



# FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

**Cambodia**

Thematic window  
Culture and Development

**Joint Programme Title:**  
Creative Industries Support Programme

---

November | **2011**

---



## CISP Final Programme Report



**NOVEMBER 2011**

**Compiled By: Sokheang Hong, Consultant**

## Contents

List of Abbreviation .....	3
CISP Program Glossary .....	4
I. Introduction .....	5
II. Background of CISP .....	6
III. Project Partners .....	6
3.1. National government partners: MIME, MoC, MoCFA, MAFF .....	6
3.2. NGOs in Phnom Penh, Ratanakiri, Mondulakiri, Preah Vihear and Kampong Thom.....	7
3.2.1. National Non-Government Partners.....	8
3.2.2. Provincial NGO partners .....	8
IV. Project Beneficiaries .....	9
V. Project Result .....	10
VI. Good Practices and challenges .....	12
6.1. Summary of Good Practices.....	13
6.1. Challenges and Recommendation .....	14
VII. Conclusion and Recommendation .....	22
VIII. ANNEXES .....	23
Annex I. List of Contacts of NGO Implementing Partners .....	23
Annex II.A: Research and study reports conducted by CISP .....	25
Annex II.B: Books, Publication, Training Manual and CDs .....	27
Annex II.C: Reports of Program Management Committee Meeting.....	28
Annex III: CISP Target Areas .....	29
Annex IV: List of Partner's Reports Consulted.....	30
Annex V: PMC Composition/Members.....	31
Annex VI: List of Workshop Participants- 19 October 2011 .....	32

## List of Abbreviation

AAC	Artisan Association of Cambodia
CANDO	Cambodia-NTFP Development Organization
CCC	Cambodia Craft Cooperation
CEDAC	Centre d'Etude et de Développement Agricole Cambodgien
CISP	Creative Industries Support Programme
CLA	Cambodia Living Arts
COWS	Cambodian Organization for Women Supports
EDI	Enterprise Development Institute
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FLD	Farmer Livelihood and Development
ILO	International Labor Organisation
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
MIME	Ministry of Industry, Mine and Energy
MOC	Ministry of Commerce
MoCFA	Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts
MODE	Minority Organization for Development of Economy
MVI	My Village International
Nomad RSI	Nomad Recherche et Soutien International
NTFP-EP	Non-Timber Forest Products-Exchange Program
PFC	Provincial Field Coordinator
PKH	Ponlok Khmer
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
RSA	Royal School of Administration
VFC	Village Focus Cambodia

## CISP Program Glossary

Business Development Services	Business Development Services (BDS) are services that improve the performance of the enterprise, its access to markets, and its ability to compete. The definition of "business development services" includes a wide array of business services, both strategic and operational. BDS are designed to serve individual businesses, as opposed to the larger business community.
Creative Industries	Cultural industries are defined as those industries which produce tangible or intangible artistic and creative outputs, and which have a potential for wealth creation and income generation through the exploitation of cultural assets and production of knowledge-based goods and services (both traditional and contemporary).
Cultural products	All products that are made using locally available materials and drawing upon traditional techniques and methods.
Culturally sensitive	Sensitivity to cultural values (often used when developing or implementing development of health related programs).
Group	This term is all encompassing and includes small informal groupings of producers, membership based groups, networks, associations, NGOs and social enterprises.
Producer	The term includes artists, artisans and performers and within the program document largely refers to people producing weaved goods, handicrafts, jars and pottery, resin or non timber forestry products.

## I. Introduction

Under the objectives of the Thematic Window for Culture and Development, the joint programme was designed to promote the cultural diversity and heritage of Cambodia with the aim of harnessing the social and economic potential of its cultural assets and products. The substantial potential for diversifying sustainable economic growth and the creation of employment<sup>1</sup> in the creative industries in Cambodia considers largely under-realized, and cultural-based goods and services play a much more limited role – as a catalyst and source of jobs creation, national and local revenues and foreign exchange – than in neighboring countries in the region.

Moreover, in choosing indigenous communities as its primary target, the CISP is in accordance with a number of broader UN initiatives concerning the rights of indigenous peoples and cultures, including: The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) and the forthcoming World Conference on Indigenous Peoples in 2014. During the most recent International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples (9 August 2011), UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon called on Member States to help indigenous communities “to protect, develop and be compensated fairly for the cultural heritage and traditional knowledge that is ultimately of benefit to us all”.<sup>2</sup>

The programme was also in line with and contributed to i) the Royal Government of Cambodia Rectangular Strategy, ii) the ratified UNESCO conventions on “World Heritage (1972)<sup>3</sup>”, “Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003)<sup>4</sup>” and “Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005)”, iii) the Small and Medium Enterprise Development Framework and iv) the Cambodian Trade Integration Strategy.

To promote both the social inclusion and cultural rights of indigenous peoples and to provide their sustainable income generation and livelihood improvements, the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) with financing from the Government of Spain thus supported the Creative Industries Support Programme (CISP) in Cambodia.

Within the MDG-F, a results-oriented monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy was established to measure contributions to the MDGs and multilateralism. The strategy seeks to (i) support programmes to attain development results, (ii) measure contributions to MDG-F objectives, MDGs, and aid effectiveness mechanisms, and (iii) support scaling up and replication of successful programmes through evidence-based knowledge and lessons learned.

---

<sup>1</sup> Upon recommendation by the mid-term review, the programme focus has moved to income generation rather than employment creation as indigenous people often have had handicraft works as their employment, but low income due to low market access as a result of quality, design, marketing and production constraints.

<sup>2</sup> United Nations (n.d.) *International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples, 9 August. Secretary-General's Message for 2011.* Retrieved from [http://www.un.org/en/events/indigenousday/message\\_sg.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/events/indigenousday/message_sg.shtml)

<sup>3</sup> The UNESCO World Heritage Convention was ratified in 1991.

<sup>4</sup> The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritages was signed in 2006.

## II. Background of CISP

Approved in April 2008, CISP has a three-year duration (September 2008-September 2011, and later extended to 30 November 2011), with a total allocation of US\$3.3 million. CISP was designed to contribute to the achievement of three MDGs, two outcomes from the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), and a total of three joint programme outcomes and a number of associated outputs.

The CISP involved four UN agencies—UNESCO as “Coordinating Agency”, ILO, UNDP, and FAO—working in partnership with four ministries of the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC). Each agency and its RGC counterpart work according to their organizational strengths. UNESCO and the Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts (MoCFA) collaborated on outputs and outcomes related to the preservation and promotion of Khmer and indigenous culture, while ILO and FAO—in partnership with the Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy (MIME), and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), respectively—worked together toward improved income generation and employment creation, community development, and livelihood improvement. UNDP, along with the Ministry of Commerce (MoC), oversaw the commercialization component of the CISP, responsible for marketing cultural products and assets and creating sustainable business ventures.

In order to support the social and economic potential of Cambodia’s heritage and diversity, the CISP placed its focus on traditional basket weaving and performing arts, which were added specifically at the request of the Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts during the PMC meeting, in all four provinces, as well as a series of other cultural products and assets specific to the peoples and practices of each area, including: jars and pottery (Ratanakiri); resin production (Preah Vihear, Mondulkiri); and, textile weaving (Mondulkiri, Ratanakiri).

The official start date of CISP was 10 September 2008 lasting for a planned period of three years (September 2011). However, the actual programme implementation could only fully operationalise a year later, December 2009 when staff mobilization was finally completed. The programme was then followed by a literature review, base line study and initial field visits by the project team. Program Field Coordinators, responsible for the coordination and logistical arrangement of activities at the provincial level, began searching for suitable local-level implementing partners in mid-2009. Implementing partners then assisted with the initial scoping visits to local communities, to identify potential target areas and select programme beneficiaries. However, for many implementing partners, contracts and the actual implementation of training activities did not begin until August or September 2010.

## III. Project Partners

### 3.1. National government partners: MIME, MoC, MoCFA, MAFF

The CISP was implemented in partnership with four national Government Ministry counterparts—Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts (MoCFA), Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy (MIME), Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), and Ministry of Commerce (MoC).

The Table 1 below highlights the participating UN organizations, the respective agencies’ contributions to the joint programme, their respective government counterparts, and the focus of their CISP-relate activities.



**Table 1: Participating UN Agencies, Programme Contributions, Government Counterparts, and Programme Focus**

UN Agency	Contribution (US\$)	Government Counterpart	Programme Focus
<b>UNESCO</b>	748,604	Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts (MoCFA)	Cultural preservation and promotion
<b>ILO</b>	941,017	Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy (MIME)	Income generation / community development / livelihoods
<b>UNDP</b>	818,826	Ministry of Commerce (MoC)	Commercialization
<b>FAO</b>	791,553	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF)	Income generation / community development / livelihoods

Source: Project Final Evaluation (Draft Oct 2011)

In addition, Ministry of Women's Affairs and Ministry of Tourism due to the gender mainstreaming aspects and tourism-oriented market of the indigenous products participated in the project through Programme Management Committee as special guests. (For more information about PMC, please see Annex V: Composition/Members of the PMC). Furthermore, the Ministry of Rural Development was involved in the CISP on specific capacity building for the development of the Indigenous People and the preparation of the IP Day. The CISP also collaborated with the National Committee of One Village One Product (OVOP) in assisting producers' groups to register and obtain certification.

### **3.2. NGOs in Phnom Penh, Ratanakiri, Mondulakiri, Preah Vihear and Kampong Thom**

With aims to strengthen the institutional capacity of civil society organizations, building local ownership and sustaining programme activities after the conclusion of the CISP, the joint programme opted a strategy to implement the project activities through national and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (See Annex I: Contact of the NGOs). This method was applied as the CISP was designed to strengthen established institutions, rather than create new mechanisms for the promotion of its policies and activities. Thus, implementing partners were selected with their respective strengths in mind, as well as their capability of contributing to the present success and future sustainability of CISP initiatives.

The CISP also relied on the provincial NGOs implementing partners to act as Business Development Services (BDS) Providers. Initially, the CISP was designed to collaborate with business development service (BDS) providers; however, the lack of these providers within the country and specifically at the sub-national level prompting project decisions to further involved NGOs in the form of additional agreements with them to provide both training and mentoring at the community level. These activities were possible because the NGOs have similar target groups and provide similar services, such as training on business skills and marketing, handicraft production, and sustainable natural resource management. The provincial NGOs were also trained by some of the selected National NGOs.



### 3.2.1. National Non-Government Partners

**Artisans Association of Cambodia (AAC)** is a membership based organization for crafts producers and sellers in Cambodia and was established in 2001. It is specialised in design and labeling of the existing and improved products. Its roles in the CISP has been mainly assisting local implementing NGO partners to transfer the attained knowledge to assist the target producers with design and improved products' styles in the absence of Business Development Services (BDS) providers in Cambodia. AAC specifically assisted the improved utilisation of local materials, for instance, Lumpeak and TiengTnout in Kampong Thom, and design, styles or coloring in meeting market taste. AAC trained the local NGOs and monitored their implementation based on contractual arrangements with CISP. The training was conducted after a thorough institutional assessment of the NGOs. AAC has been responsible for providing training to provincial NGOs in promoting and creating market linkages of the indigenous products.

**Cambodia Craft Cooperation (CCC)** was hired t by the CISP to build a new kiln in Veunsai, in the village, in order to replace the ancient kiln located by the river bank. However, this kiln was not successful as it never reached the required 1,200 degrees to produce the same kind of pottery as the ancient kiln.

**Cambodia Living Arts (CLA)** was engaged by the CISP to support Kompong Chheu Teal High School in collaboration with the Kompong Thom Provincial Department of Culture and Fine Arts. It was mainly to strengthen the high school's performing arts class. CLA had recorded and produced a music CD of the Yeal Lom Group of Artists (Indigenous Tampuon from Ratanakiri province). It also performed at the training on the 2003 Convention and for the Inauguration of the Indigenous handicraft exhibition at the National Museum (with Indigenous artists from Ratanakiri and Mondulkiri).

**Enterprise Development Institute (EDI)** has been engaged by CISP in managing small grants to producers groups and the local NGOs. EDI assisted the grant recipients in proposal writing and financial accounting. It also trained target groups on overall financial management.

**Non-Timber Forest Products-Exchange Program (NTFP-EP)** operates in Phnom Penh, Preah Vihear and Mondulkiri. It was engaged by CISP between October 2010 and January 2011 to conduct value chain analysis of resin products. It assists target producers on sustainable collection and processing techniques of the natural resources.

**Royal School of Administration (RSA)** was engaged by the CISP to conduct technical capacity needs assessment of provincial departments in the four target provinces, organising training workshop sessions on program design, proposal writing and Monitoring and Evaluation. The RSA was also engaged in mentoring the proposal writing process and facilitate the submission of selected proposals to potential funders.

### 3.2.2. Provincial NGO partners

A number of Provincial NGO Implementing Partners were subcontracted to assist target communities based on their expertise and present in the target areas.

In Ratanakiri, CISP engaged Cambodian NTFP Development Organisation (CANDO) and Center for Study and Development in Agriculture (CEDAC). CANDO is operating in 10 villages, 3 communes of Ochum and Veunsai districts. It was engaged by the CISP for six months between October 2010 and April 2011. CEDAC works 4 villages in two communes in Kon Mon and Voeun Say districts. It was engaged by CISP from August 2010 to June 2011.

In Mondulkiri, CISP worked with three provincial NGOs implementing partners, Nomad Recherche et Soutien International (Nomad RSI), My Village International (MVI), and Village Focus Cambodia (VFC). The Nomad RSI, engaged by the CISP between September 2010 and October 2011, assisted the establishment and management of the Mondulkiri Resource and Documentation Center (MRDC) in Sen Monorom. The MVI worked with resin and handicraft groups in two villages, two commune and two districts between June and September 2011.

In Kompong Thom, CISP has worked with two local NGOs, Minority Organisation for Development (MODE) and Cambodian Organisation for Women Supports (COWS). The MODE was established as a local NGO working with Orphan and vulnerable Children (OVC) and People Living with HIV (PLHIV). With CISP, MODE worked on business support for handicraft producers groups in five villages in two communes, two districts from February to August 2011. The COWS worked with CISP on income generation activities with rattan and bamboo producers in 3 villages, two communes in Prasart Balang district from February to August 2011.

In Preah Vihear, the CISP engaged two provincial NGO implementing partners, Ponlok Khmer (PKH) and Farmer Livelihood and Development (FLD). The PKH has worked on business supports to resin groups in five villages between February 2010 and September 2011. The FLD worked on economic improvement of poor people in ten villages in Preah Vihear.

#### **IV. Project Beneficiaries**

The CISP sought to support the inclusion and participation of indigenous and marginalized groups in four of Cambodia's remote Northern and Northeastern provinces, including: Kampong Thom, Preah Vihear, Mondulkiri, and Ratanakiri (Table 2 below). Certain indigenous groups make up the ethnic majority of the provinces they inhabit (e.g. Tampuan, Phnong) and celebrate a nearly autonomous lifestyle from the country's Khmer majority (e.g. Tampuan Kreung, Lao, Phnong), other groups seem far more assimilated into the prevailing Khmer culture and language system (e.g. Kuoy). This assimilation may be due, in part, to a geographic proximity to the majority, or access to reliable roads; however, each of the target groups hold their own distinct language and culture, but with varying degrees of practice.

Thus, in order to support the social and economic potential of Cambodia's heritage and diversity, the CISP has chosen interventions in the areas of traditional basket weaving and performing arts in all four provinces, and a number of other cultural products and assets specific to the peoples and practices of each area, including: jars and pottery (Ratanakiri); resin production (Preah Vihear, Mondulkiri); and, textile weaving (Mondulkiri, Ratanakiri).

**Table 2. CISP Target: Geographic Areas, Ethnic Groups, and Cultural Products**

Area	Ethnic Group	Cultural Product / Asset
<b>Kampong Thom</b>	- Khmer - Kuoy	- Basket weaving, performing arts - Basket weaving, performing arts
<b>PreahVihear</b>	- Kuoy	- Basket weaving, performing arts, resin
<b>Mondulkiri</b>	- Phnong (also, Bunong or Pnong)	- Textile weaving, basket weaving, resin; performing arts
<b>Ratanakiri</b>	- Tampuan  - Kreung  - Lao	- Basket weaving, jars and pottery, performing arts, textile weaving - Basket weaving, textile weaving - Jars and pottery

Source: Project Final Evaluation (Draft Oct 2011)

## V. Project Result

Considering the initial delay in starting programme activities, the CISP was still seen effective in delivering the majority of its expected outputs. The final project evaluation observed attainment of development outputs while significant progress towards its expected outcomes was made. The programme outputs contributed to: the preservation of Cambodia's heritage, cultural diversity, and living arts while promoting their social and economic potential (Outcome 1); improvements in livelihoods, particularly for indigenous groups and women, from enhanced creative industries (Outcome 2); and, improved commercialization of selected cultural products and services in domestic markets (Outcome 3).

The program has reached out to its target areas and indigenous population. By the end of the program, at least 809 people in more than 60 groups in the four target provinces benefited directly from the project (see Table 5.1. and 5.2: Types and Number of Beneficiaries). The intervention and assistance in handicraft products have been carefully selected by the programme with systematic endorsement from the PMC members.

**Table 5.1. Total Numbers by Indigenous Groups**

No	Producer Groups	Total			Khmer	Phnong	Kuoy	Kreung	Tampuan	Lao
		Total	Female	Male	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
1	Basket	317	199	118	57	34	158	60	8	
2	Jar and pottery	64	42	22					32	32
3	Performing arts	111	56	55	47	17	22		25	
4	Resin	132	48	84		40	92			
5	Weaving	202	202	0		52		135	15	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>826</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>32</b>

Even though the sustainability of CISP interventions was questioned by both project partners at all levels and independent viewers including that of the final program evaluation, it became a concern mainly because of the short time-frame, a three year period, of the joint programme. This short project life span was exacerbated by an almost one-year delay in implementation of the activities due to time-consuming in the start-up and programme team recruitments/assignments. Some of the actual project activities at the local communities began in early 2010, which would constitute an actual implementation

period of approximately 20 months (for the earliest contracts signed). Additionally, due to difficulties in establishing timely contracts with all local implementing partners, some activities initiated implementation as late as August and September 2011, just weeks prior to the close of the joint programme.

However, CISP partners including national government officials, NGOs and the UN agencies have also witnessed potential continuities of the CISP results. For instance, a Cultural Center was established as “Cultural Hub” for indigenous culture preservation and promotion in Mondulkiri called “Mondulkiri Resource and Documentation Center”. In Ratanakiri, such a hub was constructed by the CISP and its management will be relied upon the Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts. The Ministry has made clear at different Project Management Committee meetings about its commitment to make the museum running and successful. The CISP has also assisted, through technical expertise, the establishment of an “Eco Global Museum” near the Preah Vihear World Heritage Site complex by contributing to the Museum concept. This latter museum is a national priority, thus CISP believes it will sustain on its own course. Meanwhile the other Cultural Centers in Ratanakiri and Mondulkiri will continue with, perhaps, further assistance from UNESCO and NOMAD RSI.

One can also claim that CISP sustainability exists in at least two aspects, the continuity of the CISP outputs/results and the continued financial supports from different sources after CISP completion in October 2011. The success contributed to the fact that the programme was also able to identify key barriers, the production and the marketing aspects, of indigenous products, and has tried to use different mechanisms and efforts to address them. There are some signs of success of those interventions even though it is too early to make any conclusion by the time of the project completion.

For instance, there are a number of increased sales and markets of the indigenous products to markets in Siem Reap, Phnom Penh, and the four target provinces of CISP and beyond. The indigenous products, as reported by provincial NGOs implementing partners and CISP team, were popular during various trade fairs and have started to penetrate national and international markets. CANDU, for example, reported that the newly developed and improved quality and designs supported by CISP have now being recognised in Ratanakiri, Phnom Penh and Siem Reap. The “Craft Shop”, among others, in Phnom Penh was buying and re-selling the indigenous handicrafts from Ratanakiri. It is reported that the sales have increased up to 18% as a result of CISP’s intervention on the improvement of sales and market access. However, it has been acknowledged by the team regarding the limited production capacity and production coordination skills in the fields in response to higher market demands of indigenous cultural products.

In addition, the program has documented and published various programme reports, lessons-learned reports, training materials and manual, and research papers (See Annex IIA and IIB). In overall, the CISP was able to leave behind useful trails for future programme design and intervention in the same or different areas.

The other important outputs that will be sustained include the performing arts in Kompong Cheuteal High School, and the promotion of “Living Human Treasures” which has been imbedded in the Kingdom’s legislation through a Royal Decree. In addition, some of the producers’ groups such resin and handicrafts have been formally registered. Completing this process will allow them to become a viable business partner for both genuine partnership and formal access to funding or credit. At the same time, efforts on proposal writing, capacity building on monitoring and group managements have expanded the opportunities to local NGOs and producers groups to attract funding from other sources, i.e. UNDP small grants and others. The question is though on the scale and scope of the continuity in the absence of continued programme assistance.

Table 5.2. Beneficiary and Products

		Kampong Thom	Preah Vihear	Mondulkiri	Ratanakiri	Total
Basket Weaving	Group	9	7	2	14	32
	Female	124	63	12	0	199
	Male	17	11	22	68	118
	<b>Total</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>317</b>
Jar & Pottery	Group				4	4
	Female				42	42
	Male				22	22
	<b>Total</b>				<b>64</b>	<b>64</b>
Performing Arts	Group	2	1	1	1	5
	Female	27	6	7	16	56
	Male	20	16	10	9	55
	<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>111</b>
Resin	Group		5	2		7
	Female		40	8		48
	Male		52	32		84
	<b>Total</b>		<b>92</b>	<b>40</b>		<b>132</b>
Weaving	Group			2	14	16
	Female			52	150	202
	Male			0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>			<b>52</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>202</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>188</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>826</b>

Source: CISP Data

## VI. Good Practices and challenges

The CISP team felt the needs to document experiences and lessons learned among all key stakeholders involved in the implementation of the programme between 2008 and 2011, thus organising a one-day Consultative Meeting on 19 October 2011. The meeting (see Annex VI: list of participants) was specifically designed to draw frank feedback at the end of the programme among beneficiary groups, representatives of implementing NGOs partners based in provinces and those based in Phnom Penh, Government partners, and CISP Provincial Field Coordinators and CISP Coordinator team based in Phnom Penh.

Each group of the participants was thus requested to discuss among themselves the following four areas relevant to the CISP: (1) the results of the project splitting into outputs and impacts of the project, (2) strengths of the CISP, (3) challenges of the project, and (4) recommendation from each group on the CISP.

The summary of the meeting outcomes and those were observed in various programme documents and reports are reflected below.

## **6.1. Summary of Good Practices**

### ***a. Project implementation at grassroots (Beneficiary Group)***

The group of beneficiary from Ratanakiri, Mondulkiri, Kampong Thom and Preah Vihear were very informative about the project activities that supported them directly at the community level. Those activities, for them, are considered as the strengths of the project because it helped them gain the knowledge on how to find markets for local products and improve small business activities in their rural areas. They also added that the project trained the right knowledge to them, for instance, in adopting new techniques from producing large-sized products to small ones with higher selling prices. They were able to produce more products with less time. Finally, they claimed that the project trained them to preserve the indigenous culture.

### ***b. Partnership with local government (sub-national institutions including provinces, districts, and communes)***

Provincial NGOs reported that the strength of the project was its ability to achieve its overall goal, Culture and Development. Good cooperation with government ministries and provincial departments of the four Ministries, Ministry of Culture & Fine Arts, Ministry of Commerce, Ministry of Industry, Mines & Energy, and Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries, and good collaboration and experiences sharing among the program implementing partners were also stated as the program strengths. The participants also viewed a number of project strengths on the ground including its building of market networks between provinces; ensuring producers groups are supporting one another. Finally, the NGO group claimed that the project contributed to improvements of living standards, culture and tradition, human resources and national resources.

### ***c. Partnership with national governments and NGOs***

Participant from the National Government placed the program strengths on good cooperation at all levels of the program stakeholders. The cooperation was classified into cooperation among the four UN Agencies especially the quarterly Program Management Committee meetings, the program cooperation with Government Ministries and local authorities, and its cooperation with NGOs implementing partners. The project strength was also placed on its ability to ensure community participations, working collectively among them, sharing knowledge, conduct regular discussion and feedback sessions and jointly preserving their culture and tradition.

National NGOs representatives considered strengths of the program for the opportunities to share information and experiences among communities, from technical persons to all the program stakeholders at all levels, and also partnership building created with national organisations that have experiences working with communities. They also viewed good cooperation with NGO implementing partners, Kampong Cheuteul High School, and communities as the project strengths. Project implementation was evolved overtime based on lessons-learned and good flexibility of some of the UN agencies such as UNESCO. The participants also viewed that ownership was built within the communities and the implementing NGO partners that some continuity of the project activities will be continued, consistently with the views of the Provincial Field Coordinators team.

#### **d. *Joint UN agencies (effectiveness of MDG guidance using joint project modal)***

CISP Team-National Coordinators pointed to the effectiveness of the CISP structure as the key project strengths. This structure allows for utilisation of joint skills in implementing the CISP by the UN Agencies (FAO, UNDP, UNESCO, and ILO) and four Government Ministries (MIME, MoCFA, MoC, and MAFF). The four UN agencies were able to work with one principle, i.e. every operation and implementation involved and consulted with all concerned stakeholders, and beneficiaries. Strong commitments from the four UN agencies and with strong facilitation and attention from the UNRC have made this joint framework effective. The joint structure was also instrumental in securing supports and facilitation from the four Government Ministry partners and good cooperation from NGOs implementing partners. The project gained supports, facilitation, and cooperation from authorities at all levels.

Some other common features of the joint team that have made CISP effective include a joint office, joint meetings and joint missions, joint coordination in each of the target provinces, a common database for use, and a common office equipment/facility. The project also has a common identity: common communication and dissemination. The CISP team also added that the project has worked with the right and relevant Goal, Culture and Development.

CISP- Provincial Field Coordinators confirmed most of the project strengths that were raised by CISP national team. Those areas included good cooperation and joint working experiences among the four UN agencies, Government, local authorities, NGO implementing partners and communities. They also added that the project has made the right selection of NGO implementing partners, thus being able to continue the project activities after CISP. They also cited the ability of the project to work in culture preservation by assisting the adoption of the Royal Decree on Living Human Treasure, for instance, as project strength.

### **6.1. Challenges and Recommendation**

With the strengths and achievements, CISP have faced a number of challenges. One of the project intended interventions was to rely on Business Development Service Providers to train producers groups. In the absence of such services, the CISP has opted local NGOs to do the work. In some areas such as Kampong Thom, the NGO field staff acted as mentors. Below are the achievements, challenges and recommendations made by the participants of the final workshop:

#### **A. *Beneficiary Group***

In addition to the project strengths, the beneficiaries group reported the results of the project (see Table 6.2.1. below) by focusing on what improved in their communities. They emphasised on the improved living standards of the target villagers who have benefited from the project. Those included better knowledge, skills in producing better quality, standard products with less raw materials and higher sale prices. The improvement lead to better income that they linked to better schooling for their children and reduced domestic violence. In addition to the knowledge to preserve indigenous culture, they also claimed the knowledge gained on cash-flow management, production plan, marketing and sale setting.

However, they have also faced a number of challenges in their communities. They reported that communication between people is not so well that they are unable to produce products on time. They also faced difficulties in finding market to sell the finished products. Some citizens lacked self confidence in helping themselves. The hired trainers did not pay enough attention to queries made by some villagers. They also felt that they need follow-up trainings. With the mentioned challenges, they requested continue supports, additional training (namely on weaving), and better communication.



The challenges reported by beneficiary groups were also observed by the different stakeholders during their field monitoring and researches. Artisan Association of Cambodia (AAC) in the process of identifying the NGOs to play critical roles in the DBS to producers' group observed the low capacity of NGO staff and staff turnover among some NGOs implementing partners (CEDAC). The final evaluation report observed the same situation for some NGOs.

Table 6.2.1 Report of Beneficiary Group

Results	Challenges	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Improved Living Standards</b></li> <li>• Better income and worked as groups exchanging ideas</li> <li>• Better skills producing better products and higher sales.</li> <li>• Changed from bamboo baskets to weaving</li> <li>• Exchanged experiences across communities.</li> <li>• Improved product standards, easy to sell.</li> <li>• Selling at a higher price, saving raw materials</li> <li>• Know how to plan production, price setting, finding markets.</li> <li>• Savings in groups, knowledge on cash flow management</li> <li>• Better income, sending children to school, reduced domestic violence</li> <li>• Preserved natural resources</li> <li>• Know how to preserve indigenous cultures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some citizens still have low self-confidence (estimated at 20%)</li> <li>• Communication among producers needs further improvement in order to produce quality products with guaranteed quantity.</li> <li>• There is not always market access to the finished products</li> <li>• Participation remains low as their ability to take part is limited.</li> <li>• Some handicraft trainers on weaving need to be attentive to questions/queries raised by the trainees.</li> <li>• Training on business plan is not enough as participants are not able to do the plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request continued program supports to creative industry for indigenous people.</li> <li>• Request authorities having close communication</li> <li>• Additional training on business planning</li> <li>• Trainers to provide additional trainings on weaving.</li> </ul>

## B. Provincial NGOs

While participants from NGOs partners raised the programme strengths as discussed above, (Table 6.2.2 below) they also emphasised on the results that have been produced by the programme. Those included at least 50 producers groups that made a total of 917 beneficiaries (database captured 809 indigenous people). The people learned production techniques and marketing. As a result, they have improved the quality of their products and sales, earning higher income and reducing the needs to migrate for works outside the communities. Some of the group members became trainers transferring the products techniques to other community members.

However, the group of provincial NGOs also raised a number of challenges during the project implementation. One of them was that the project life span was too short. They recommended five years. They also raised that the project budget for facilitating NGOs to work in the communities was too small. They recommended the four UN agencies continue supporting the existing NGOs and communities. On the products, they claimed that the sales are expensive for local users and the quality and quantity were not guaranteed and recommended additional training to help producers address the aforementioned constraints.

**Table 6.2.2: Report by Provincial NGO Representatives**

<b>Results</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p><b>1. Results Achieved</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 producers groups (917 persons/496 females created).</li> <li>• Trained groups on marketing, production techniques</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community groups gained knowledge on improved products with quality and quantity and marketing</li> <li>• Group members are able to provide training to others on techniques</li> <li>• Improved incomes through sales of the products</li> <li>• Gained employment in the communities, reduced work migration</li> <li>• Participated in culture preservation among indigenous communities.</li> <li>• Gained solidarity and interest from other community members.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project life span is short for local NGOs (it should be at least five years).</li> <li>• Budget for facilitating NGOs in the communities is small.</li> <li>• The project provides new idea for some communities, which takes time to adapt.</li> <li>• Quantity and Quality of Products remain an area for great improvement.</li> <li>• Some products are expensive and are not popular among domestic users. They are more for tourists.</li> <li>• Coordination among the four UN agencies had gaps in providing (supports) to provincial implementing partners.</li> <li>• Facilitation with communities was with numerous steps and policies. Communities find difficult in implementing their activities.</li> <li>• Reporting Templates/Forms are different among the four UN agencies</li> <li>• Village natural resources are depleting, making some producers inactive.</li> <li>• Some of finished products could not be sold, no market.</li> <li>• Communities wanted quick result (at the cost of quality).</li> <li>• The project ends without leadership at the local level.</li> <li>• There has been high turn-over of staff among the National Project Coordinators of the four UN agencies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report Templates and Policies should be common among the four UN agencies.</li> <li>• The 4 UN agencies (should have) similar project to CISP and continue supporting the existing NGOs and communities.</li> <li>• Seek new funding to ensure sustainability of the project (budget is responding to the needs of the communities)</li> <li>• Provide training on producing products that are responding to the market (in terms of) needs, quality and price.</li> <li>• If there will be a next joint programme, there should be only one Programme Coordinator (not having additional Programme Coordinator per Agency).</li> </ul>

### **C. National NGOs**

While NGOs claimed a lot of success with the CISP intervention, they also raised some challenges. They pointed that the information sharing and communication among the four UN agencies were not sufficient, thus recommending mechanism for information sharing before activities take place. They also mentioned that the project budget to assist communities was not large enough. Though market potential and information gathering were claimed as success for communities, gaining market access will take time, thus requesting continued supports and expanded time-frame for project interventions.

**Table 6.2.3.: Reports by National NGOs Representative**

<b>Results</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>1. Results Achieved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced time for non-productive activities among</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was some gap in information sharing and communication among the four</li> </ul>	<p>a. Communication and information sharing system should be established in advance.</p>

Results	Challenges	Recommendation
<p>youths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regained their youthful pride</li> <li>• Parents could participate and encourage children</li> <li>• School became well known</li> <li>• Income generated from the performance</li> <li>• Products sold a higher price, higher ordered product volumes</li> <li>• Increased networks with outsiders</li> <li>• Ability to send children to school</li> <li>• Reduced debts</li> <li>• Know how to write and collect fund for community business</li> <li>• Standards distributed to resin groups</li> <li>• Public acceptance of importance of resin</li> <li>• Good relations from community to technical staff and national Government.</li> <li>• Communities gained access to information and supports in making decision</li> <li>• Increased knowledge of potential markets for resin products</li> </ul>	<p>(UN) agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3-year period was too short as the internal operating system for an inter-agencies project as CISP. This short-time span is a barrier for sustainability of the communities.</li> <li>• Selection of target communities had some limitation that some communities complained about internal problems and weak group solidarity.</li> <li>• Knowledge sharing and solidarity among some communities are limited.</li> <li>• The selection of NGO partners that provided supports to communities was also short-coming.</li> <li>• Technical and financial support provided by local NGO partners to target communities were also limited.</li> <li>• Exit plan/project completion plan.</li> <li>• Finding markets for the products needs time that we have not only reached 100% market potentials. We have only prepared communities for market development.</li> <li>• Policies especially on official recognition of artisan association, official and informal fees payments to authority.</li> <li>• Challenges in communication with and monitoring to NGO implementing partners by provincial field coordinators.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Project should be launched with public information sharing</li> <li>c. Project assistance should be continued.</li> <li>d. Clear condition (criteria) to select target communities and NGO implementing partners.</li> <li>e. Reversed fund should have been available for sustainability at the community level and for (implementing) remaining activities as part of project exit/project completion strategy.</li> <li>f. Expanding the time-frame for market development supports to respond to the project goal.</li> <li>g. CISP National Coordinator team should promote policies to support community business and those who provide support to communities.</li> <li>h. CISP Provincial Field Coordinators Team should have received enough information about the project activities and expected results especially on their monitoring roles to the NGO implementing partners and mutual information sharing responsibilities.</li> <li>i. Each UN agency should lead activities related to their expertise and skills in order to assist the NGO implementing partners and to facilitate (coordination) at national level.</li> </ul>

***D. National Government Implementing Partner (The analysis below has come from only one partner)***

The achievements included the preservation of indigenous culture, raised living standards of the target group members, and gained knowledge on the profile of indigenous cultures and museums. The government representative also pointed to the cumbersome of the UN procedures that caused delay in the project implementation. The government felt that cooperation and information sharing were not good enough especially at sub-national levels. It also added that selection of NGOs could have done better by identifying the right NGOs with the right skills in assisting the indigenous communities. The government

also recommended that some Government agencies should be able to implement the some project components directly.

Table 6.2.4: Report by Representative of National Government Implementing Partners

Results/Achievements	Challenges	Recommendation
<p><b>1. Preserved indigenous culture</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through the products</li> <li>• Dance: Living Human Treasures and Folk Dances</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Living standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased income through products sales.</li> <li>• Business knowledge and group management</li> <li>• Gained knowledge on marketing</li> <li>• Strengthened access to domestic and export markets</li> <li>• Increased skills such as weaving and dance</li> <li>• Provided women with increased opportunities to earn income.</li> <li>• Expanded the growing of natural resources/raw materials.</li> <li>• Common office space to work together</li> <li>• Museum to present indigenous culture.</li> <li>• Promoted tourism</li> <li>• Increased productivities</li> <li>• Improved good relations between communities</li> <li>• Disseminated indigenous cultures and tradition.</li> </ul>	<p><b>1. Technical, Financial and Administrative Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slow release of project budget for implementation</li> <li>• Cooperation with Ministry level: Ministry is not implementing the project fully.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Cooperation among the 4 UN agencies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not much joint discussions to propose project(s).</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Cooperation with Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No close implementation with provincial departments.</li> <li>• Some ministries did not involve with the project implementation</li> <li>• Provincial authority was not aware of the existence of the project.(Reasons: they were not involved at the design of the project)</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Cooperation with 4 NGOs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some skills were not assisted with guidance (For instance, making kiln, there was no NGO with the right skills to do it.)</li> <li>• Exploiting communities- buying from them at lower price, and selling at a high price.</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Participation of beneficiary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Envy between community in the group and those who are not.</li> <li>• Some community members did not have commitments.</li> <li>• Exploiting efforts of other community members.</li> </ul>	<p><b>1. Technical, Financial and Administrative Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should release the project budget on time for implementation by focusing on results rather than paperwork.</li> <li>• Should fund related ministries to implement the project fully</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Cooperation among the 4 UN agencies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should discuss among themselves to make proposal</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Cooperation with Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the project design stage, all stakeholders should be included.</li> <li>• Some concerned ministries should implement the project directly.</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Cooperation with 4 NGOs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should identify the right NGOs with the right expertise and skills.</li> <li>• Eliminate exploitation on the target groups.</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Participation of beneficiary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select skillful group leadership by providing training on group management.</li> <li>• Encourage by addressing various challenging issues.</li> </ul>

### E. CISP Team- National

The CISP national team raised a number of programme achievements related to culture preservation and values, increased living standards and livelihood, promoted gender, preserved and used natural resources, and partnership building between UN, Government and NGOs. At the same time, they

also raised the program short-comings including the four different UN systems, short-project time frame given the delayed process during Inception Stage, more time spent on facilitation, and some important start-up such as baseline study and target areas identification were taking a lot of time.

They also made several recommendations: a joint program dealing with UN reforms should not be less than five years; joint UN should be followed by joint staff recruitment and management under a common joint Programme Manager. They recommended that all stakeholders should be consulted during the program designs stage. They also emphasised on the needs for the UN agencies to ensure continuity of what have already been achieved under the CISP.

Table 6.2.5. Report by CISP National Team

Results/Achievements	Challenges	Recommendation
<p><b>1. Culture</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Realised and acknowledged indigenous identity</li> <li>• IP has higher pride than before.</li> <li>• Public understands the IP culture value than before through reports, dissemination, publication and visits, and trade fairs.</li> <li>• Culture linked with natural resources and markets</li> <li>• Preserve cultures through transferring knowledge from one generation to the next.</li> <li>• The Government's recognition through the adoption of the Royal Degree on Living Human Treasures (LHT).</li> <li>• Strengthened solidarity between indigenous communities.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Living Standards/Livelihoods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided option to increased income</li> <li>• Strengthened ownership</li> <li>• Strengthened power and living conditions</li> <li>• Increased income leading to secured food, schooling and health etc)</li> <li>• Strengthened food security, increased nutrition</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Gender</b></p>	<p><b>What challenges have encountered during the project implementation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has used different administrative, financial systems of the 4 UN agencies.</li> <li>• Project Duration is not appropriate, short.</li> <li>• Time spent on facilitation causes delay especially at the project start up (phase).</li> <li>• Time given for assessment and evaluation of target villages was short and was not done at the beginning of the project. (Not effective)</li> <li>• A lot of time was used for office preparation and recruitment of project officials following each of the UN agencies.</li> <li>• Transferring of budget from UN (HQ) to each UN agency at Country level was slow.</li> <li>• Each UN agency transferred budget to NGO partners slowly due to complex administrative and financial system(s).</li> <li>• Capacity of NGO partners is limited, affecting the quality of work, slow and challenging in report writing (in English)</li> <li>• Information sharing between communities to national level was slow.</li> <li>• Selected NGO partners received</li> </ul>	<p><b>For future project implementation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure joint office and joint working framework</li> <li>• Joint staff recruitment to ensure smooth project implementation</li> <li>• Ensure joint report templates for the project</li> <li>• Project involved with the UN reform (one UN) and development should not be less than five years.</li> <li>• Project design has to consult with various institutions and target groups so broadly that special features/identify (such as cultures, tradition and languages, etc), challenges and needs of the communities are understood.</li> <li>• Project design (activities, duration, budget) must respond to challenges and needs (of the identified beneficiaries)</li> <li>• Provide skills training to project staff, sub-national staff, NGO implementing partners, and government officials.</li> <li>• Continued activities that have started by the UN agencies or under Ministry Framework, for instance, living treasures</li> </ul>

Results/Achievements	Challenges	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women gained opportunities to generate family income.</li> <li>• Women have social recognition.</li> <li>• Gained self confidence</li> <li>• Association had artisan skills and business</li> <li>• Men recognized women's roles.</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Natural Resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustained use of natural resources (raw materials)</li> <li>• Participated in sustaining raw materials</li> <li>• Strengthened growing mentality</li> <li>• Help the communities and public understand the value of natural resources</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Government &amp; NGO partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learned the Conventions (from 2003-2005)</li> <li>• Learned the Royal Degree of LHTs</li> <li>• Officials/Staff learned the proposal writing</li> <li>• Officials/Staff understand the business-related laws</li> <li>• Increased networks from communities, local level to provincial and to national level.</li> </ul>	<p>funding to implement activities from numerous donors, making facilitation difficult.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changing of project staffs among UN agencies and NGO partners affecting the project operations.</li> <li>• Arranging meetings and workshops with communities were too frequent, disturbing the time for business activities (lacking coordination during activity plan preparation)</li> <li>• Target villages and infrastructure (road) are in remote area, (staff and trainers) spend a lot of time in travelling.</li> <li>• Some of the Government Ministry partners have not understood their roles in the CISP project.</li> <li>• Timing and budget are not relevant to the project ambitions.</li> <li>• General environment is not conducive to the project and communities (for example, forest land has become in the zone of an Economic Land Concession).</li> <li>• The introduction of semi-autonomous/modern tool such as kiln and weaving loom were either irrelevant or unable to reach/improve the efficiency or traditional tools.</li> </ul>	<p>program and the program on democratic development at sub-national level, in order to ensure success and sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN leadership should explain their respective Operations and Finance staff about the essence of the (CISP) project.</li> <li>• Ministries should appoint Focal Points working in the relevant technical departments so as to be able to join the programme implementation.</li> <li>• DSA rate provided to Government officials should be at the same rates as UN staff.</li> <li>• NGO implementing partners should have the will to implement the contract agreed with the project.</li> <li>• To ensure sustainability of the production, replanting and protecting natural resources as raw materials must be ensured.</li> <li>• Should have continued dissemination of project identity and project activities.</li> </ul>

**F. CISP Team – Provincial Level**

CISP Provincial Field Coordinator team mentioned the opportunities that CISP has made for UN agencies, Government and NGOs to work together. They also claimed good participation from local authorities that lead to some communes incorporated the culture preservation activities in their Commune Investment Programs. They added that people were able to produce more, sell at higher prices, find markets, do planning, and build confidence. At the same time, they also raised a number of challenges including the 4 UN agencies with different policies and procedures, not adequate information sharing, minimal meetings between national and provincial CISP teams, and the project short time frame. They recommended that UN should have a common policy and procedures including budget; regular program

meetings and a joint action plan among all joint UN agencies; and the CISP should have at least 5 years life.

Table 6.2.6: Report by CISP Team

Results/Achievements	Challenges	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The four Departments and Government Ministries and four UN Agencies and NGOs had to opportunities to work together.</li> <li>• Local authorities participated well with the CISP, resulting in incorporation of the culture preservation activities into some Commune Investment Plans.</li> <li>• Created producers groups and dance groups making jobs and income.</li> <li>• Group members were trained and participated in exchange visits in the provinces, across provinces and outside the country.</li> <li>• Created market networks</li> <li>• Producers groups know how to set sale price, production plan and sale.</li> <li>• They are able to preserve, use and replant natural resources.</li> <li>• Producer groups are courageous in expressing their comments, help one another and solidarity.</li> <li>• Products Fairs: provided opportunities to show community products, traditional ways of making products; and encouraged producers to improve and increase their products.</li> <li>• Groups have by-laws and internal rules that are recognised by village/communes, savings and revolving fund.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four UN agencies with 4 different policies including division of labors, budget and administration, which results in:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Partner NGOs write reports several times fulfilling each UN agency</li> <li>○ Slow decision making causes delays in implementing action plans</li> <li>○ Top-down decision making results in in-corresponding activities to the action plans and duplicating them.</li> <li>○ Duplicating activities result in wasting community's time including that of producers.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For some activities, national project coordinators or NGO partners did not coordinate with provincial field coordinators.</li> <li>• National CISP office did not disseminate most of the Study Reports/Research Finding to provincial level.</li> <li>• Meeting between national and provincial levels were minimal (due to budget constraints). The planned regular meetings every two months or at least PFCs participating in the PMC meetings could not be implemented. DSA for PFCs to attend meetings in Phnom Penh were not planned in the programme design.</li> <li>• The project is too short that producer groups are not strong by the time the project ends.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint UN work should have a joint policy and a common budget for the project implementation.</li> <li>• Regular Meetings should be arranged between national and provincial project implementers</li> <li>• A joint action plan among UN agencies should be in place to avoid duplicate activities and release communities from frequently getting busy with visitors.</li> <li>• CISP should have at least 5-year period and budget for business capital to all groups that are formed.</li> </ul>



## VII. Conclusion and Recommendation

Most participants raised strategic areas of project strengths and results. Those include the appreciation of joint efforts in working towards the achievements of the project results including preserving the living treasures, and the opportunities to share lessons and experiences among implementing partners and across indigenous communities. They claimed the achievement of the relevant program Goal of Culture and Development.

Specifically, the strength of the project was information and experiences sharing among UN agencies, between UN and Government partners, and between key players in the provinces. NGO participants specifically emphasised the ownership on the project activities within the communities and market networks established between provinces. The strength of the project is also laid on the flexibilities in responding to emerging needs.

All participants, however, concluded that the CISP life-span was too short and recommend it be at least a five-year program life given the complexity of joint programmes. They related this concern to the aim of maintaining sustainability of the programme results. This aforementioned observation and note have been consistently raised by the evaluation report, monitoring report and most concerned programme stakeholders. The most raised challenge related to the project life is about the community sustainability, market access, the needs for additional training, follow-up and monitoring. They claim that more time is required for market development and market penetration has just started.

Another issue, raised by project implementing partners at all levels, was communication/information sharing which has produced some un-intended frustration and misunderstanding among stakeholders including duplicated work on the ground due to limited coordination. Government focal point, NGOs and CISP team suggest improvements in this aspect.

Participants also raised issues related to the UN rules and procedures that are different among the four UN agencies, often unnecessary prolonged and duplicated efforts, and made recommendation for a harmonised and common system to facilitate such a complex joint program like CISP in the future. They also recommended interventions from the respective Country Representative of each of the UN agencies in ensuring their administrative and financial persons facilitate the efforts behind this joint programme. This matter was also raised by the final project evaluation.

**Sandra Yu**, ILO Local Strategy Specialist of Decent Work Programme concluded the meeting that while participants raised very important issues of the project life span, UN is having normally 3 or 4 years project. If we are lucky, we are having continued supports. We should, however, present ourselves that we are not there supporting communities forever. When we promote livelihood activities, but we might not know whether they will be able to continue living there. What remained will be the Government, NGOs and communities. For us, when we promote land, we also promote their rights to use the land. It's the direction of us (UN and NGOs) in the future. It is important that we promote living treasures, but it is also important that the children and the next generation are also promoting their own cultures. If we promote products, it is important that producers produce what they can sell. Association and NGOs have the responsibilities to assist them to produce what they can sell.

## VIII. ANNEXES

### Annex I. List of Contacts of NGO Implementing Partners

Location	Implementing Partners
National (Phnom Penh)	Artisan Association of Cambodia (AAC) No. 11b, Street 240, Phnom Penh Mr. Men Sinoeun, AAC Executive Director, aacinfo@online.com.kh/aac@online.com.kh
	Cambodia Crafts Cooperation (CCC) Office: #21C, Street 371, Sangkat Teok Thla, Khan Sen Sok, Tel./Fax 023 986239 or 011 984879 Mr. SEUNG Kimyonn, Executive Director, ccc_kimyonn@online.com.kh <a href="http://www.cambodian-craft.com/">http://www.cambodian-craft.com/</a>
	Cambodia Living Arts (CLA) No. 128-G9, Sothearos Boulevard, Tonle Bassac, Khan Chamcarmon, Attn: Mr. Song Seng, Tel: 012 583 891, Email: seng@cambodianlivingarts.org
	Enterprise Development Institute (EDI) Attn: Mr. Vann Piseth, Training Team Leader No. 13c, Street 185, Sangkat Tomnup Toeuk, Chamcarmon Tel: 012 828 698, Email: pedicambodia@gmail.com; website: <a href="http://www.enterprisedi.org">www.enterprisedi.org</a>
	Non-Timber Forest Products-Exchange Program (NTFP-EP) No. 10E0, Street 420, Khan Chamcarmon, Phnom Penh Attn: Tel: 023 727 407, 012 938 417
Kampong Thom	Minority Organization for Development (MODE) No. 14, Street 1, Kampong Thom, Steung Sen District, Attn: Peanh Sinal, Tel: 012 94 79 24, Email: sinalpeanh@yahoo.com
	Cambodian Organization for Women Supports (COWS) Ms. Chum Chanputheavy, Executive Director, Tel: 012 784 122
Preah Vihear	Ponlok Khmer (PKH) Thmey Village, Kampong Pranak commune, Preah Vihear town, Preah Vihear province. Attn: Mr. Ang Cheat Lom, Executive Director Tel: 064 96 51 51, Mobile : 012 51 79 43 Email: cheatloma@ponlokkhmer.org / cheatlom@yahoo.com
	Farmer Livelihood and Development (FLD) Mr. Yem Phalla, Project Manager No.1, Street 323, Sangkat Boeung Kak II, Tuol Kork, Phnom Penh
Mondulhiri	Nomad Recherche et Soutien International (Nomad RSI) Attn: Ms. Brigitte Nikles, MRDC Manager

Location	Implementing Partners
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- My Village International (MVI) Mr. SimYoura, Executive Director</li> <li>- Village Focus Cambodia (VFC)</li> </ul>
Ratanakiri	<p>Cambodia-NTFP Development Organization (CaNDO)  Contact: Mr. Heang Sarim , Tel: (+855) 92 286 383 Email:  sarimheang@yahoo.com or candodevelopment@gmail.com</p> <p>Center d'Etude et de Développement Agricole Cambodgien (CEDAC)</p>

## Annex II.A: Research and study reports conducted by CISP<sup>5</sup>

No	Date	Type	Title	Consultant	Done by
1	Dec-09	Survey	Creative Industry Value Chain Analysis	Emerging Market Consulting	UNDP
2	Mar-10	Research	M & E framework	Annie Hurlstone	UNDP
3	Apr-10	Strategy	CISP Communications and Advocacy Strategy	Mai Ling Turner	UNDP
4	May-10	Research	Tourism and Handicraft Initial Scoping Study	ShareeBauld	UNDP
5	Aug-10	Research	Analysis on Trade Related Legislation/Procedures	Bun Youdy	UNDP
6		Research	Handicraft Market Demand Assessment	Business Development Link	UNDP
7	Oct 2011	Research	Sales and Market Access Creative Industries Support Programme	Kuysorn SENG	UNDP
8	Aug-10	Evaluation	CISP mid-term evaluation	BoboBoase	MDG-F secretariat
9	Feb-09	Survey	Baseline surveys on four target provinces	CORD	ILO and FAO
10	Jul-05	Research	Operationalizing gender aspects in the CISP	Manuela Bucciarelli	ILO
11	Jul-10	Evaluation	CISP partner SWOT analyses	AAC	<a href="#">ILO</a>
12	Jul-10	Research	Community Resource Assessment for Livelihood Action Planning	A.L.Cruz	UNESCO
13		Research Publication	Sambor Prei Kuk et le bassin du Tonle Sap (in French and Khmer Edition)	Bruno Bruguier and Juliette Lacroix	UNESCO
14		Research Publication	Preliminary Research on Cambodian Minority Language (in French and Khmer Edition)	Jan Michael Fillipi	UNESCO
15	Oct-11	Research Publication	Aspects de la culture traditionnelle des Bunoong du Mondulkiiri (Aspects of Bunoong's Traditional Culture in Mondulkiri French and Khmer Edition)	Sylvain Vogel	UNESCO
16		Research Publication	Kuay: a vocabulary with historical comments (English)	Gérard Diffloth	UNESCO
17		Research Publication	Voix du Mondulkiri (French and Phonetics)	Sylvain Vogel	UNESCO
18	Aug-2011	Research Publication	Market Scan for Dipterocarpus Oleoresin	Nola Andaya-Milani	NTPF-EP/UNDP

<sup>5</sup> For further information and availability of the research paper, project reports and documents, please contact: Mr. **Kilian, Blaise**, Email: [b.kilian@unesco.org](mailto:b.kilian@unesco.org)

No	Date	Type	Title	Consultant	Done by
19	Aug-2011	Research Publication	Characterization and End Uses of Dipterocarpus Liquid Resins ( <i>D. alatus</i> and <i>D. intricatus</i> ) from Cambodia	Study Leader: Mariluz SP. Dionglay  Co-researchers: Rebecca B. Lapuz Rowena E. Ramos Audel V. Mostiero	
20	Sept 2011	Research	Rapid Assessment of Domestic Industry and Market for Resin-based Products in Cambodia	Prom Tola	NTFP-EP/UNDP

## Annex II.B: Books, Publication, Training Manual and CDs

No.	Date	Title	Published by	Potential for circulation	Circulated to
1.	July-10	Market Demand and sales potential of souvenirs and utility handicraft in the Siem Reap Market	UNDP	Yes	
2.	Aug-10	Market Strategy for NGO Partners	UNDP	Yes	
3.	Oct-10	Market Assessment Study on Products made by Indigenous People of Cambodia	UNDP	Yes	
4.	Oct-10	Legal Training Needs Assessment	UNDP	Yes	
5.	Sept-11	Broucher of Indigenous Crafts of Cambodia	UNDP	Yes	
6.	Aug-09	Contents of the National Consultation on the Elaboration of the Royal Degree establishing a Living Human Treasures System in Cambodia	UNESCO	Yes	
7.		Initial research on Ethnic minority languages in Cambodia	UNESCO	Yes	
8.		2003 Convention on the Protection of the intangible and cultural heritage and its basic texts in Khmer	UNESCO	Yes	
9.		Guidelines for the Establishment of a Living Human Treasures system-in Khmer. Reprinted to answer more demand from MOFCA.	UNESCO	Yes	
10.		Information kit on the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions-in Khmer	UNESCO	Yes	
11.		CDs: "Songs from the Lake" produced by CISP-Cambodia Living Arts	UNESCO	Yes	
12.		CDs: "Songs from Mondulkiri" produced by CISP and Patrick Kesalé	UNESCO	Yes	
13.	Aug-10	Improving your exhibiting skills: A training guide	ILO	Yes	
14.	10-Jun	Financial Literacy	ILO	Yes	
15.	June	Starting a Handicraft Business	ILO	Yes	
16.		Indigenous People Handicraft Catalogue by ILO	ILO	Yes	

## Annex II.C: Reports of Program Management Committee Meeting

No.	Date	Title	Published by	Potential for circulation	Circulated to
1	Aug-09	Report	Report on the 1st Program Management Committee Meeting		UNESCO
2	Nov-09	Report	Report on the 2nd Program Management Committee Meeting		UNESCO
3	Mar-10	Report	Report on the 3rd Program Management Committee Meeting		UNESCO
4	Jun-10	Report	Report on the 4th Program Management Committee Meeting		UNESCO
5	Sept-10	Report	Report on the 5th Program Management Committee Meeting		UNESCO
6	Jan-11	Report	Report on the 6th Program Management Committee Meeting		UNESCO
7	Apr-11	Report	Report on the 7 <sup>th</sup> Program Management Committee Meeting		UNESCO
8	Aug-11	Report	Report on the 8 <sup>th</sup> Program Management Committee Meeting		UNESCO



**Annex III: CISP Target Areas**

N	Province	District	Commune	Village
1	Kampong Thom	1.Sambor	1.Sambor	Sambo
2				Kampong Cheuteal
3				Ngorn
4		2.Sandann	2.Ngorn	Rovieng
5				Veal PringLeu
6				Srae
7		3.Prasat Balang	3.Salavisai	Korky
8				OaKroach
9				MarakKor
10	PuTru			
11	Mondulkiri	4.O'Rang	4.Senmonorom	PuHsiam
12				AndongKraleung
13		5.Senmonorom	6.Sokdom	PuTreng
14				Pu Les
15	6.Pichrada	7.Busra	Lao Ka	
16			Pu Tang	
17	PreahVihear	7.Rovieng	8.Romany	Romcheck
18				SreThnung
19				Or- Pur
20		8.Tbeng 9.Meanchey	11.Prame	9.Raksa
21				Donma
22				10.Por
23				Por
24		12.Preah Khlaing	12.Preah Khlaing	SrePreang
25				Bosh Thom
26		10.Cham Khsan	13.Pring Thom	Prame
27				Krangdon
28	11.Cheb	14.Sangke Pir	10.Cham Khsan	
29			13.Pring Thom	
30			Krolapease	
31	Ratanakiri	12.O'Chum	17.Poy	11.Cheb
32				14.Sangke Pir
33				Kroload
34		15.Malu Prey Pir	15.Malu Prey Pir	Bosh
35				PreahKa – Ork
36		16.O'Chum	16.O'Chum	PreahKa – Ork
37				LaeunKren
38		13.Veunsai	18.Kok Lac	LaeunKren
39				Kres
40				Ta-Ngach
41		14.Konmom	19.Toeun	Kancheung
42				Koy
43				Mass
44		15.Veunsai	20.Pakalanh	Roc
45				Trark
	La-Lai			
	15.Veunsai	20.Pakalanh	KorngNork	
			La-Meuy	
	15.Veunsai	20.Pakalanh	LaenSre	
			LaenCamkar	
	15.Veunsai	20.Pakalanh	Pakalann	
			Kampong Cham	

## Annex IV: List of Partner's Reports Consulted

In additions to individual consultants' reports (Annex IIA above), the following internal project partners' reports were consulted.

Affiliates	Partners' Reports
Partners' Reports to FAO	CEDAC- Terminal Report October 2011
	COWS- Terminal Report October 2011
	MVI- Terminal Report October 2011
	MODE- Terminal Report October 2011
	PKH- Final Report
<b>Partners' Reports to ILO</b>  Mission Reports  Training Reports	AAC- January- April 2010 to ILO
	AAC- July 3-7, 2010
	AAC- Institutional Analyses in Rattanakiri Province, 13-17 March 2010
	CANDO- Progress Report for April to June 2011
<b>Partners' Reports to UNDP</b>	AAC- Promote and Creation of Market Linkages of Culture Products, Kampong Thom Province, As of July 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2011
	RSA- Technical Needs Assessment and training workshops, February 2011
	RSA-Coaching Sessions Report May 2011
	RSA- Coaching Sessions (Proposal Writing) Report May 2011
	RSA- Final Report June 2011
	CANDO- Final Report
	EDI- Final Report October 2011
<b>Partners' Reports to UNESCO</b>	<a href="#">Nomad RSI, Completion Report October 2011</a>

## Annex V: PMC Composition/Members

### **Programme Management Committee (PMC):**

**Chairperson:** Mr. Douglas Broderick, United Nations Resident Coordinator in Cambodia

**Moderator:** Mr. Philippe Delanghe, Head of Culture Unit, UNESCO Phnom Penh Office

**Secretariat:** UNESCO Phnom Penh Office

**Members:** Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts (MoCFA); Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy

(MIME); Ministry of Commerce (MoC); Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF); UNESCO, ILO, UNDP, FAO

**Special guests:** Ministry of Rural Development

Ministry of Tourism

Ministry of Women's Affairs

### **Technical guests:**

H.E. Mr. Ok Sophon, General Director of Cultural Techniques, Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts

Mr. Chan Bunnarith, Assistant to the Director of Studies and Internships, Royal School of Administration (ERA)

Mr. Nav Chantha, Marketing Officer, CANDO

Mr. Sun Youra, Executive Director, My Village Organization (MVI)

Mr. Vao Sovang, Director of the Research and Development Department, OVOP National Committee

**Annex VI: List of Workshop Participants- 19 October 2011**