expenses and transport within the project area.

7. Evaluation Outputs

7.1. Presentation to staff

Immediately upon completing the field work, the evaluator will prepare a brief PowerPoint presentation of the main findings for sharing in the meeting with staff. The presentation shall be in Khmer and should convey the project's achievements, challenges, and recommendations for improvement, plus some key questions to be discussed in the meeting.

7.2. Evaluation Report

The evaluation report shall be brief, in order to convey the main findings in a succinct manner. The report shall be written in English, consist of not more than 8 pages (not including annexes), and shall contain at least:

1. Executive Summary: a brief, to-the-point, summary of no more than 1 page describing the key findings and recommendations.
2. Introduction: short description of the project, purpose of the evaluation, evaluation scope and key questions.
3. Evaluation design/methodology (including limitations)
4. Key findings with regard to each of the evaluation questions, assessing the project's relevance and effectiveness.
5. Conclusions and Recommendations, based on the key findings.
6. Annexes: Terms of Reference; List of Persons/CBOs consulted; List of Documents consulted, Question Guide; Evaluation Schedule; Additional data collected in the focus group discussions (if relevant).

8. Budget

The Consultant's budget may not exceed EUR 1,500 (USD 1,780), and should include consultant fees, withholding tax (15% withheld and paid by Morodok to the taxation department), travel to/from Sre Ambel, accommodation, and meals.

9. List of Acronyms

CBET	Community-Based Eco-Tourism
CBO	Community-Based Organisation
CPA	Community Protected Area (at CBO that protects natural resources)
EUR	Euro
FELM	Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Mission
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
NRM	Natural Resources Management
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development