EBA

SUBSTUDY 2

02

2020

EVALUATION OF THE SWEDISH CLIMATE CHANGE INITIATIVE, 2009–2012: CAMBODIA CASE STUDY REPORT

Mutizwa Mukute and Bunyeth Ho

Evaluation of the Swedish Climate Change Initiative 2009 – 2012: Cambodia Case Study

Mutizwa Mukute and Bunyeth Ho

Delstudie 2, 2020:02
till
Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys (EBA)

Mutizwa Mukute is a senior evaluation consultant, Emerald Network Ltd, based in Harare, Zimbabwe.
Bunyeth Ho, Evaluator, Emerald Network Ltd.

Please refer to the present report as: EBA Mutizwa Mukute and Bunyeth Ho, Evaluation of Swedish Climate Change 2009 – 2012: Cambodia Case Study, EBA Delstudie 2, 2020:02, Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys.

This report can be downloaded free of charge at www.eba.se

ISBN 978-91-88143-57-0
Printed by Elanders Sverige AB
Stockholm 2020

Cover design by Julia Demchenko

Table of Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AF	Adaptation Fund
AKAS	Action for Khmer Aid Services
ANKO	Akphiwat Neary Khmer Organization
CBO	Community-Based Organisations
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCCA TF	Cambodia Climate Change Alliance Trust Fund
CCCA	Cambodia Climate Change Alliance
CCCD	Commission on Climate Change and Development
CCCSP	Cambodia Climate Change Strategic Plan
CCD	Climate Change Department
CCFF	National Climate Change Financing Framework
CCI	Climate Change Initiative
CCO	Climate Change Office
CCTT	Climate Change Technical Team (CCTT)
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CRF	Community Fish Refuge
CIF	Climate Investment Funds (CIF)
CIF	Climate Investment Funds
CSF	Community/Sangkat Fund
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EBA	Swedish Expert Group for Aid Studies
ERG	Evaluation Reference Group
EU	European Union
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Forest and Fisheries
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoE	Ministry of Environment
NCCC	National Climate Change Committee
NCDD-S	National Committee for Democratic Development Secr.
NCSD	National Council for Sustainable Development
NDA	Nationally Designated Authority
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NESAP	National Environmental Strategy and Action Plan

NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPRS	National Poverty Reduction Strategy
NSDP	National Strategic Development Plans
NSFSN	National Strategy for Food Security and Nutrition
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Dev't
PBCRG	Performance-based Climate Resilience Grants
PPCR	Pilot Programme on Climate Resilience (PPCR)
RGC	Royal Government of Cambodia
SEIE	Sustained, Emerging Impact Evaluation
SGP	Small Grants Projects
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SNP-DRR	Strategic National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNTA	United National Transitional Authority
US	United States
VRA	Vulnerability and Risk Assessment
WFP	World Food Programme

Foreword by the EBA

In 2009, the Swedish government decided to start using ODA to deal with climate change and its negative effects. With a primary focus on the poorest countries, and mainly on their adaptation to climate change, Sweden set aside 4 bn SEK to be used over a four-year period. Furthermore, this constituted a major part of Sweden's 7 bn SEK contribution to the internationally agreed 'fast-start' of climate finance.

Ten years later, this surge of climate finance, including the bilateral, regional and multilateral activities to which it was put to use, has been evaluated. This report contains a case study in which the bilateral cooperation part of the climate change initiative (CCI) has been evaluated. Together with ten other case study reports this study is published on-line and may be found at https://eba.se/en/ebarapport/. The synthesis report of the evaluation, together with a separate summary of the evaluation are available in print and on-line.

It is our hope that this evaluation may provide guidance for the future use of ODA in the efforts to curbe climate change. The intended users of the evaluation are primarily staff at the MFA and Sida who engage in this challenge on a daily basis.

The evaluation has been accompanied by a reference group. This group has taken active part in a particular learning process the evaluation has facilitated. The reference group has been chaired by Johan Schaar, vice chair of the EBA. The responsibility of the analysis and the recommendations rests entirely with the evaluators.

Helena Lindholm, EBA Chair

Summary

This report is part of the larger Evaluation of the Swedish Climate Change Initiative 2009 – 2012. Main findings, insights and recommendations of the evaluation, as well as a full list of the evaluation case studies, are found in the main report 'Evaluation of the Swedish Climate Change Initiative 2009 – 2012', EBA 2019:10. The Cambodia case study, described in this sub-report is one of eleven case study reports. Together with the Mali bilateral case study and the bilateral portfolio analysis, it treats the bilateral part of the initiative. Other case studies of the evaluation deal with regional and multilateral interventions.

The Cambodia case study drew on outcomes harvesting for impact identification with intended beneficiaries, who also revealed the important processes by which the outcomes were generated. The main added value of drawing on outcome harvesting resided in giving stronger voice to beneficiaries, thus complementing the utilisation-focused approach applied throughout the evaluation.

Data was gathered through interviews, document study and two group interviews with community groups and commune representatives in Sangke district, Battambang Province and Krakor district, Pursat Province. The total number of evaluation participants was 27.

Despite 28 years of peace, the economic, social, and ecological challenges that were created by the Cambodian genocide and subsequent civil war continue to be felt today and have a bearing on the vulnerability of the population to climate impacts. These challenges include:

- Higher portion of widowed women and 1,2 million Cambodians in the diaspora by 2014.
- Governance challenges associated with public service delivery standards and corruption
- Destruction of infrastructure including irrigation systems
- Closing of schools and killing or fleeing of educated people
- Rapidly diminishing forest cover

Cambodia's National Environmental Strategy and Action Plan (NESAP, 2016-2023) identifies the following as the major environmental issues: (i) biodiversity and ecosystem services loss and threats arising from agricultural expansion and intensification, deforestation, pollution and climate change and inadequate water management, (ii) excessive pressure on protected terrestrial areas and coastal areas, (iii) loss of fisheries resulting from overfishing and ecosystem damage, (iv) soil, water and air pollution from deforestation and fuel wood use and rapid economic development of the manufacturing sector, (v) more frequent and severe droughts and inadequate water management, and (vi) increasing GHG emissions from transport and exposure of transport infrastructure to climate change.

Cambodia's history and social ecological context makes it one of the ten most climate vulnerable countries in the world. It is exposed to extreme temperatures, heat waves, floods, droughts, tropical storms, sea level rise and epidemics. The country experienced over 7,800 disaster events between 1996-2013, with 2011 as one of the worst years. The incidence of droughts and floods has been increasing over time. The impact is worsened by the country's low adaptive capacity and its high dependence on natural resources for livelihoods and economic development. Small scale farmers are the most vulnerable as the majority (58 percent) are dependent on one crop (rice), lack agricultural training and infrastructure, use poor quality seed, and have poor access to agricultural markets.

Three main valued outcomes from total climate investment (all sources) in Cambodia were identified at the national and sub-national levels. Cambodia's climate funds are mainly external, from bilateral and multilateral channels. 70 percent of the funds went to adaptation, 22 percent to mitigation, and the remainder to the two combined or to policy, research and capacity building. General results, to which also the CCI contributed, include:

Enhanced national capacity to understand and respond to climate change impact, mainly in the prioritized sectors: agriculture, forestry, water resources, fisheries, coastal area planning and DRR.

Coordinated nationally owned agenda, with a joint planning under the leadership of the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Economy and Finance.

Cambodia's *increased readiness for larger climate finances*, mainly through experiences in managing the CCCA Trust Fund (CCCA TF).

At community level, three main kinds of long-term outcomes were arising from climate change financing and programming:

- *Improved livelihoods and reduction of community vulnerability* to climate change. Primary data showed that CCI interventions specifically contributed to increased local food and nutrition security as well as incomes. However, evidence also suggests the climate change coping capacities of fishing and farming communities in Cambodia are uneven, with poorer households and women being more compromised.
- *Conserved and restored ecosystems and biodiversity* in project areas. The CCI specifically contributed to the conservation and restoration of forests and wetlands, which produce important ecological services. However, the achievement of system-wide impact on ecological or ecosystem services is simultaneously undermined by factors such as lack of financial and human resource capacities, rapid expansion of agricultural land, logging and fuel wood extraction in protected forests.
- *Enhanced community solidarity and agency*. In community forestry social networks and cooperative norms were found. However, there are also strong forces that work against this. Cambodia has a patronage system and high-power distance, which protects and privileges the more powerful while pressing the less powerful to accept the unequal distribution of power.

While the outcome harvesting methodology allowed the evaluation to establish general results, some were more specifically attributed to Sweden and its CCI investments in Cambodia. The

approaches used within the CCI to contribute to the achievement of positive outcomes outlined above include:

- Awareness raising, training and technical support;
- The use of quality baseline analysis tools;
- Choosing the right ministries as champions;
- Promotion of collaborative structures and political buy-in through joint planning mechanisms and processes;
- The establishment of Community Conservation Areas (CCAs) as main mechanism to conserve and restore critical ecosystems;
- Water harvesting and irrigation development.

An overall CCI achievement in Cambodia was its contribution to a nationally owned climate change agenda. This was made possible by Sweden being consistent in its approach, while also, among other things, being the leading EU donor on decentralization, on addressing governance issues and by investing in catalytic interventions.

Furthermore, the evaluation also generated insights on how systemic change may be promoted. These include:

- A donor's credibility, supported by the quality and relevance of its input, is key to enhance impact;
- The focus needs to be on championing rather than on champions, in order to make the whole system, rather than separate actors, responsible for the climate change agenda;
- Institutional capacity development is a key contribution to systemic changes;
- Collaboratively developed research products are important to guide decisions and action
- Investments (physical, human, social/political) at community level are essential.

1. Introduction

This report discusses findings from a systems-based evaluation of the Swedish Climate Change Initiative (CCI, 2009-2012) in Cambodia as part of Sweden's fast-start climate finance initiative. CCI was a 4-year, SEK 4 billion investment whose purpose was to *"effectively contribute to long term adaptation efforts, especially in the poorest countries, and to developing countries' efforts to reduce greenhouse gas levels."* [1] Seventy-two percent of CCI funds were distributed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) to multilateral portfolios, while Sida disbursed the remainder to bilateral (15 percent) and regional (13 percent) portfolios. The investment in Cambodia was one of five bilateral climate investments which were made in Bangladesh and Cambodia in Asia, Burkina Faso and Mali in Africa and Bolivia in Latin America. Cambodia received 60 MSEK under the CCI.

The impact evaluation was commissioned by the Swedish Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA) in mid-2018, about six years after the end of CCI to: (a) establish an in-depth understanding of the long-term sustainability and contribution of CCI, and (b) generate lessons or insights from CCI and post-CCI experiences to inform Swedish climate aid ahead. This report addresses these evaluation objectives by:

- Analysing the history and context of Cambodia for climate change and related matters of concern.
- Identifying system-wide climate change related long-term outcomes and associated explanations.
- Surfacing CCI's main contributions to these long-term outcomes, and associated explanations.
- Drawing potential insights for Sweden's future climate financing and programming.

[1] Nilsson, L. (2013). p. 1.

1.1 CCI guiding principles

CCI investments were guided by a set of seven principles, which we organised for evaluation purposes into four themes consistent with a theory of change (Table 1):

Table 1: Inferred theory of change implied by CCI principles

Dimension of theory of change	CCI Principles (P)
Selection of regions, countries and channels of allocating funds	P1: The funds reserved for adaptation interventions should go primarily to the poorest countries.
	P5: The allocation should reflect the ongoing work of the Commission on Climate Change and Development (CCCD), which recommended the use of climate finance for context-specific issues; integration of environment, development, climate change adaptation (CCA), mitigation, disaster risk reduction, poverty alleviation and governance.
	P4: Consideration should be taken to the ongoing international climate negotiations regarding timing and choice of channels.
Areas of intervention and activities	P6. Sustainable adaptation to climate change requires that the climate perspective is integrated into the countries' own development strategies. Central areas are water-and land-use in urban as well as rural areas.
	P7: A proportion of the Swedish contributions should focus on disaster risk reduction as an integral part of climate adaptation.
	P5: The allocation should reflect the ongoing work of the Commission on Climate Change and Development (CCCD), which recommended the use of climate finance for context-specific issues, integration of environment, development, climate change adaptation (CCA), mitigation, disaster risk reduction, poverty alleviation and governance.

Engagement and power relations between partners and donors	P3. Contributions should work towards the implementation of the Paris agenda principles on aid effectiveness, which encourages aligning aid to national priorities and processes in developing countries and enhancing national ownership.
Outcomes and impact generation	P2: The Swedish contributions should have a tangible added value (+P1, P5, P6 and P7)

1.2 Bilateral and regional climate investment

The framing of *long-term adaptation efforts* within the CCI bilateral investments can be traced back to two major sources in which Sweden played a significant role: the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and the Commission on Climate Change and Development (CCCD)[2]. They were both interested in understanding what constitutes good climate change adaptation and the categories of change that were essential to generate it. Climate change adaptation (CCA) was viewed by these sources as comprising activities that reduce the negative impact of climate change on human or natural systems by maintaining or increasing adaptive capacity and capacity to address drivers of vulnerability to climate change, while at the same time integrating CCA with disaster risk reduction, mitigation and development[3][4]. In addition, CCCD underlined the importance of climate financing and cooperation between rich and poor nations and within nations[5]. The CCI categories into which funds were to be invested and changes were to be made are:

- Improved resilience to climate change, linked to vulnerability reduction and resilience building. Investments have a direct

[2] Mukute, M. (2019).
[3] OECD (2010).
[4] CCCD (2009). p. 4.
[5] Nilsson, L. (2013, p. 1

impact on people's abilities to adapt to climate change and include infrastructural investments that reduce damages to the physical environment.

- Climate change policy and administrative management, linked to governance, making and implementing policies that address climate risks and improving administrative structures, systems and institutions for integrating climate change.
- Education, training and awareness concerning climate change, linked to acquiring new knowledge and making behaviour and habits change aligned to current and projected climate conditions.
- Climate studies, scenarios and research, covering the identification of training, policy and risk-reduction activity gaps, adaptation hot spots and options.
- Coordination of climate change measures and actors, linked to collaborative engagement between stakeholders and the dissemination of research knowledge for strengthening practice.
- Climate funds for providing material and financial capacity to support the implementation of climate change programmes, strategies and action plans[6].

It is worth noting that investment in one category did not limit change to within that category, as outcomes and impact were also shaped by other categories[7]. For example, investment in education, training and awareness (category c) impacted on resilience building (a) and coordination of climate change measures and actions (e), while investments in resilience building at community and ecosystem level (a) generated insights that fed into education (c), policies (b) and improvement of practice (a).

[6] Wingqvist, et al. (2013).
[7] Mukute, M. (2019).

1.3 Evaluation process

This Cambodia case study report is one of a number of evaluation processes and products that are intended to address the two main evaluation questions. We selected Cambodia as one of two in-depth bilateral case studies (Mali being the other) because: there has been long-term Swedish support in Cambodia which has evolved over time and has been sustained; CCI investments in Cambodia were made into different sectors, notably: water, land use (agriculture), forestry, coastal areas and disaster risk reduction (DRR), which might offer insights into integration; and we wanted to identify complementarities between CCI bilateral investments and CCI regional and multilateral investments (especially the Adaptation Fund), and other climate bilateral investments in Cambodia. These considerations provide a good basis for understanding impact in context and for generating insights and learning at a systemic level. They enable the development of an understanding of the logic and relevance of overseas development assistance (ODA) in general, and of Sweden's ODA and climate financing impact and generating insights for the future.

Following discussion with the evaluation reference group (ERG) in May 2019, we adopted a systems approach to help us broaden the field from which we could draw insights that could inform Sweden's future climate aid, and to better contextualise and understand Sweden's impact contribution in Cambodia. A systems evaluation approach is suitable for assessing climate change adaptation (CCA) interventions because adaptation is largely shaped by factors outside the individual project or programme[8]. The approach helps capture the effects of complexity and thus can help inform policy makers and practitioners about the effects of their choices and actions[9]. Within the systems approach, we utilised a family of complementary theory and systems-based evaluation methodologies to understand emerging impacts of and generate insights from CCI in a complex and dynamic context, involving interacting stakeholders with partially shared interests[10]. In order to support the generation of

[8] Spearman, M. and McGray, H. (2011) p. 10.
[9] Heider, C. (2017).
[10] Simister, N. (2019).

insights, we draw on learning history and theory of change. Learning history helps in the surfacing of insights arising from the evolution of interconnected events, policies and strategies, institutions and programmes in dynamic and interacting systems[11,12]. Similarly, theory of change evaluations connect diverse, multi-scale projects and programmes and accommodates new and emerging conditions, and provide for the agent's contribution to long-term change while acknowledging the contribution of other agency in an evolving adaptation context or system[13]. This enables the identification of forward-looking system-level insights. These learning-oriented evaluation approaches also provided a foundation contribution analysis to contextualise Sweden's contribution to emerging impact[14]. Beyond these insights, we drew on expansive learning theory, to help us identify conceptual, social and material tools that have effectively mediated the understanding and transformation of matters of concern[15] in the case study as these can be scaled across contexts[16]. In addition, the theory enables the identification of new difficult concerns that define the next zone of proximal development – what ought to be resolved so that a system becomes more historically advanced, which is important for informing Sweden's future climate funding and programming.

We drew on outcomes harvesting for impact identification with intended beneficiaries, who also revealed the important processes by which the outcomes were generated[17]. The main added value of drawing on outcome harvesting resided in giving stronger voice to beneficiaries, thus complementing the utilisation-focused approach, which focuses on involving intended evaluation users in enhancing the potential utility and usefulness of the findings to the intended users[18]. In addition, we drew on the sustained emerging impact evaluation (SEIE) approach to reveal how CCI impact was sustained over time[19]. The learning history approach also helped

[11] Gearty, M. & Colvin, J. (2015).
[12] Colvin, J. & Mukute, M. (2017).
[13] Bours, D., McGinn, C., and Pringle, P. (2014).
[14] Mayne, J. (2008).
[15] Engeström, Y. (2016).
[16] Mukute M., Colvin, J., & Baloi, A. (2017).
[17] Wilson-Grau, R (2015).
[18] Patton, M. Q. (2012).
[19] Cekan et al. (2016).

reveal some of the sustained changes, which are closely tied to impact.

After agreeing the evaluation design and approach with the EBA, we conducted the Cambodia bilateral portfolio in-depth case study. This involved holding in-depth interviews with 14 CCI stakeholders in the Swedish Embassy, three Government structures, two UN bodies, a network of civil society organisation; and two community projects (Annex 1); and two group interviews with community groups and commune representatives in Sangke district, Battambang Province and Krakor district, Pursat Province. The total number of evaluation participants was 27, of whom nine were women (including those who contributed to the evaluation via email). The group interviews were supported by field observations of interventions that were supported by the Swedish Embassy through local partners. The projects visited were implemented by local NGOs: Action for Khmer Aid Service (AKAS) in Sangke District coordinated by a man; Akphiwat Neary Khmer Organization (ANKO) in Krakor District, founded and led by a woman. Our sampling was influenced by an interest to see how adaptation processes were integrative and gender-sensitive in multiple and interacting CCI priority sectors of land use (crop production), fisheries, forestry, water harvesting and disaster risk reduction (DRR). In addition, we obtained responses from two former Swedish Embassy managers as well as conducted document analysis and literature review. The main methodological limitation was the small size of the sample of evaluation participants. We sought to overcome this by reviewing and drawing on relevant documents, consistent with outcome harvesting, which combines primary and secondary data to retrospectively establish the events that led to an outcome[20]. Given that we also conducted a CCI multilateral investments evaluation in Cambodia, which established different findings, we attach (Annex 2) an explanation to this.

[20] Chazdon et al. (2017).

2. History and context of environment and climate change

This chapter discusses the evolving context in which climate financing and programming in Cambodia has been implemented. It is divided into three main sectors: (a) the developments of the past to reveal matters of concern that have strong historical roots, (b) the current context, focusing on the main matters of concern, and (c) connecting the past and the present developments using a learning history approach, and focusing on selected climate change related interacting systems at global and country levels to expose patterns.

2.1 Past developments with strong effect on the present

Cambodia gained independence from France in 1953 and inherited an agrarian economy that was based on rice and rubber plantations and high dependence on imports. About two decades later, in 1975, the civil war started, resulting in the closing down of schools and universities, the abolishing of human rights and civil liberties, the death of 2 million people in four years – a quarter of the population at that time - as well as the destruction of infrastructure and forests[21]. In 1979 the Khmer Rouge's genocide regime was overthrown and a new one established. Sweden began providing humanitarian aid then[22]. In 1991 Cambodia's political parties signed the Agreements on the Comprehensive Political Settlement of the Cambodia Conflict in Paris (Paris Peace Agreement). The United National Transitional Authority (UNTA) in Cambodia was subsequently established at Cambodia's request to run the country temporarily and coordinate elections, and restore law and order. Elections were held in 1993, which resulted in the formation of a coalition government and the establishment of the Kingdom of Cambodia as a constitutional monarchy with a democratic, multi-party system in

[21] Holligan, J. & Abdulhak, T. (2011).
[22] Andersen, H., Larsson, K. L., & Öjendal, J. (2019).

the same year. In 1995, Cambodia ratified the UNFCCC and in 1998, full peace was achieved and democratic elections were held, thus paving the way for an opportunity to rebuild the country and to engage with environment and climate change issues. Against this background, Sweden has been supporting Cambodia in reconstruction and development since 1997, with a combined cumulative total of 4 billion SEK between 1997 and 2017[23]. In 2001, the Law on the Election of the Commune was established to provide for the election of councillors at the commune level and the first commune level elections were held in 2002[24]. Today Cambodia is divided into 24 provinces, 185 districts and 1,621 communes, which form part of the Ministry of Interior[25].

Despite 28 years of peace, the economic, social, and ecological challenges that were created by the genocide and subsequent civil war continue to be felt today and have a bearing on the vulnerability of the Cambodian population to climate impacts. These challenges include:

- Altering the population structure by causing a higher proportion of widowed people to be women than men[26] and contributing to 1.2 million Cambodians in the Diaspora by 2014[27,28]. Cambodia's population is about 16.5 million, of whom 50 percent are below 22. The female to male ratio is 1.04:1, and higher at the over 65 age group, 1.6:1, which makes Cambodia's population the most female-biased in the Greater Mekong Sub-region[29]. This is largely a result of the genocide and emigration caused by the Khmer Rouge regime between 1975 and 1980[30], which killed and displaced more men than women and resulted in negative population growth.

[23] Andersen, H., Larsson, K. L., & Öjendal, J. (2019).
[24] Holligan, J. & Abdulhak, T. (2011).
[25] Holligan, J. & Abdulhak, T. (2011).
[26] OECD (2017).
[27] National Bank of Cambodia. (2015).
[28] OECD/CDRI. (2017
[29] Cambodia population. Retrieved from: https://countrymeters.info/en/Cambodia
[30] Ibid.

- Governance challenges associated with public service delivery standards, accountability, and corruption, which have resulted in Western donors tying their aid to governance reforms and democratic processes[31].
- The destruction of infrastructure, including irrigation systems, during the 1980, thus undermining agricultural production. While there was subsequent rehabilitation of 250 irrigation systems covering 720,000 ha of irrigated land between 1999 and 2006[32], war and floods (of 1996 and 2002) left only 28 percent of Cambodia's road network in good or fair condition[33].
- Closing of schools and killing or fleeing of educated people to other countries, thus negatively impacting on national skills and competences[34].
- In 1965, Cambodia's forest cover, including rubber and oil palm plantations and perennial crops, was 73 percent but is now below 50 percent. Logging to finance war not only caused deforestation but also developed a habit of illegal logging, which has been sustained. For example, during the 1980s, the then Government used forests to finance the national budget and restoration work[35] and forest exploitation was accelerated since the 1990s through large scale concessions as well as illegal logging[36].

Consequently, one of the main areas of development and development cooperation in the 1990s was governance and human rights37.

[31] McHanon, D. & Ley, K. (not dated).
[32] Vathana, L. (2018).
[33] ADB. (2002).
[34] Chhair, S. & Ung, L. (2016).
[35] MoE. (2018).
[36] MoE. (2018).
[37] Swedish Embassy, pers. comm., July 2019

2.2 Current context

Under this sub-section we describe the matters of concern regarding ecological and socio-economic development and climate change vulnerability in Cambodia during the current decade. These have a more direct bearing on the climate investments and programmes implemented from 2009, when CCI was implemented alongside other donor-supported interventions.

2.2.1 Ecological matters of concern

Cambodia's National Environmental Strategy and Action Plan (NESAP, 2016-2023) identifies the following as the major environmental issues: (i) biodiversity and ecosystem services loss and threats arising from agricultural expansion and intensification, deforestation, pollution and climate change and inadequate water management, (ii) excessive pressure on protected terrestrial areas and coastal areas, (iii) loss of fisheries resulting from overfishing and ecosystem damage, (iv) soil, water and air pollution from deforestation and fuel wood use and rapid economic development of the manufacturing sector, (v) more frequent and severe droughts and inadequate water management, and (vi) increasing GHG emissions from transport and exposure of transport infrastructure to climate change. In 2016 forests covered 48.14 percent of Cambodia, a loss of nearly 25 percent in half a century, with paddy fields, cropland, water and wood scrub cover at 23.24 percent, 16.62 percent, 4.32 percent and 3.39 percent respectively[38]. Flooded forests constituted 2.63 percent of the land and are included in the forest cover percentage above[39]. The forests have been a major source of rural livelihoods and government revenue over the years.

Climate change is also negatively impacting on fish populations through changes in water levels, flow rates and flooding patterns and worsened by pollution, poor land use practices, dam construction and deforestation, which alter or reduce fish habitats[40].

[38] MoE. (2018). *Cambodia forest cover 2016.* Phnom Penh, Cambodia: p. 7.
[39] Ibid. p. 8.
[40] MAFF. (2011).

For example, the dams constructed in the upper Mekong River for hydropower in China have reduced Mekong fish stocks and negatively affected the river's natural pulse and other natural processes tuned to it in the middle and lower Mekong that is shared by Lao PDR, Thailand, Cambodia and Vietnam and home to 60 million people[41]. Hydropower dam construction in the middle and lower Mekong will significantly reduce fish the river through blocking their migration routes and altering their habitats[42]. This will impact on the Cambodians significantly given that:

"Cambodia's fisheries provide full-time, part-time and seasonal employment for up to 6 million people and the fisheries sector contributes very significantly to domestic food security, providing over 81.5 percent of the animal protein in the national diet and also forming a critical source of essential vitamins and micro-nutrients." (Forum Syd)

These issues show that climate change is one of several ecological challenges, while at the same time suggesting the need for both adaptation and mitigation measures.

Droughts, the development of hydro power and upstream dam construction, including beyond Cambodia's borders, are increasing pressure on water resources in Cambodia. Water resources management is compromised by lack of financial resources and low technical capacity of relevant people and agencies, thus making pro-poor water resources management difficult[43].

2.2.2 Socio-economic matters of concern

Cambodia socio-economic concerns should also be understood within the context of its narrow economic base, an aging population and climate change[44].Forestry, fisheries and agriculture remain important for Cambodia's economy, livelihoods, although not to as great an extent as previously. Forestry, fisheries and agriculture also remain important for CCA and mitigation. Overall, though significant, these sectors' contribution to GDP has been declining,

[41] Smith, S. W. D. (2012).
[42] Kiguchi, Y. (2016).
[43] Vathana, L. (2018).
[44] UNDP. (2014).

partly as a result of growth in the other sectors, notably construction and industry (garments), which depends on imported raw materials. Their contribution has fallen from 47.7 percent in 1995, to 32.1 in 2011, and 23.4 percent in 2017[45]. Crops' contribution to GDP has not only been increasing but it has remained a major contributor compared to livestock, fisheries and forestry, with rice as the most important agricultural crop, constituting 60 percent of agriculture's contribution to GDP[46]. The proportion of people in agriculture has fallen from 80 to 40 percent between 1993 and 2017[47'48]. Land pressure and the associated deforestation and loss of carbon sinks are some of the main areas of concern, which were being felt even at the beginning of CCI. This concern is evidenced by the fact that over the last 10 years, paddy rice production has been growing at about 9 percent annually alongside other crops, notably cassava for industrial use (50 percent), sugar cane (22 percent), maize (20 percent) and vegetables (10 percent)[49]. The area under non-paddy crops increased from 220,000 ha to 770,000 ha between 2008 and 2012[50]. These concerns are worsened by low soil fertility, recurrent floods and droughts and low irrigation development[51]. Droughts that occurred between 1987 and 2007 affected a total of 6.5 million people while floods affected 9.6 million people during the same period[52]. The frequency and severity of floods and droughts began increasing in the 1990s[53] while those of warm nights and hot days began in the 1960s[54]. Consequently:

"Communities have begun to realise that the rain-fed agriculture is no longer good enough to support farmers' livelihoods." (ANKO)

Cambodia's weak land tenure security and land governance challenges are undermining Cambodia's agricultural transformation

[45] World Bank (2018).
[46] World Bank (2016).
[47] Sok Chan (2017).
[48] National Climate Change Committee. (2013)..
[49] World Bank. (2015).
[50] Royal Government of Cambodia, (2014). p. 24.
[51] World Bank. 'Cambodia Overview.' Retrieved from: http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/cambodia/overview.
[52] National Committee for Disaster Management and Ministry of Planning. (2008).
[53] Ministry of Environment. (2011)..
[54] McSweeney, C., New, M., & Lizcanol, G. (2009).

by encouraging over-exploitation of land, reducing investments in agriculture and undermining optimal farm mechanisation as the farms tend to be small[55]. Consequently, Cambodia has cleared forests for agriculture[56] at a rate that is not sustainable. Fragmented land tenure system that has been changing over time, resulting in a steady growth of the proportion of landless rural people, from 4.1 percent in 1960 to 15 percent in 2001 and 29 percent in 2011. Successful farmers and urban-based investors have been buying the land from peasants, especially the ones in debt while the companies have used economic land concessions (ELC) to grab forests for agricultural production[57]. For example, from 2005 to 2013 Cambodia's farmland expanded by 4.7 percent annually with cassava plantations increasing by 128 percent[58]. Consequently, concerns have been raised about REDD+, which has increased the value of forests as carbon sinks, which ELC[59]. Against this background, the RGC's communal land titling has not provided indigenous villagers with adequate legal mechanisms to protect their access to and ownership of land and enable livelihood resilience building in the face of ELCs and land encroachment by wealthier actors[60]. In this regard, one interviewee noted:

"Although contributing to economic growth, concessions to domestic and international investors for the growing of corn, rice, sugar cane, rubber, cashew nuts and mango production are putting pressure on land, contributing to the clearing of forests and the using up of residual forest fertility." (UN/FAO)

Fishing and fisheries provides an important component of the rural economy and 69 to 82 percent of Cambodia's animal protein diet and contributes 10-12 percent of the GDP[61,62,63]. It provides full and part-time employment to over 6 million people in Cambodia[64]. Freshwater fishery contributes the most, followed by aquaculture

[55] World Bank. (2015).
[56] MoE. (2018).
[57] Diepart, J. C. (2015).
[58] World Bank. (2015)..
[59] Dhiaulhag, A., Yasmi, Y., Gritten, D., Kelley, L. & Chandet, H. (not dated)
[60] Hak, S., McAndrew, J. & Neef, A. (2018).
[61] WorldFish Center. 'Cambodia.' http://www.worldfishcenter.org/content/cambodia
[62] Kurien, J., (2017).
[63] MAFF. (2011).
[64] MAFF. (2011).

and marine capture respectively. For example, the respective contributions were 509,350 tonnes, 172,500 tonnes and 120,600 tonnes in the 2016-17 agricultural season[65]. This is significant given that Cambodia is the fourth largest inland fish producer country in the world[66]. But Freshwater fisheries are under threat from climate change and variability, over-exploitation and dam developments, which disrupt fish migration, and alter fish breeding habitats[67].

Socially, although at 9.6 percent annually Cambodia's annual agricultural production has increased significantly and contributed to poverty reduction, small scale farmers (with below 1 ha) face some challenges. In particular, the average farm size has been decreasing (e.g. from an average of 0.99 ha in 2008 to 0.88 in 2012), making it potentially difficult for small scale farmers to meaningfully benefit from value chains being developed[68]. Larger farm owners (over 3 ha) on the other hand are likely to benefit as their farm sizes have been increasing over the same period from an average of 3.61 ha to 7.03 ha. Corruption is a related matter of concern. Acknowledging the progress made by Cambodia and the new challenges it faces, Sweden's past ambassador to Cambodia has noted that:

"The country faces major challenges such as widespread corruption, establishing the rule of law with an independent judiciary, embedding democratic culture and values … diversifying the economic base, tackling climate change and environment-related threats, and reducing growing inequality."[69]

The 2017 banning of the opposition at council level has undermined democracy and decentralisation through making the councils one-party structures, which control the flow of money and local development investments[70]. This has happened in spite of Sweden and other donors' contributions to the establishment of formal democratic structures, systems and procedures.

[65] MAFF 2017.
[66] Oudry, G., Pak, K., Chea, C. (2016
[67] Ashley Halls and Matthew Johns (2013).
[68] World Bank. (2015)..
[69] MFA, Government of Sweden. (2008). p. 1.
[70] Andersen, H., Larsson, K. L., & Öjendal, J. (2019)..

2.2.3 Vulnerability to climate change

Cambodia's history and social ecological context makes it one of the 10 most climate vulnerable countries in the world. It is exposed to extreme temperatures, especially heat waves, floods, droughts, tropical storms, sea level rise and epidemics and experienced over 7,800 disaster events between 1996-2013, with 2011 as one of the worst years, during which 75 percent of its provinces were hit by floods that affected 1.77 million people[71,72]. The incidence of droughts and floods has been increasing over time and negatively impacting on human life and livelihoods, infrastructure, education, health and the economy and swelling migration from rural to urban areas and neighbouring countries[73]. Recurrent floods in Cambodia damage and destroy infrastructure, kill people and destroy crops and the average annual cost of floods in the agricultural sector is between USD100m - USD170m[74]. The impact is worsened by the country's low adaptive capacity and its high dependence on natural resources for livelihoods and economic development[75]. Small scale farmers are the most vulnerable to floods, droughts, pest and diseases as the majority (58 percent) are dependent on one crop (rice), lack agricultural training and infrastructure, use poor quality seed, and have poor access to agricultural markets[76]. While the proportion of people living in poverty has declined significantly due to the country's progress in agriculture and other sectors but they remain marginally out of poverty[77]. Nutritional insecurity is still high having been 33 percent in 2014[78]. Multi-dimensional poverty has remained high at 33 percent in 2014, although inequality has also fallen from a Gini co-efficient of 0.38 to 0.3 between 2004 and 2014. Infant mortalities remain high and are largely caused by communicable, maternal, neonatal, water-borne and infectious diseases. School enrolment remains a key challenge, even though there have been improvements. For example, in 2014 enrolment

[71] Oudry, G., Pak, K., Chea, C. (2016).
[72] National Climate Change Committee. (2013).
[73] Oudry, G., Pak, K., Chea, C. (2016).
[74] Vathana, L. (2018).
[75] Climate Change Technical Team. (2014).
[76] Finscope survey (2016).
[77] World Bank. (2015).
[78] World Bank. (2015).

rates were 85 percent, 40 percent, 20 percent and 12 percent for primary, lower secondary, upper secondary and tertiary levels respectively. Even though the unemployment rate is low at 3 percent, the pay and working conditions are poor[79].

The identified matters of concern and the extent of Cambodia's vulnerability to climate change suggest that *CCI principle 1: The funds reserved for adaptation interventions should go primarily to the poorest countries*, was observed when Cambodia was selected as one of the five bilateral countries.

2.3 Tracing the history of key developments

We developed Table 2 overleaf to show major national climate events, national climate policies and strategies, and the development of national climate-related institutions, international climate change agreements and financial commitments over a 25-year period. The table also shows Sweden's bilateral support to Cambodia over the same period. This provides a basis upon which we made inferences of patterns over time and across selected systems/themes. We identified the following patterns from the table:

- The high frequency of floods and droughts and Cambodia's ratification of the UNFCCC inspired Cambodia to respond to climate change impacts strategically.
- Fast-start climate finance commitments made by some donors provided Cambodia with the necessary financial resources to develop and mainstream the Cambodia Climate Change Strategic Plan (CCCSP). The development of the CCCSP (2014-2023) created a ripple effect through building synergies with existing and future National Strategic Development Plans (NSDPs), Rectangular Strategies and the National Policy on Green Growth to ensure strategic cohesion in relation to CCA, low carbon development, mitigation and DRR[80]. CCCSP's goal

[79] OECD (2017).
[80] National Climate Change Committee. (2013). p. vi.

is "Reducing vulnerability to climate change impacts of people, in particular the most vulnerable, and critical systems (natural and societal), shifting towards a green development path by promoting low-carbon development and technologies, [and] promoting public awareness and participation in climate change response actions[81]." Its generative effect was also extended to at least 14 line-Ministries and agencies that developed 5-year Climate Change Plans and vertically through the National Climate Change Committee (NCCC) responsible for dealing with climate change matters issues at sub-national level.

- Cambodia's climate change institutions have been evolving from a low-profile office to a sophisticated and high-profile Department (CCD) and Committee (NCCC and NCSD), with a broadened mandate in line with the growing significance and profile of the climate agenda in Cambodia. The climate change office became a department, and an inter-Ministerial National Climate Change Committee became a National Council for Sustainable Development. In addition, the recent decision to reform change the UNDP personnel managing CCCA TF suggests important progress towards national ownership.
- The Commission on Climate Change and Development (CCCD) visit to Cambodia in May 2008 to establish facts about climate change and what could be done about it, and the subsequent feedback presentation of their findings in early 2009 or early 2010 could have contributed to putting the issue on the climate agenda at a high level (EBA, personal communication, August 2019).
- When Sweden commenced climate change investments under CCI (alongside other donors), the climate change issue had very little financial and programming attention. But from then on, Cambodia's activities in climate change policy and programming

[81] Ibid. pp. xvi-xvii.

work began to grow. At the same time, civic space was wider then than it is now. Cambodia's notable progress in CCA, economic development and governance appears to have built trust and confidence of international partners and attracted climate finances over the last decade.

The learning history table below suggests the observation by Cambodia of CCI Principle 4: Consideration should be taken to the ongoing international climate negotiations regarding timing and choice of channels. Its observation is implied from Cambodia's development of the NDC soon after the Paris Agreement and its ability to access the Adaptation Fund a few years after its operationalisation.

Table 2: Notable climate events, policy and institutional developments in Cambodia over the past 25 years

Themes	1995-2008	2009-2013	2014 to 2019
Notable climate events	Significant floods were experienced in 1996, 2000 and 2002, 2003, 2006 and 2008. Droughts in 1995, 1996, 2001, 2002 and 2003 leading to crop failure and famine. The 2002 drought affected 2 million people.	A Typhoon Ketsana occurred in 2009, and major floods were experience in 2011 and 2013 There was no significant drought	Wide scale floods hit Cambodia in 2018. Rains started late in 2014 and the worst drought in 100 years occurred in 2016.
Policy developments and influencing	Cambodia ratified the UNFCCC (1996) & the Kyoto Protocol (2002). The first National Adaptation Plan	National Policy of Green Development (2013-2030) adopted. Cambodia Climate Change Strategic	King of Cambodia urges donor countries to honour climate fund pledges at the Paris CoP (2015) and Cambodia ratifies the Paris Agreement (2016), and Cambodia's NDC developed.

of Action (2006) adopted. National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP, 2006-2010) adopted. Phase I Rectangular Strategy for on sustainable economic development (2004-2008) adopted. Agriculture and Water Policy (2007) adopted. Strategic National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (SNP-DRR, 2008-2013) adopted. Civil society space was opened and many NGOs and CBOs emerged.	Plan was developed (2014-2023). National Strategic Development Plan (2009-2013) adopted. Phase II Rectangular Strategy on sustainable economic development (2009-2013) adopted. National Social Protection Strategy for the Poor and Vulnerable (2011) adopted, National Poverty Reduction Strategy (NPRS, 2013) adopted Strategy for Agriculture and Water (2010–2013) & National Strategy for Food Security and Nutrition (NSFSN, 2014-2018) adopted. Strategic National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (SNP-DRR, 2014-2018) adopted. Programme for Sub-national Democratic Development (2010) adopted & Strategic	14 x 5-year Climate Change Action Plans developed (2014-2018); and Cambodia Climate Change Financing Framework developed (2014). National Strategic Development Plan (2014-2018) adopted. Phase III Rectangular Strategy on sustainable economic development (2014-2018) adopted, and a study on the impact of climate change on the economy of Cambodia by 2050 produced (2019). Gender Equality and Women Empowerment (2014-2019) adopted. Law on Disaster Management (2015) enacted & SNP-DRR (2019–2023) adopted. Prohibiting of opposition from contesting in local council (commune) elections & NGO Law (restrictive) enacted.

		Framework for Decentralisation & De-concentration (2010-2019) adopted.	
Institutional & climate financing in Cambodia	National Climate Change Office (CCO) established (2003). National Climate Change Committee (NCCC) was established (2006). Ministry of Environment appointed the NDA (2003) for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). The CCCA Trust Fund (TF) was established (2008)	National Climate Change Department (CCD) replaced CCO (2009). The Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Finance mandated to coordinate national climate change efforts (2010). CCCA TF operationalised with financial support from EU, Denmark and Sweden (2010) and UNDP as fund manager.	The National Committee on Sustainable Development (NCSD) replaced NCCC (2015) Ministry of Environment nominated as the National Designated Authority (2014). NCCC Secretariat nominated the National Implementing Entity – GCF (2015). CCCA TF Phase 2 established, with continued support from EU, Denmark and Sweden, UNDP was the fund manager and will remain the fund manager in the next phase to which EU has already promised to support.
Swedish bilateral financing	Sweden's support focused on democracy, human rights and education; and was later expanded to include environment.	The Swedish country strategy sought to increase national capacity to coordinate and implement climate adaptation activities (2012-2013).	The Swedish country strategy sought to increase national capacity to coordinate and implement CCA, build resilience at local level and foster sustainable use of natural resources, at local level, foster cooperation between

CCCD conducted a study visit to Cambodia (2008).	CCI was initiated in Cambodia with four projects, LGCC, CCCA TF (2010-2014), Forum Syd, and UNDP Small Grants Project (2010).	citizens and local authorities (2014-2018). Post Swedish CCI support in CCA: LGCC Phase 2, CCCA TF Phase 2 (2015-2019), Forum Syd continued and the UNDP Small Grants Project continued and Swedish Embassy in Cambodia employed an environment and climate expert for the first time (2018).

3. Emerging impact, strategies and obstacles

Climate investments in Cambodia, which began in earnest about a decade ago, have created long-term outcomes and emerging impact. Through outcome harvesting with different stakeholder groups, we identified relevant outcomes at national and sub-national levels, and at community level, to appreciate the valued impact of climate investments and programmes since CCI commenced in Cambodia. These are set out in sections 3.1 and 3.2 below. We also note significant non-Swedish contributions to these outcomes, while holding over our analysis of contributions from CCI to chapter 4.

We then discuss generative strategies and mechanisms that catalysed impact generation (section 3.3), and the new and emerging challenges regarding responses to climate change impact and risks (section 3.4). Generative tools mediate the creation of a ripple effect, which could lead to transitional change, which affects other elements in the same programme or process and transformational change, which makes a difference in policy, institutional practice, or in what people think and do in their daily lives [82]. Emerging challenges provide insights into what might need to be done next in the pursuit of adaptation as a moving target under changing and uncertain conditions[83].

3.1 Emerging national and sub-national impact

We identified three main valued outcomes at the national and sub-national levels and these are described below. These should be understood in the context that most of Cambodia's climate funds are external, from bilateral and multilateral channels. For example, between 2003 and 2013, Cambodia received 52 percent of its climate funds (USD655.6 million in the form of both grants and loans) from multilateral sources and 48 percent from bilateral[84]. These funds

[82] Chazdon et al. (Eds.). (2017).
[83] Bours et al. (2014).
[84] The NGO Forum on Cambodia. (2014).

were distributed as follows: 70 percent adaptation, 22 percent mitigation, 4 percent policy, research and capacity building, and the remaining 4 percent into both adaptation and mitigation[85]. The bulk of the funds went into agriculture, water and irrigation (41 percent), followed by disaster management (16 percent) and transport and infrastructure (14 percent)[86].

3.1.1 Enhanced national capacity to respond

Climate investments and programmes enabled the purposeful acquisition of actionable climate change knowledge among policy and decision-makers in government and civil society. The main sectors in which this capacity was developed are: agriculture, forestry, water resources, fisheries, coastal area planning and DRR. These are also priority sectors of the CCCSP. Our findings suggest that the theoretical and practical knowledge resulted in the development of a good understanding of the development and climate change context. It enabled the development of good baseline data for decision-making, the development of climate planning and investment frameworks and their integration into sectoral and sub-national plans, thus creating a ripple effect.

"The knowledge and information enables us to know where we want to go, to tackle the right problems, to target the right places, people and institutions; to understand the cost of no action and to mainstream climate change in our policies, strategies and activities, not for the sake of it, but for a purpose."

(NCSD for the Ministry of Environment)

This impact has been sustained through the generation of new knowledge from practice-based learning, which has been cascaded into the education system through curricula revision and innovation.

Japan and Australia were reported as having made significant contributions to higher education training and long-term capacity development, with Australia and Sweden significantly contributing to research and science and Scandinavian countries providing the

[85] Ibid.
[86] The NGO Forum on Cambodia. (2014).

main technical assistance in CCA and mitigation. It is worth noting that even though Sweden's contribution to this impact covered the CCI period, it was not part of CCI. The main impact of investment in the education sector includes a system-wide development of science and research capacity of the country, which contributed to the bridging of the knowledge and competence capacity gaps caused by the killing of the educated people during the genocide. These competences have a potential to contribute towards national capacity to understand climate change and its impact, develop and implement strategies to address it.

The following groups of external actors were reported as having notable technical, institutional, financial and material investments in Cambodia's CCA priority areas: (i) forestry, GEF and UNDP, (ii) fisheries and mangrove conservation: the EU, US and FAO, (iii) agriculture and value chain development: FAO, IFAD, US, Australia, Asian Development Bank and the World Bank, (iv) water resources management: China, Korea, France, Japan, Switzerland, (v) protected areas: Adaptation Fund (AF), and (vi) DRR: World Food Programme (WFP).

3.1.2 Coordinated nationally owned agenda

Climate investments enabled joint planning among Government Ministries under the leadership of the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Economy and Finance, who have been described as the CCA champions. Through their leadership, 14 line Ministries developed and implemented 5-year Climate Change Plans aligned to the 10-year national Climate Change Strategy and the NDC[87].

Climate financing in Cambodia enabled a strong ownership at ministerial level including more than 10 ministries.[88]

This enabled a certain level of coherence and complementarity across sectors and scales. In addition to Ministries integrating climate change in their plans and budgets, the climate change agenda has also been integrated into sub-national programme and

[87] Sum. T. (2017).
[88] Sida, personal comm., January 2019

investment plans. The Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) notes:

"Despite the many challenges inherent in realising such strong ambitions, Cambodia is proud of the progress made in climate change policy … Explicit efforts have been made in mainstreaming climate change into national and sub-national planning. For example, Cambodia has developed and implemented the Climate Change Strategic Plan 2014-2023 (CCCSP), and associated action plans developed by each relevant ministry. These plans are Cambodia's first ever comprehensive national policy documents that illustrate not only the country's priority adaptation needs, but also provide roadmaps for de-carbonisation of key economic sectors and the enhancement of carbon sinks".[89]

At sub-national level, CCCSP shaped the development of Local Adaptation Plans and the incorporation of climate change in investment plans; climate proofing of local infrastructure development; and the development and operationalisation of a performance-based climate financing model:

"The methodology for the development of the action plans takes into account climate vulnerabilities, an analysis of the effectiveness and efficiency of proposed actions, co-benefits (economic, environment and social), and potential implementation challenges. The process included a number of innovations to ensure that Climate Change actions were truly linked to regular planning (avoid a silo approach) … and presented with a truly programmatic approach (rather than a ranking of individual projects)." [90]

Sub-national vertical integration of climate change response efforts has been conducted through the National Committee for Democratic Development (NCDD) in the Ministry of Interior and supported by a Strategic Framework for Decentralisation and De-concentration and an associated Plan (2010-2019):[91]

"NCDD has not only been able to ensure that national climate policies and budgets are integrated at sub-national level, it has also built a sense of community ownership through a top-up approach, through which communities contribute

[89] RGC. (2015). p. 2.
[90] CCCA. (2014). p. 4.
[91] Am, P., Caccillato, E., Nkem, J., & Chellivard, J. (2013).

something to the projects we support. The approach is relatively new as it only began in 2011." (NCDD of the Ministry of Interior)

One of the ripple effects of successful sub-national Performance Based Climate Resilience Funds and operational grants from the EU and Sida invested has been the accessing of funding from other donors, notably IFAD to support 43 districts, and GEF to support 10 districts[92]. Consequently, national ownership was enhanced based on quality climate strategies and plans and the enhanced capacity to understand and manage climate effects described above. The mainstreaming of the climate agenda went beyond the strategic and operational levels, and also fed upwards into the National Strategic Development and the Rectangular Strategy:

"Climate change challenges and indicators are now being included in the National Strategic Development plan for 2014-2018, in collaboration with the Ministry of Planning. The recently released Rectangular Strategy III of the Royal Government of Cambodia (2014-2018) also includes clear directors in support of climate change and green growth objectives." [93]

Donors that have contributed significantly to the development and mainstreaming of the climate policy are the EU, Sweden, Denmark and UNDP, who jointly contributed about USD10.9 million between 2010 and 2014.[94] Sweden's contribution to this impact largely took place during and through CCI (and using CCI funding) and has been sustained beyond CCI. The World Bank's Climate Investment Funds (CIF), into which Sweden also contributed through CCI[95], has also contributed to the development of sector policies and policy dialogue in Cambodia on climate change and on gender mainstreaming.[96]

[92] De Coninck, S. (2019).
[93] National Forum on Climate Change. (2013). p. 1.
[94] CCCA. (2014).
[95] Through CCI Sweden contributed to two of the funds under the CIF that invested in Cambodia – the FIP and the SREP.
[96] Bird, N., Cao, Y. & Quevedo, A. (2019).

3.1.3 Contributed to climate finance readiness

Cambodia's experience in managing the CCCA Trust Fund (CCCA TF) significantly contributed to its readiness for multilateral climate change adaptation funds, notably the Adaptation Fund (AF) and the Green Climate Fund (GCF). The CCCA TF is governed by an inter-Ministerial NCSD (formerly NCCC) chaired by the Prime Minister, receives technical support from the Climate Change Technical Team (CCTT) and, until recently, has had UNDP responsible for fiduciary management of the Fund[97]'[98]. CCCA TF funds have been invested in water, crop and livestock production, horticulture, aquaculture, post-harvest management, health and DRR[99]. Between 2014 and 2016, the CCCA TF had contributed to the development of climate action plans by 14 line ministries; a model for performance-based climate financing at local level; the establishment of a National Council for Sustainable Development; and to Cambodia's ratification of the Paris Agreement in 2016.

The collective experiences and insights into climate change financing and programming in Cambodia have fed into the development of the National Climate Change Financing Framework (CCFF, 2014), which involved the Ministry of Economy and Finance, NCDD Secretariat, Ministry of Planning, and the Council for the Development of Cambodia[100]:

"Over the last few years, an estimated USD250 million has been mobilised to support the implementation of various climate change projects… These activities are generating lessons to support the establishment of a national level climate change financing framework." [101]

In addition, Cambodia had already accessed the USD45 million from the Adaptation Fund since 2013.[102]

By mid-2019, Cambodia and participating donors had already decided to have a different UNDP team to be the fund manager of

[97] CCCA. (2012).
[98] Salamanca, A. (2016).
[99] CCCA. (2014).
[100] CCCA. (2014).
[101] Bird, N., Cao, Y. & Quevedo, A. (2019). p. 2.
[102] NCSD, Ministry of Environment, pers. comm., July 2019

the CCCA Trust Fund in phase 3, the next phase. The EU had already decided to continue funding into the post-2019 period and Sweden was in the process of deciding whether it would also contribute[103]. Looking ahead, even though Cambodia has made good progress in meeting GCF requirements, there is no guarantee that it will get the funds:

"Direct access to some climate finances is complicated, especially accessing GCF funds. In this regard Cambodia plans to work on two fronts: work through others such as the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank that are already accredited and support national organisations such as NCDD to get accredited." (NCSD of the Ministry of the Environment)

During the CCI period the EU, Sweden (using CCI investments), Denmark and UNDP had been funding CCCA TF and helping it become climate finance ready, and all of them except Denmark have continued to provide the investment and support beyond the CCI period.

3.2 Emerging impact at community level

We identified three main kinds of long-term outcomes arising from climate change financing and programming in some of Cambodia's communities where vulnerability reduction and adaptation projects have been implemented. Donor contribution to this level of impact is difficult to trace and is often place-specific. The identified emerging outcomes are:

- Improved livelihoods and reduction of community vulnerability to climate change,
- Conserved and restored ecosystems and biodiversity in project areas, and
- Enhanced community solidarity and agency.

[103] Swedish Embassy, pers. comm., July 2019

3.2.1 Improved livelihoods, reduced vulnerability

Climate change adaptation projects resulted in improved crop and fish production among participating communities, which in turn enhanced household food and nutrition security and incomes. For example, a Chief of Commune in one of the communities that received UNDP small grants support noted:

"From the water harvesting support we received from UNDP, we have been able retain water in the nearby river, put 1,000 ha of land under irrigation, establish home gardens with a mix of annual and perennial plans, grow 2-3 crops per year, increase yields and crop diversity. At the same time, we and our youth have become productive throughout the year." (Kompong Por commune)

Primary data generated during the evaluation revealed that CCI interventions contributed to increased local food and nutrition security as well as incomes, which enabled the participating farming communities to address more household needs, including paying school fees. In some areas, vegetable production is a new practice, which has enabled women to reduce time needed to collect uncultivated vegetables. In addition, the establishment of water harvesting structures and technologies reduced women's burden of fetching water from distant places. The availability of productive work throughout most of the year, which arose from irrigation repair and development and the subsequent expansion of agricultural land, motivated youth to stay in some of the participating villages and not to migrate to urban areas or neighbouring countries. Increased fish production arising from damming of rivers and from aquaculture benefitted women as they are in charge of fish processing and sales. Water harvesting, irrigation infrastructure and diversified means of living reduced community vulnerability to climate change by making water available for agricultural production during the dry season, and dry spells during the rainfall seasons. For example, CCI facilitated the establishment of 69 functioning water user groups for the sustainable management of irrigation systems and dams. Community fish ponds benefitted from floods, which came brought migratory fish.

Empirical evidence suggests the climate change coping capacities of fishing and farming communities in Cambodia are uneven between the more affluent and poorer farmers, with the latter and women being more compromised.[104] However, there is also evidence of enhanced coping capacities among some fishing and farming communities. Government fishery reforms, which promote community fisheries, have enabled greater participation of men, women and youth in fisheries. This has resulted in the rejuvenation of ecosystems that were in danger, conservation of flooded rice fields, mangroves and forests, improved livelihood options and enhanced collective benefits.[105] A study conducted in Srey Snam district suggested that Community Fish Refuges (CFRs) have significantly increased fish productivity, daily fish catches, fish consumption and income from fish.[106] In agriculture community coping mechanisms to impacts of droughts and floods have included water harvesting, irrigation, establishing community seed and grain banks, repairing paddy banks, culling or moving livestock to safer areas, migration and reducing food consumption.[107] International climate finance investments have been contributing to improved coping mechanisms for whole communities. For example, between 2014 and 2018 Sweden and the EU contributed nearly USD2 million into Performance-based Climate Resilience Grants (PBCRGs), which have been used for the construction of rural roads, restoration and protection of irrigation canals, community pods, water gates and sewage systems in eight districts.[108] Multilateral donors planned to scale this initiative into 44 more districts from 2019.[109]

3.2.2 Restored ecosystems and biodiversity

In project areas, CCI contributed to the conservation and restoration of forests, flooded forests and wetlands, which produce

[104] Oudry, G., Pak, K., & Chea, C. (2016).
[105] Kurien, J. (2017). p. 51.
[106] Phala, C., Sarin, T., Suvedi, M., & Ghimire, R. (2019).
[107] Daze, A., Ravesloot, T., & TANGO International (2013).
[108] Coninck, S. (2019).
[109] Coninck, S. (2019).

ecological services such as fish breeding habitats, carbon sequestration and biological diversity. For example:

"Through our environmental conservation, natural resources management and climate change work in Mekong, Battambang, and the Coastal Region, which is supported by Sida and Margaret A. Cargill Foundation, we have been able to support the establishment of 330 Community Conservation Areas whose combined total size is 260,928 ha. These have contributed to the sequestration of approximately 30.4 metric tonnes of carbon dioxide." (Forum Syd)

Protected areas, especially forests provide for types of ecosystem services, namely, hydrological services, carbon sequestration, biodiversity conservation and recreation.[110] In this regard, the Adaptation *Fund's Enhancing Climate Resilience of Rural Communities Living in Protected Areas of Cambodia* project, which received nearly USD5 million spread over 5 years, contributed towards improved livelihoods, well-being and community resilience to climate change of participating villagers. A key explanation for this contribution has been given as sound baseline studies, flexible and responsive project management and commitment of target communities[111]. Some of these changes have been catalysed by enabling national policy. For example, the replacement of commercial fishing with public fishing in 2012 has resulted in the transformation of over 93,000 ha Tonle Sap Lake into 23 fish conservation areas, which are important for fish breeding[112]. Restored flooded forests, which are important for fish breeding habitats, has resulted in the recovery and conservation of some fish species and populations. This outcome means that the community's natural capital – landscape, water, social and biodiversity of plants and animals[113] – has been enhanced.

However, the achievement of deeper and system-wide impact on enhancing ecological or ecosystem services is undermined by several factors. For example, even though Cambodia expanded the size of its protected areas from 26 percent of its land surface area in 2014 to 42 percent in 2016, its lack of financial and human resource capacities is has resulted in continued deforestation and biodiversity

[110] Simpson, V. & Souter N. J. (2017). P 1-3.
[111] TANGO. (2018).
[112] Sithirith, M. (2015).
[113] Flora, C.B. & Flora, J.L. (2008).

loss in the protected areas.[114] The rapid expansion of agricultural land, exemplified by a 50 percent increase between 2002 and 2012, is turning forests and wetlands in ELCs and logging and fuel wood extraction protected forests [115] thus undermining the overall production of ecosystem services. Deforestation and agricultural expansion are depleting the already inherent low soil fertility, especially upland where cassava is being grown, and exposing the country to more extreme flooding.[116]

3.2.3 Enhanced community solidarity and agency

Community level impact has included the development of community capacities to work together to conduct development and influence change. In community forestry, where climate investments have been made, two forms of social capital were found present and essential for organising collective action in Cambodia's community forestry (CF): social networks and cooperative norms[117]. For example, one interviewee in Sangke district, Battambang province noted:

"Although we no longer receive support from UNDP, the project groups that were established are still functional. We have three groups: on seed, chicken and vegetables. The vegetable group is led by a woman, who is also the leader of the three groups combined. The support we received to address water insecurity has been transformative because, for farmers like us, water is a major driver of poverty and vulnerability to climate change. Group members are managing this on their own." (Kompong Preang commune)

Another added:

"The commune's Fish, Water Users, and Flooded Forests committees meet with the community groups every Monday to discuss matters of common interest; and periodically to prepare commune annual plans and investment plans together. Some of the group members are also members of commune committees." (AKAS)

[114] Simpson, V. & Souter N. J. (2017).
[115] World Bank. (2017).
[116] Ibid.
[117] Ido, A. (2019)..

Climate investments at community level have also increased cooperation between communities and commune councils through joint planning and implementation of local development projects, and increased solidarity among women through projects (especially supported by UNDP), resulting in women being groomed to take leadership roles in society and to carry out much of the critical advocacy work in the country. In this regard, a recent Climate Investment Funds (CIF) evaluation established that women hold 32 percent of the management positions in water user management committees and its Pilot Programme on Climate Resilience (PPCR) was significantly contributing to the integration on gender in climate change planning in Cambodia, at national level.[118]

These outcomes suggest that the political capital of the communities have been improved. Political capital refers to:

"The ability to affect the distribution of both public and private resources within the community" (Flora & Flora 2008, p. 145), (ii) the ability to gain access to individuals and organizations – the so-called power brokers or movers and shakers – with the resources to influence important decisions (Flora et al., 2004), and (iii) the ability to develop new leadership in the community, and/or expand the engagement of citizens in discussions of important community matters through the use of various strategies, such as deliberation forums." [119]

However, there are stronger forces that work against the sustained embedding of collective agency and actions by the poor and less marginalised members of the community within and beyond the project areas. Cambodia has a patronage system and high-power distance, which protects and privileges the more powerful and encourages the less powerful people, institutions and organisations to expect and accept the unequal distribution of power [120] . This culture has been undermining systemic democratisation, decentralisation, local participation and bottom-up decision-making[121]. At the same time, the orientation of Cambodia's anti-corruption reforms, including those provided by Sweden and other donors on public finance management, public expenditure

[118] Itad, Ross Strategic & ICF. (2019).
[119] Beaulieu, L. J. B. (2014).
[120] Chan, R. & Chheang, V. (2008).
[121] Ibid.

tracking and decentralisation, have been more liberal and regime-friendly and have resulted in increased state power and insignificant redistribution of power.[122]

3.2.4 Enhanced civil society development and opened democratic space

Bilateral donors such as Sweden have contributed to democratic development through strengthening Cambodia's education system; civil society, especially in the form of community-based organisations (CBOs) and local movements; and building local democratic institutions such as multiparty commune councils.[123] They have also contributed to the establishment and development of local NGOs, which were first established in the early 1990s following the Paris Peace Agreement of 1991 just before and during UNTAC to conduct human rights and voter education activities.[124] In 2009, 20 percent of ODA in Cambodia went into NGOs covering different sectors and kinds of activities[125]. Beyond funding, donor contributions to CSOs have included capacity development and promoting a rights-based approach. For example, Sweden's support to CSOs in Cambodia has sought to: (i) counterbalance the state and encourage pluralism, (ii) complement state reforms, (iii) mobilise citizens and empower the public and stimulate political participation, and (iv) influence the state through policy influence and dialogue[126]. Similarly, local NGOs in Cambodia conduct: (i) democracy and human rights, (ii) development, (iii) organisation and human resource development, and (iv) research and analytical work[127]. NGOs' main added value in Cambodia has been associated with promoting alternative development approaches and models which encourage participation, equity, gender equality and

[122] Baker, J. & Milne, S. (2018).
[123] Andersen, H., Larsson, K. L., & Öjendal, J. (2019).
[124] ADB. (2011).
[125] ADB. (2011).
[126] Andersen, H., Larsson, K. L., & Öjendal, J. (2019). p. 139.
[127] ADB. (2011).

environmental sustainability[128], and responding to climate change impacts[129].

However, the impact of CSOs and its durability is being constrained by 'high politics'.[130] In addition: (i) CSO leadership is dominated by an old generation in a youthful country, (ii) CSOs are not addressing some of the youth concerns such as safe migration and good economic prospects, and (iii) some CSOs are either disconnected from their constituencies or advance the interests of councils more than that of the ordinary people they represent or push the people to be too confrontational against local authorities[131]. In spite of their achievements, many CSOs have been criticised for owing their existence to the influence and financial support from international donors and not emerging from the scaling up of grassroots organisations. In the meantime, they are also facing a decline in foreign funding as evidenced by its decline by 14 percent in 2015 and by 15 percent in 2016.[132]

Under these circumstances, some donors have shifted their focus towards: (i) supporting human rights defenders, (ii) broadening organisation development for CSOs to relate with larger ecosystems such as other CSOs, funders and policy makers, and (iii) looking for ways to supporting indigenous, grassroots initiatives[133].

3.3 Generative strategies and tools

Several strategies contributed to the achievement of the outcomes outlined above. These include:

Awareness raising, training and technical support: This increased capacity to understand and respond to climate change effects through climate policy making and mainstreaming and climate programming at multiple levels. At community level, training focused on practical ways of responding to climate change.

[128] ADB. (2011).
[129] Sida. (2013).
[130] Andersen, H., Larsson, K. L., & Öjendal, J. (2019).
[131] Krajnovic, M. (2015).
[132] Ker, S. (2018).
[133] Krajnovic, M. (2015).

It includes the training of relevant people on climate finance, environmental and social safeguards and their roles in enabling access to GCF.[134]

Quality baseline analysis tools: Drawing on good technical knowledge quality baselines has informed decision-making, policy-making, programming and resource mobilisation. The baselines at multiple levels benefited from technical capacities indicated above, as well as from effective tools such as the Vulnerability and Risk Assessment (VRA) tool.

Championing: Choosing the right Ministries, with necessary and complementary competences and convening powers. The Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Economy and Finance derived from technical expertise the ability to create spaces for collective thinking and planning, self-awareness, understanding of own comparative advantage and mutual accountability[135].

Collaborative structures and mechanisms and political buy-in: Joint planning mechanisms and processes, especially through NCCC and NCSD, enabled collective thinking and co-designing. This has been accompanied by the securing of high-level political buy-in and participation as evidenced by the King's participation in climate matters nationally and at CoP; and the Prime Minister's chairing of the NCSD, allowing for integration from the highest levels. The climate governance and management structures have been augmented through supportive frameworks and procedures.

Community Conservation Areas (CCAs): The establishment of CCAs has been the main mechanism used to conserve critical ecosystems and restore degraded ones in project areas. CCAs include forest and fish conservation areas. This has been supported by training on climate change impacts and how to respond to them

Water harvesting and irrigation development: At community level, investments in irrigation repair and development and the harvesting and/or damming of water were transformative. They

[134] Bernhard, R. & Sokhai, N. (2016). *Climate finance readiness (CFR) programme: Support to the National Adaptation Plan Process in Cambodia.* Phnom Penh, Cambodia: GIZ & USAID.
[135] NCSD, Ministry of Environment, pers. comm., July 2019

resulted in increased water availability of over a longer period of time. This allowed for more and diverse crops to be grown per season and over larger areas of land. Some of the small dams have been dedicated to aquaculture, thus increasing water fish production. Community ownership and the potential sustainability of these infrastructural developments have been enhanced by a **top-up approach** in which communities contribute materially (See Figure 1).

Figure 1: Dam construction project

Dam construction for Climate Change Project

Implementing Agency: Akphiwat Neary Khmer Organization (ANKO-local NGO) cooperated with Commune Council – Kompong Por

Funding source: Swedish Government Fund (Sida)

Through: UNDP/SGP/CCSAP_15,349.49$

Matching Fund: Community saving fund_500$

Duration: 2012-2014

Organised groups at community level: These have been able to identify priorities, access climate investments from communes and embark on local adaptation initiatives. Group formation and development, coupled with capacity development, as well as support for formation of community based organisations (CBOs), are the two main strategies that have been employed to develop community solidarity and agency. CBOs are a particularly important generative tool for community empowerment in Cambodia as they can own assets such as land, fisheries, and forests, development five-year Community Management Plans and associated annual plans that can be funded by Development Partners and the Government's

Community Management Budget and access technical support from relevant departments in Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry (MAFF) and Ministry of Environment (MoE) such as Forestry, Fisheries, Agriculture, and Climate Change.[136] In addition:

"Community top-up or co-financing approach, in which communities contribute something to a project, has helped communities develop a sense of ownership and motivating them to look after project assets even after the end of the projects." (UNDP)

3.4 New and emerging obstacles

We identified the following new and emerging obstacles, some of which are also unintended negative consequences of Cambodia's progress in CCA and sustainable development over the last decade or so:

Low levels of synergy: The successful coordination role played by the two Ministries – of Environment, and Economy and Finance - appears to be facing new challenges, which are implied by the shift from working closely with 15 line Ministries to five, which include: (i) Education and Research, (ii) Public Works and Transport, (iii) Mines and Energy but exclude the Ministry of Agriculture, Forest and Fisheries and the Ministry of Water. This suggests that the silo mentality and habits, cultivated over years, may still be present. One interviewee observed that this is very different at commune level where farmers think system wide and attributed this regression to some Government institutions feeling that the champions who get receive the funds, attention and credit should do the work on their own – an isolation of the praised champions[137]. Another explanation provided during the evaluation was associated with the emergency of Ministry clusters. Part of the problem might lie in limited harmonisation of funding between donors from different parts of the world, which increases transaction costs and undermines synergy. For example, the Water Resources Department gets much

[136] Forum Syd, pers. comm., July 2019
[137] UN/FAO, pers. comm., July 2019

of its support from Korea and China while education and research get much support from Europe.

Inadequate practical research capacity: The main obstacle to a systems level integration of climate change education and development of multi-level competencies is associated with low literacy rates and lack of funds to support students to conduct practical research and degree programmes that are otherwise too discipline-based to address the nature of climate and development demands. On the other hand, college and university training have historically focused too much on generalists when there is need for specialists such as agronomists, plant pathologists, aquatic ecologists and plant breeders.

Language and access to international knowledge: Language is another constraint as Cambodians learn mostly learn in their Khmer language and are cut off from reading or contributing to international journals that tend to be in English or French publications:

"This insularity is undermining the science and technology development of Cambodia." (UN/FAO)

A local NGO leader echoed this statement in relation to fundraising:

"We face language limitations when we need to communicate with foreigners, including donors." (ANKO)

Western donor concerns about shrinking civic space: Most of Cambodia's climate finance comes from donors, who are now concerned about the restrictive effect of the NGO Law, absenting of independent media, the targeting of human rights defenders and the shrinking of democratic space, especially since the end of 2017 when the Supreme Court dissolved the main opposition party[138]. This has already resulted in many donors, including, USAID, the EU and its member states, South Korea and Australia to cut their development assistance. Even "Sweden, Cambodia's longest-standing Western donor, stopped new state-to-state development

[138] Human Rights Watch. (2018). Cambodia: Events of 2018. Retrieved from: https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2019/country-chapters/cambodia

aid, except in the areas of education and research[139]." This is likely to put a strain on the implementation of Climate Action Plans, which are already under-funded:

"Fifteen different national level agencies and ministries have developed sectoral Climate Change Plans ... Yet the vast majority of the actions recommended in these plans did not receive funding," [140]

Migration: Cambodia's rapid economic growth has resulted in notable livelihood improvements and transitions in agriculture. Examples include young men and women migrating from rural areas to join construction and garment industries in urban areas, and the mechanisation of agriculture[141]. Labour shortages in rural areas have created new challenges in agriculture and land use:

"Youth migration has encouraged the growing of crops that require less labour, such as non-edible cassava for industrial use… You can just plant it, go away and come back to harvest. In rice production, transplanting and post planting care has declined, thus affecting productivity. The other response has been mechanisation … Some farmers with 2 ha of land and own tractors. They are also used for other things such as logging, causing further problems." (UN/FAO)

"This risk of land degradation has been linked to lack of security of tenure." [142] *(See Section 2.2.2).*

Inadequate funding of local NGOs: Some **l**ocal NGOs view their capacity to mobilise donor resources for concrete CCA projects with communities as undermined by donor attitude and policies:

"Donors do not appear to trust Cambodian NGOs as they do now want to deal with us directly. They only provide funds through international and foreign bodies and in supporting the development of national policies than in supporting real resilience building and livelihood improvements on the ground. They do not have confidence in us." (ANKO)

[139] Human Rights Watch. (2018).
[140] Lake, E. (2019).
[141] World Bank. (2015).
[142] World Bank. (2015).

4. CCI's Cambodia contributions

CCI significantly contributed to two main long-term outcomes out of the ones identified in this evaluation, namely: (i) the development, mainstreaming and implementation of a nationally owned climate change agenda, and (ii) Cambodia's climate finance readiness.

4.1 Contribution to a nationally owned agenda

The following specific evidence from primary sources suggests that the CCI made a significant or leading contribution to this long-term contribution[143]:

"Sida has significantly contributed to Cambodia's building of a foundation to address climate change. It is a key Government partner in the environment and climate change sector that has provided high level policy support. It has also shifted away from project-focused support to programming support." (NCSD of the Ministry of the Environment)

The NCCC, through the CCCSP, also specifically acknowledges the contribution of Sida in the development of Cambodia's climate policy as reflected in the following statement:

"The development of the CCCSP was made possible with financial support from development partners, namely, the European Union, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)." [144]

We identified a number of factors that suggest plausible explanations of why CCI was able to make contributions of this significance:

Walking its talk on climate change matters: "Sweden's position on climate change, which comes across as genuine"[145]. This

[143] In both cases the references to Sida support are direct references to investments through CCI.
[144] National Climate Change Committee. (2013).
[145] UN/FAO, pers. comm., July 2019

quality of Sweden gave CCI the moral force or credibility to have its voice listened to.

Being the leading EU donor on decentralisation: Sweden's contribution to the mainstreaming and vertical integration of climate change is partly attributed to its being a leading donor on decentralisation support [146], and being, alongside ADB, the European lead partner for policy dialogue with the RGC on decentralisation and deconcentration [147]. The significance of Sweden's contribution to decentralisation is partly reflected in its support for the piloting of Community/Sangkat Fund (CSF) to support local governance and development in 1996, and investment in the subsequent scaling and institutionalisation of the CSF across the nation, covering over 1,600 communes during the 2000s[148]. Between 2002 and 2010, the United Kingdom and UNDP joined Sweden to contribute 20 percent of the CSF funding with RGC remaining providing 80 percent during and 100 percent from 2011 onwards[149], thus embedding the mechanism. National and sub-national ownership are important elements of decentralisation.

Having a comparative advantage in, and mandate for, addressing governance issues: Sweden was selected to lead the decentralisation role among EU donors, not because it had invested the most resources in this sector, but because of its comparative advantage and track record, performance effectiveness and mandate in Cambodia[150].

Having a relatively small budget that suited low financial investments: Sida invested a good part of its climate funding into policy, research and capacity building, which received and required a relatively small amount of climate funding (4 percent of total funds between 2003 and 2013). This potentially explains why CCI work has been so visible even though its bilateral financial contribution in Cambodia was among the lowest compared to other bilateral donors in Cambodia.

[146] MFA, Government of Sweden. (2008).
[147] EU. (2014)..
[148] Yishay et al. (2019)
[149] Ibid.
[150] EU. (2014).

4.2 Contribution to finance readiness

Sweden (through CCI) contributed to Cambodia's climate finance readiness by being a leading donor (financially) among the four donors that invested in Cambodia's national climate fund, the CCCA TF Phase 1 (2010-2014) through which Cambodia developed firsthand experience in planning for and utilising multi-donor trust climate funds. By December 2012 at the end of CCI, Sweden had contributed the equivalent of USD3,977,518, which was the highest out of the total deposits (41.7 percent) of the USD9,546,369 combined investments. UNDP, the EU and Denmark had contributed 31.4 percent, 21 percent and 5.9 percent[151] respectively. The funds were invested in water, crop and livestock production, horticulture, aquaculture, post-harvest management, health and DRR[152]. This preparedness is likely to have contributed to Cambodia's ability to access Adaptation Funds. Furthermore, efforts to strengthen Cambodia's climate finance readiness extended beyond CCI, with Sweden, UNDP and the EU committing a combined total of USD12.9 million to CCCA TF Phase 2 (2014-2019)[153]. The combined support that Sweden and the other three donor partners provided to Cambodia during CCCATF phases 1 and 2 is likely to have resulted in Cambodia taking on the role of CCCA TF fund management from UNDP in 2019, and to the approval of its concept note to the Green Climate Fund (GCF). Accessing GCF funds will further strengthen Cambodia's ownership of its climate agenda as it will have wider latitude to decide on what to do with the funds.

We identified the following major plausible explanations behind CCI's significant contribution to this long-term outcome:

Being a leading investor in CCCA TF: The fact that, among four donors, Sweden invested over 40 percent of the national climate fund during the CCI period is likely to have made its contribution particularly significant. A related plausible explanation is Sweden's genuine interest in supporting partners to access climate

[151] CCCA. (2012).
[152] CCCA. (2014).
[153] Ministry of Environment. (2016).

finance, and to invest in developing their institutional and technical capacities. as shown in Mali through the Mali Climate Fund[154].

Being Cambodia's active partner in fiduciary management capacity: One of the major requirements for becoming climate finance ready is the ability to manage climate funds. Sweden through CCI helped Cambodia in this regard through participating in relevant financial and governance structures as reflected in the following statement: "Sweden supports governance and fiduciary management structures and process and provides support in tax, audits, statistics, conducting censuses, in arbitration and in the tribunal that deals with atrocities"[155]. These efforts have been sustained beyond CCI under the Partnership for Accountability and Transparency (PAT) Programme (2016), with expert support from Statistics Sweden, the Swedish Tax Agency, the Swedish National Audit Office and the Swedish Parliament's investigation service[156]. Sweden was also one of the donors that supported the development of the Climate Change Financing Framework CCFF (2014), which also enhanced Cambodia's climate finance readiness.

Being Cambodia's active partner on gender: Sweden strengthened Cambodia's integration of gender in climate change programming, which is required for accessing both AF and GCF resources. CCI contributed to this through developing, implementing and sharing Gender Equality Strategy pilot projects of the Cambodia Community Based Adaptation Programme and by supporting the development of the Cambodia Gender Action Plan (Personal communication, UNDP, July 2019). This has been enabled by Sweden's focus in Cambodia, which includes democracy, gender equality, human rights and freedom of expression[157]. It is rooted in its feminist foreign policy, which emphasizes peace, justice, human development and respect for human rights and connections between climate change, poverty reduction and women's rights.[158]

[154] Mukute, M. (2019).
[155] Johanna Palmberg, pers. comm., July 2019
[156] Sida. (2017).
[157] Sida. (2017).
[158] Hultgard, A. M. (2015).

These CCI outcomes and their explanations suggest that Principle 2: *The Swedish contributions should have a tangible added value*, was observed and that the outcomes were experiences across sectors, which is consistent with Principle 6: *Sustainable adaptation to climate change requires that the climate perspective is integrated into the countries' own development strategies. Central areas are water-and land-use in urban as well as rural areas.*

4.3 CCI interventions and outputs

The Sida categories into which CCI made investments are: (i) climate change policy and administration, (ii) training and awareness, (iii) resilience building, and (iv) climate funds. These were implemented through the following four projects, which were implemented through: (i) CCCA – a multi-stakeholder national structure, (ii) NCDD Secretariat – a local government structure responsible for decentralisation, (iii) UNDP – a United Nations body with experience in environment and climate finance management and programming, and (iv) Forum Syd, with experience in sub-grant administration and programme work in democracy, gender equality, environment and climate change. The investments were made after receipt of the Commission on Climate Change and Development's (CCCD) recommendations following a situational analysis visit to Cambodia. Table 3 below summarises the CCI interventions in Cambodia by project/programme and the associated outputs[159], which contributed to the two major outcomes described above (Sections 4.2 and 4.3).

Table 3: CCI-supported projects/programmes in Cambodia and associated outputs

CCI investment and programme	Outputs generated by end of 2012

[159] Sida. (2013).

Cambodia Climate Change Alliance (CCCA): 27 MSEK	Increased capacity and enhanced systems and structures at the Ministry of Environment through the establishment of a multi-donor trust fund and a fund secretariat. Inspired 9 line ministries to integrate climate change in their sector plans and programmes (scheduled to begin in 2013). The fund enabled the development and implementation of 19 pilot CCA projects whose results were to be fed into the programme. Integration of climate change in formal and non-formal education, and in the national curricula. The development of the *Climate Change Financing Framework*.
Joint Climate Change Initiative of Capacity Development of Cambodian NGOs (implemented by Forum Syd/Cord/DCA): 11.2 MSEK	21 local NGO partner organisations enhanced their practice capacity and knowledge of climate change and disaster prevention with a strong rights perspective. Partners' strategic plans and programmes integrated climate change, local organisations developed climate change plans and advocated for the advocating integration of climate change issues into local development plans at the municipal level. Established a functional NGO learning and knowledge platform on climate change.
Cambodia Community-based Adaptation Programme (implemented by UNDP): 17.3 MSEK	41 local NGOs/CBOs were strengthened in knowledge of climate change and ability to identify vulnerable groups. 96 municipalities participated in the implementation of adaptation measures and 69 municipalities integrated adaptation in their municipal development/investment plans. 628 local communities participated in the implementation of adaptation measures with over 60,000 farmers benefitting from the rehabilitation of small-scale irrigation systems and local dams. 69 functioning water user groups for the sustainable management of irrigation systems and dams. A gender equality strategy was developed and integrated in the pilot projects, including in the tool for vulnerability assessment and women assumed leadership positions in adaptation projects.
Local Governments Climate Change (implemented by NCDD-S and UN Capital Development Fund): 4.5 MSEK	Increased capacity of the local communities, local and regional authorities to identify priorities and co-finance investments for local adaptation projects. Phase II sought to learn more about how climate change adaptation can be integrated into the decentralisation reform.

CCI's areas of intervention and associated outputs suggest that CCI Principle 5: The allocation should reflect the ongoing work of the Commission on Climate Change and Development (CCCD), which recommended the use of climate finance for context-specific issues; integration of environment, development, climate change adaptation (CCA), mitigation, disaster risk reduction, poverty alleviation and governance and Principle 7: A proportion of the Swedish contributions should focus on disaster risk reduction as an integral part of climate adaptation, were observed. The policy development and decentralisation projects through CCCA and NCDD respectively were particularly important in the observation of Principle 3: Contributions should work towards the implementation of the Paris agenda principles on aid effectiveness, which encourages aligning aid to national priorities and processes in developing countries and enhancing national ownership. However, we could not find evidence to suggest significant observation of the following elements of the Paris Agenda Principles on Aid Effectiveness: (i) donor agencies harmonise and coordinate development aid, (ii) both donors and recipients manage for results, and (iii) mutual accountability.

5. Conclusion and lessons ahead

5.1 Conclusion

The evaluation findings discussed in the preceding chapters suggest that CCI made good progress towards achieving its goal in Cambodia. The systems-based evaluation also shows that there were many bilateral and several multilateral donors whose investments also contributed to the long-term outcomes that were selected as the focus of this evaluation. The findings also help us conclude that the CCI principles were observed to a large extent, though implicitly. We also noted, with interest, that other bilateral donors operating in Cambodia, notably Denmark and the EU have similar climate investment and programming principles[160]'[161]. Similarly, Cambodia's Climate Change Strategic Plan is guided by a set of guiding principles[162]. From this, we concluded that CCI and other climate investment and programming principles may have influenced Cambodia to develop their own. In addition, we conclude that there ought to be a good reason for donor and developing countries to be adopting such principles, and in line with this suggest that it is important to articulate and be guided by good norms when deciding on and implementing climate investments and programmes[163].

A systems-based evaluation approach helped us reveal how bigger forces such as high politics can work against the embedding of innovative ideas and practices on democracy at systemic level. It enabled us to identify outcomes that mattered to key stakeholders in climate change adaptation in Cambodia beyond those specific to CCI. The identified system-level outcomes are:

- Enhanced national capacity to understand and respond to climate change impact,

[160] DANIDA. (2016).
[161] EU. (2014).
[162] National Climate Change Committee. (2013). pp. 3-4.
[163] *See for example:* Schlatek, L. & Bird, N. (2017).

- Coordinated development and mainstreaming of a nationally owned climate change agenda,
- Contributed to the development of Cambodia's readiness for larger climate finances,
- Improved livelihoods and reduction of community vulnerability to climate change,
- Conserved and restored ecosystems and biodiversity in project areas,
- Enhanced community solidarity and agency, and
- Enhanced civil society development and opened democratic space.

In addition, we found the use of a family of system and outcome harvesting-based, and learning-oriented evaluation approaches helpful in revealing potentially important causal issues and catalytic mechanisms that exist within and outside the complex adaptive system under review. For example, we saw how some non-climate finance investments made by Sweden outside CCI, also contributed towards the realisation of identified outcomes. These include investments in education and research, in fiduciary management and in governance systems and structures beyond the sectors directly participating in environment and climate change matters. Along the same vein, the evaluation approached revealed that non-climatic issues such as electoral and media practices, can affect climate investments. This in turn impacts on climate programming and adaptation processes and results on the ground. Beyond this, the evaluation approach identified several structural and conceptual tools that are effective for understanding and transforming climate vulnerability and risk.

The outcome harvesting approach was helpful in obtaining a systems-perspective of the multiple actors and factors that contributed to changes beyond the intervention under review. Using an outcomes-based approach, which emphasizes the participation of those running and benefitting from the intervention under review, helped extend the utilization-focused approach by including the sense-making process and deliberately involving beneficiaries.

Its interest in change processes enabled the surfacing of generative mechanisms that accelerated change processes, and a stronger presence of beneficiary voices that are normally excluded from intended users in a utilisation-focused approach. Its feminist concept of power directed our attention to matters of power, its distribution and explanations behind it in relation to CCA and related change processes in Cambodia. An outcomes-based approach is therefore important when there is need for: (i) using a systems perspective to understand change, (ii) contribution analysis, (iii) making the voices and perspectives of the intended users and beneficiaries count, (iv) understanding change processes, and (v) appreciating power and power relations in the system under review.

5.2 Emerging insights on systemic change

Below we describe the main evaluation insights, which could be relevant to Sweden's future climate financing and programming.

5.2.1 Donor's credibility enhances impact

This evaluation suggests that generation of climate financing impact is not just a function of how much funding is invested. It also depends on the quality and relevance of the donor's input which accompanies the funding. This is reflected in the kinds of outcome contributions that Sweden is valued for in Cambodia and tied to the EU's criteria for dividing lead roles among its 10 members operating in Cambodia. These criteria include: (i) the donor's comparative advantage regarding expertise and experience, (ii) the effectiveness of development cooperation to date, (iii) the donor's mandate, and (iv) the potential impact of the donor's assistance as a catalyst for other sources of finance. In addition, and equally important, is the credibility of the donor's position and advice in relation to its practice at home and internationally. This was reflected in conversations about why Cambodia finds it worthwhile to consider Swedish advice on climate change policy. These considerations of comparative advantage also explain why the Swedish Embassy in Cambodia, which did not have an environment and climate change

expert until late 2018, could not have taken a leading role in this sector among EU donors (as it did in Mali). The essence of this insight is that appropriate climate change institutional, technical and moral capacities are critical success factors for climate financing effectiveness.

5.2.2 Championing rather than champions

The approach to addressing climate change issues in Cambodia, through which collective climate change efforts by 15 line-ministries and agencies are led and coordinated by two ministries (the champions) appears to have worked well for some time. But the recent focus of about a third of these ministries and agencies, which excludes some key ministries that are responsible for climate change vulnerable resources such as water and land, raises concern. One interviewee suggested that these fewer ministries are the more positive about the collaborative work arrangements while another indicated that some of those that are no longer active are saying, "They are the champions. They have the money. Let them do the adaptation work." It is against this background that we draw the insight that climate programming should shift focus from the champions to the entire activity system of championing climate change adaptation, which pays attention to the champions, their community of practice, the rules and conceptual tools that guide their relationships, and the division of labour. This insight resonates with a point made during the 2013 Cambodia National Forum on Climate Change:

"Effective climate change mainstreaming requires an adequate balance between "decentralised" process (with line ministries in the lead to ensure strong ownership and linkages between sector strategies and climate actions), and inputs from the central climate change institution (to provide minimum standards, ensure quality of assumptions about climate change impacts, as well as cross-sectoral cooperation and the coherence of the overall planning process)." [164]

[164] National Forum on Climate Change. (2013). p. 3.

5.2.3 Capacity development and systemic changes

One of the most enduring impacts of CCI was its contribution to Cambodia's climate change strategy, gender strategy, NDC, climate finance monitoring and evaluation framework. Their translation into practice came about through adaptation programmes supported by Sweden and other donors. For example, the climate change strategy was also integrated into the strategies of several line ministries and into national strategic plans thus influencing system-level change. Institutional capacity development also enhanced NCSD capacity and credibility at international levels. These processes and products contributed to Cambodia's capacity to own the climate agenda at local to national levels while at the same time enhancing institutional capacities to develop and implement policies. This was augmented by the strengthening of climate governance systems operating at national level such as NCSD, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Finance, the National Climate Fund and the NGO Forum; and at subnational levels through NCDD. These national and sub-national mechanisms were able to translate climate and related policies into provinces, districts and communes and strengthen climate finance governance. The high-profile nature of CCI's investments in policy and climate governance systems at multiple scales made them visible. NCCD played a critical role of linking the national and sub-national level and therefore was a critical and enabling meso-level mechanism.

5.2.4 Generative research, decisions and action

Cambodia has used some research, decision-making and action tools effectively towards CCA. We identified three kinds of tools: conceptual, institutional and material. Conceptual research tools such as the Vulnerability and Risk Assessment tools were used to generate comprehensive data for making the right decisions and target the right groups of people, land and water ecosystems. Study findings also inform national policies and strategies such as the CCCSP, NDC and Green Growth Policy and local adaptation and plans. The research products and policies work better when they are collaboratively developed and implemented. Effective national

decision-making institutional mechanisms include the inter-ministerial Cambodia Climate Change Alliance and the National Commission on Sustainable Development. CBOs have been one of the most effective institutional mechanisms to drive the climate agenda locally. Material tools include irrigation and aquaculture infrastructure. Generative tools from an ecosystem perspective refer to the ones that generate ecosystem services. In Cambodia, these have included fish conservation areas and forest conservation areas, which conserve biodiversity and increase carbon sequestration capacity. This insight suggests that it is important to invest climate finance promoting the development and use of quality research, decision-making and good/best/emergent practice tools and mechanisms.

5.2.5 Adaptation and change at community level

Some forms of community capital appear to have a generative or ripple effect in a particular context. In the case of Cambodia, where there is high rainfall, periodic floods and droughts, high dependence of rain-fed agriculture, fishing and fisheries and forestry and low technical knowledge of land use, investments in three forms of capital (physical, human and social/political) have been generative. Physical capital in the form of water harvesting pools, small dams and irrigation systems increased availability of water for agriculture, livestock, fish production and domestic use, thus reducing drudgery for women and increasing food, income and employment opportunities for youth. Human capital, developed through community awareness and training on climate change and climate change responses, helped community members to understand climate change and adjust their ways of earning a living and looking after their land and water resources. Through forming local groups and CBOs, villagers mobilised both social and political capital by organising themselves to access power and power brokers and to get other resources (financial and infrastructural) from donors and local authorities; and to own and control natural resources. This insight suggests that identifying and utilising the most potent community resources to invest in, can accelerate CCA development at household and community (systemic) levels.

References

ADB. (2002). *Impact of Rural roads on Poverty Reduction: A Case Study-Based Analysis*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: ADB.

ADB. (2011). Civil society briefs, Cambodia. Publication Stock No. ARM113342

Am, P., Caccillato, E., Nkem, J., & Chellivard, J. (2013). *Mainstreaming climate resilience into development planning in Cambodia.* London, UK: IIED.

Andersen, H., Larsson, K. L., & Öjendal, J. (2019). Supporting state-building for democratisation? A study of 20 years of Swedish democracy aid to Cambodia. Stockholm, Sweden: EBA.

Ashley Halls and Matthew Johns. 2013. 'Assessment of the vulnerability of the Mekong Delta Pangasius catfish industry to development and climate change in the Lower Mekong Basin.'

Baker, J. & Milne, S. (2018). Cambodia's anti-corruption regime 2008-2018: A critical political economy approach. U4 Issue 2019:1. Oslo, Norway: CMI.

Beaulieu, L. J. B. (2014). Promoting community vitality and sustainability: The community capitals framework. Purdue University.

Bernhard, R. & Sokhai, N. (2016). *Climate finance readiness (CFR) programme: Support to the National Adaptation Plan Process in Cambodia.* Phnom Penh, Cambodia: GIZ & USAID.

Bird, N., Cao, Y. & Quevedo, A. (2019). *Transformational change in the Climate Investment Funds: A synthesis of the evidence.* London, UK: ODI.

Bours, D., McGinn, C., & Pringle, P. (2014). *Guidance Notes 1: Twelve reasons why climate change adaptation M & E is challenging.* Phnom Penh, Cambodia/Oxford, UK: SEA Change CoP and UKCIP.

CCCA. (2012). *Cambodia Climate Change Alliance Annual Report 2012.* Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Ministry of Environment.

CCCA. (2014) *Climate change practice note: The factors of change.* Phnom Penh, Cambodia: CCCA.

CCCA. (2014). *Cambodia Climate Change Alliance Final Report.* Phnom Penh, Cambodia: CCCA.

CCCD (2009). *Closing the gaps: Disaster risk reduction and adaptation to climate change in developing countries.* Stockholm, Sweden: CCCD.

Cekan, J., Zivetz, L., Rogers, P. 2016. *Sustained and Emerging Impacts Evaluation*. BetterEvaluation. Retrieved 2nd April 2018 from http://betterevaluation.org/themes/SEIE

Chan, R. & Chheang, V. (2008). Cultural challenges to the decentralisation process in Cambodia. Retrieved from: https://www.apu.ac.jp/rcaps/uploads/fckeditor/publications/journal/RJAPS_V24_Rotha_Vannarith.pdf

Chazdon, S., Emery, M., Hansen, D., Higging, L. & Sero, R. (Eds.). (2017). *A field guide to ripple effects mapping.* Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Publishing.

Chhair, S. & Ung, L. (2016). *Cambodia's path to industrial development: Policies, lessons and opportunities. Retrieved* from: https://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198776987.001.0001/acprof-9780198776987-chapter-11

Climate Change Technical Team. (2014). Analysis and recommendations for a Cambodia climate change financing framework.

Colvin, J. & Mukute, M. (2017). *Transforming Systems of Governance in Ethiopia to Support Adaptive Capacity Development.* Impact evaluation of ACCRA Ethiopia phase 2. Oxford, UK: Oxfam GB.

Coninck, S. (2019). Ongoing process to Green Climate Fund accreditation in Cambodia, supported by UNCDF LoCAL. Phnom Penh: Cambodia, UNDF.

DANIDA. (2016). *Guiding principles for the Danish climate envelope.* Copenhagen, Denmark: Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Energy, Utilities and Climate.

Daze, A., Ravesloot, T., & TANGO International (2013). Cambodia, environmental and climate change assessment: Preparation for IFAD's country strategic plan opportunities programme (2013-2018). Phnom Penh: Cambodia, IFAD.

De Coninck, S. (2019). The ongoing process to Green Climate Fund accreditation in Cambodia, supported by UNCDF LoCAL. Retrieved from: https://www.uncdf.org/article/4682/an-ongoing-process-to-green-climate-fund-accreditation-in-cambodia-supported-by-uncdf-loc

Dhiaulhag, A., Yasmi, Y., Gritten, D., Kelley, L. & Chandet, H. (not dated). Land grabbing and forest conflict in Cambodia: Implications for community and sustainable forest management. Retrieved from: https://www.iufro.org/download/file/27949/6596/ws32-PII_ch11_Cambodia_pdf/

Diepart, J. C. (2015). The fragmentation of land tenure system in Cambodia: Peasants and the formalization of land rights. Paper presented at the Technical Committee on Land Tenure and Development meeting held in Paris on 7 April 2015.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Learning by expanding: An activity theoretical approach to developmental research (2nd ed.)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

EU. (2014). *European development cooperation strategy for Cambodia 2014-2018*. Brussels, Belgium: EU.

Finscope survey 2016. http://www.finmark.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/finscope-cambodia-agriculture.pdf

Flora, C.B. & Flora, J.L. (2008). Rural Communities: Legacy and Change (3rd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Forum Syd, pers. comm., July 2019

Gearty, M. & Colvin, J. (2015). *Ethiopia's climate resilient green economy, 2009–2015: A learning history*. Unpublished report. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Global Green Growth Institute.

Hak, S., McAndrew, J. & Neef, A. (2018). Impact of Government policies on corporate land grabs on indigenous people's access to common lands and livelihood resilience in the Northeast Cambodia. *Land 7*(122), 1-20.

Heider, C. (2017). *Rethinking evaluations*. Washington DC, US: Independent Evaluation Group.

Holligan, J. & Abdulhak, T. (2011). *Overview of Cambodian history, governance and legal sources*. Retrieved from: https://www.nyulawglobal.org/globalex/Cambodia.html

http://www.mekongwatch.org/index.html

Hultgard, A. M. (2015). Sweden's goal of promoting equality: Letter to the editor. Retrieved from: https://www.phnompenhpost.com/opinion/swedens-goal-promoting-equality

Human Rights Watch. (2018). Cambodia: Events of 2018. Retrieved from: https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2019/country-chapters/cambodia

Ido, A. (2019). The effect of social capital on collective action in community forest management in Cambodia. *International Journal of the Commons,* 13(1), 777-803.

Itad, Ross Strategic & ICF. (2019). Final Evaluation Report: Evaluation of transformational change in the Climate Investment Funds. Itad, London: UK.

Johanna Palmberg, per. comm., July 2019

Ker, S. (2018). Civil society in Cambodia. Retrieved from: https://www.civilsocietyacademy.org/single-post/civil-society-in-cambodia

Kiguchi, Y. (2016). Impacts of dam construction on the Mekong: Experience of the Mun River. Retrieved from:

Krajnovic, M. (2015) Cambodia's shrinking space for civil society and the role of donors. Retrieved from: https://www.chemonics.com/blog/cambodias-shrinking-space-for-civil-society-and-the-role-of-donors/

Kurien, J., (2017). Community fisheries organisations of Cambodia: Sharing lessons learned in the context of the SSF Guidelines. *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Circular 1138*. Rome, Italy: FAO.

Lake, E. (2019). Cambodia strives for ownership of their GCF-NAP process. Retrieved from: https://www.globalsupportprogramme.org/cambodia-strives-ownership-their-gcf-nap-process

MAFF 2017. *Annual Report for Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries 2016–2017*. Retrieved from: http://www.twgaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/2017_MAFF-Annual-Report-2016-2017-_En.pdf

MAFF. (2011). *Strategic planning framework for fisheries (2010-2019): Fishing for the future*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia, MAFF.

Mayne, J. (2008). *Contribution Analysis: an approach to exploring cause and effect*. ILAC Brief 16. Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative (CGIAR).

McHanon, D. & Ley, K. (not dated). *Political economy analysis of civic space in Cambodia: Challenges and opportunities for active citizenship*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Oxfam.

McSweeney, C., New, M., & Lizcanol, G. (2009). *UNDP Climate Change Country Profiles Cambodia*. Retrieved from: http://country-profiles.geog.ox.ac.uk

MFA, Government of Sweden. (2008). *Cooperation strategy for development cooperation with Cambodia, 2008–2010*. Stockholm, Sweden: MFA.

Ministry of Environment. (2016). *Climate Change Action Plan (2016-2018)*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Ministry of Environment.

Ministry of Environment. (2011). *Adaptation Fund: Proposal for Cambodia*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Ministry of Environment.

MoE. (2018). *Cambodia forest cover 2016*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: MoE.

Mukute M., Colvin, J., & Baloi, A. (2017). *Africa Climate Change Alliance Resilience, Phase 2: Synthesis evaluation final report.* Oxford, UK: Oxfam GB.

Mukute, M. (2019). *Evaluation of the Swedish Climate Change Initiative (2009-2012): Bilateral portfolio analysis report.* Unpublished report.

Mukute, M. (2019). *Evaluation of the Swedish Climate Change Initiative 2009 – 2012: Mali deep-dive case study report.* Unpublished draft report.

National Bank of Cambodia. (2015). Cambodia Balance of Payments. *Statistics Bulletin – Series No. 50, Fourth Quarter 2015*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: National Bank of Cambodia, Royal Government.

National Climate Change Committee. (2013). *Cambodia Climate Change Strategic Plan (2014-2023).* Phnom Penh, Cambodia. National Climate Change Committee.

National Committee for Disaster Management and Ministry of Planning. (2008). *Strategic National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction 2008-2103.* Phnom Penh, Cambodia. National Committee for Disaster Management and Ministry of Planning.

National Forum on Climate Change. (2013). Third National Forum on Climate Change: Cambodia getting ready for a full-scale climate change response – summary of proceedings of the meeting held at Peace Palace, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 5-7 November 2013.

NCSD, Ministry of Environment, pers. comm., July 2019

Nilsson, L. (2013). Synthesis report: Swedish Special Climate Change Initiative 2009-2012. Stockholm, Sweden: MFA.

OECD (2010) *Evaluating Development Cooperation: Summary of Key Norms and Standards (2nd ed.).* Paris, France: OECD.

OECD (2017). *Social Protection System Review of Cambodia*, OECD Development Pathways. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264282285-en

OECD/CDRI. (2017). *Interrelations between Public Policies, Migration and Development in Cambodia*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264273634-en

Oudry, G., Pak, K., & Chea, C. (2016). Assessing Vulnerabilities and Responses to Environmental Changes in Cambodia. Phnom Penh: Cambodia, International Organization for Migration.

Patton, M. Q. (2012). A utilisation-focused approach to contribution analysis. *Evaluation 18*(3), 364-377.

Phala, C., Sarin, T., Suvedi, M., & Ghimire, R. (2019). Assessment of community fish refuge management practice in the Siem Reap Province of Cambodia. *Environments* 6, 1-11.

RGC. (2015). *Cambodia's Intended Nationally Determined Contribution.* Phnom Penh, Cambodia: RGC. p. 2.

Royal Government of Cambodia. *National Strategic Development Plan 2014–2018*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Royal Government of Cambodia, 2014. p. 24.

Salamanca, A. (2016). *Climate change readiness in the ASEAN countries: Discussion Paper.* Bangkok, Thailand: Stockholm Environment Institute – Asia.

Schlatek, L. & Bird, N. (2017). *The Principles and Criteria of Public Climate Finance – A Normative Framework.* London: ODI.

Sida, personal comm., January 2019

Sida. (2017). Our work in Cambodia. Retrieved from: https://www.sida.se/English/where-we-work/Asia/Cambodia/Our-work-in-Cambodia/

Sida. (2013). Final report on the Swedish Government's Special Climate Change Initiative 2009-2012: Bilateral and regional interventions: Case number 2008-002362. Stockholm, Sweden: Sida.

Simister, N. (2019). *Complex M & E systems: Raising the standards, lowering the bar.* INTRAC Praxis Series Paper 6.

Simpson, V. & Souter N. J. (2017). Editorial: The future of payments for ecosystem services in Cambodia. *Cambodian Journal of Natural History 1*, 1-3.

Sithirith, M. (2015). The governance of wetlands in the Tonle Sap Lake, Cambodia. *Journal of Environmental Science and Engineering B4*(2015), 331-346.

Smith, S. W. D. (2012). The impact of continued Mekong hydropower development on local livelihoods. *Consilience: The Journal of Sustainable Development* 7(1), 73-76.

Sok Chan 2017. Report says farming workforce halved. Khmer Times, 15 June: Retrieved from: http://www.khmertimeskh.com/news/39336//

Spearman, M. and McGray, H. (2011) *Making adaptation count: Concepts and options for monitoring and evaluation of climate change adaptation.* GIZ, BMZ, & WRI. Retrieved from: www.seachangecop.org/node/107 p. 10.

Sum. T. (2017). *Cambodia's experience in managing climate finance at national level.* Paper presented at the Regional NAP Expo for Asia 11-12 September 2017, Seoul, Republic of Korea.

Swedish Embassy, pers. comm., July 2019

TANGO. (2018). Final report: Overall evaluation of the Adaptation Fund. Tucson, USA: TANGO.

The NGO Forum on Cambodia. (2014). Climate change financing in Cambodia. News Briefs. Phnom Penh, Cambodia, The NGO Forum on Cambodia.

Through CCI Sweden contributed to two of the funds under the CIF that invested in Cambodia – the FIP and the SREP.

UN/FAO, pers. comm., July 2019

UNDP. (2014). Competitiveness and linkages in Cambodia's manufacturing sector. *Discussion Paper*, No. 12. New York, US: United Nations Development Programme.

Vathana, L. (2018). *Current impacts of climate change on water resources in Cambodia: Challenges from floods and droughts. Phnom* Penh, Cambodia: Parliamentary Institute of Cambodia.

Wilson-Grau, R (2015). *Outcome Harvesting. Better Evaluation.* Retrieved from: http://betterevaluation.org/plan/approach/outcome_harvesting

Wingqvist, G. Ö., César, E., & von Walter, S. (2013). *Categorisation of bilateral and regional contributions in the Climate Change Initiative.* Retrieved from: https://sidaenvironmenthelpdesk.gu.se/our-work-publications/reports

World Bank 2016. *Cambodia Economic Update* October 2016. http://gs.mef.gov.kh/contents/uploads/2016/10/October-2016-Cambodia-Economic-Update-Oct-10-2016-final.pdf

World Bank (2018). Retrieved from: http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NV.AGR.TOTL.ZS?locations=KH

World Bank. (2015). *Adapting to stay competitive: Cambodian agriculture in transitions – opportunities and risks.* Phnom Penh, Cambodia: World Bank.

World Bank. (2015). *Cambodian agriculture in transition: opportunities and risks.* Washington DC, US: World Bank.

World Bank. (2017). Cambodia: Sustaining strong growth for the benefit of all. Washington DC, USA: World Bank. Retrieved from: https://hubs.worldbank.org/docs/imagebank/pages/docprofile.aspx?nodeid=27520556

World Bank. 'Cambodia Overview.' Retrieved from: http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/cambodia/overview.

WorldFish Center. 'Cambodia.' http://www.worldfishcenter.org/content/cambodia

Yishay, A. B., Parks, B., Trichler, R., Baehr, c., Aboagye, D. & Prum, P. (2019), *Building on a Foundation Stone: The Long-Term Impacts of a Local Infrastructure and Governance Program in Cambodia*. EBA Report 2019:04, The Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA), Sweden.

Appendix 1

List of evaluation participants

Organisation	No. of evaluation participants
National Council for Sustainable Development (NCSD) of Ministry of Environment	3
National Committee for Democratic Development, Ministry of Interior	2
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	2
Swedish Embassy, Phnom Penh	1
Sida, former personnel in the region	2
Forum Syd	1
United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (UN/FAO)	1
Akphiwat Neary Khmer Organization (ANKO), Pursat Province	12
Action for Khmer Aid Service (AKAS), Battambang province	3
Total	27

Appendix 2

Differences between the bilateral and multilateral case study reports on Cambodia

There are several similarities between the Cambodia bilateral and multilateral reports, especially in terms of the challenges being faced. However, there are also differences, the main one being that the bilateral report is more optimistic about CCI's contribution while the multilateral report reveals cautionary evidence and pathways to maladaptation.

We trace these differences to:

(i) delivery mechanisms used by the two portfolios,

(ii) the experiences and perspectives of the people we spoke to beyond national government key informants, and

(iii) the combination of data generation methods we used.

Bilateral investments made at ground level were delivered through NGOs that worked with UNDP and Forum Syd. These institutions appear to have made a strong contribution towards helping communities they worked with make progress towards adaptation and resilience building. This is reflected in the data generated from government, UN bodies (UNDP and FAO), Forum Syd and the local organisations and communities visited.

Multilateral investments on the other hand were delivered through federal, district and local government. The interest of local government appears to have been more about increasing government power over the communities than on adaptation and resilience building. This is the picture that emerged from the ground and is consistent with Sweden's decision not to invest funds in local government.

The findings in the bilateral report were the result of drawing on the change processes and mechanisms as revealed through the

combined use of learning history, expansive learning, theory of change and outcome harvesting (feminist).

The multilateral AF case study used process tracing by centering itself on outcomes as experienced by the local forest communities and afterwards comparing these outcomes with project reports and AF data. Care was taken to desist from using secondary data as a starting point, instead field visits, local perspectives, personal observations and political country context were used to build up layers of varied and contradictory perspectives.

Previous EBA reports

2020:01 Mobilizing *Private Development Finance: Implications for Overall Aid Allocations*, Polly Meeks, Matthew Gouett and Samantha Attridge

2019:09 *Democracy in African Governance: Seeing and Doing it Differently,* Göran Hydén with assistance from Maria Buch Kristensen

2019:08 *Fishing Aid - Mapping and Synthesising Evidence in Support of SDG 14 Fisheries Targets,* Gonçalo Carneiro, Raphaëlle Bisiaux, Mary Frances Davidson, Tumi Tómasson with Jonas Bjärnstedt

2019:07 *Applying a Masculinities Lens to the Gendered Impacts of Social Safety Nets*, Meagan Dooley, Abby Fried, Ruti Levtov, Kate Doyle, Jeni Klugman and Gary Barker

2019:06 *Joint Nordic Organisational Assessment of the Nordic Development Fund (NDF)*, Stephen Spratt, Eilís Lawlor, Kris Prasada Rao and Mira Berger

2019:05 *Impact of Civil Society Anti-Discrimination Initiatives: A Rapid Review*, Rachel Marcus, Dhruva Mathur and Andrew Shepherd

2019:August *Migration and Development: the Role for Development Aid*, Robert E.B. Lucas (joint with the Migration Studies Delegation, Delmi, published as Delmi Research overview 2019:5)

2019:04 *Building on a Foundation Stone: the Long-Term Impacts of a Local Infrastructure and Governance Program in Cambodia*, Ariel BenYishay, Brad Parks, Rachel Trichler, Christian Baehr, Daniel Aboagye and Punwath Prum

2019:03 *Supporting State Building for Democratisation? A Study of 20 years of Swedish Democracy Aid to Cambodia,* Henny Andersen, Karl-Anders Larsson och Joakim Öjendal

2019:02 *Fit for Fragility? An Exploration of Risk Stakeholders and Systems Inside Sida*, Nilima Gulrajani and Linnea Mills

2019:01 *Skandaler, opinioner och anseende: Biståndet i ett medialiserat samhälle*, Maria Grafström och Karolina Windell

2018:10 *Nation Building in a Fractured Country: An Evaluation of Swedish Cooperation in Economic Development with Bosnia and Herzegovina 1995 – 2018*, Claes Lindahl, Julie Lindahl, Mikael Söderbäck and Tamara Ivankovic

2018:09 *Underfunded Appeals: Understanding the Consequences, Improving the System,* Sophia Swithern

2018:08 *Seeking Balanced Ownership in Changing Development Cooperation Relationships*, Nils Keizer, Stephan Klingebiel, Charlotte Örnemark, Fabian Scholtes

2018:07 *Putting Priority into Practice: Sida's Implementation of its Plan for Gender Integration*, Elin Bjarnegård, Fredrik Uggla

2018:06 *Swedish Aid in the Era of Shrinking Space – the Case of Turkey*, Åsa Eldén, Paul T. Levin

2018:05 *Who Makes the Decision on Swedish Aid Funding? An Overview*, Expertgruppen för Biståndsanalys

2018:04 *Budget Support, Poverty and Corruption: A Review of the Evidence*, Geske Dijkstra

2018:03 *How predictable is Swedish aid? A study of exchange rate volatility,* Númi Östlund

2018:02 *Building Bridges Between International Humanitarian and Development Responses to Forced Migration*, Alexander Kocks, Ruben Wedel, Hanne Roggemann, Helge Roxin (joint with the German Institute for Development Evaluation, DEval)

2018:01 *DFIs and Development Impact: an evaluation of Swedfund,* Stephen Spratt, Peter O'Flynn, Justin Flynn

2017:12 *Livslängd och livskraft: Vad säger utvärderingar om svenska biståndsinsatsers hållbarhet?* Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys

2017:11 *Sweden's Financing of UN Funds and Programmes: Analyzing the Past, Looking to the Future*, Stephen Browne, Nina Connelly, Thomas G. Weiss

2017:10 *Seven Steps to Evidence-Based Anticorruption: A Roadmap*, Alina Mungiu-Pippidi

2017:09 *Geospatial analysis of aid: A new approach to aid evaluation*, Ann-Sofie Isaksson

2017:08 *Research capacity in the new global development agenda*, Måns Fellesson

2017:07 *Research Aid Revisited – a historically grounded analysis of future prospects and policy options*, David Nilsson, Sverker Sörlin

2017:06 *Confronting the Contradiction – An exploration into the dual purpose of accountability and learning in aid evaluation*, Hilde Reinertsen, Kristian Bjørkdahl, Desmond McNeill

2017:05 *Local peacebuilding – challenges and opportunities*, Joakim Öjendal, Hanna Leonardsson, Martin Lundqvist

2017:04 *Enprocentmålet – en kritisk essä*, Lars Anell

2017:03 *Animal health in development – it's role for poverty reduction and human welfare,* Jonathan Rushton, Arvid Uggla, Ulf Magnusson

2017:02 *Do Anti-Discrimination Measures Reduce Poverty Among Marginalised Social Groups?* Rachel Marcus, Anna Mdee, Ella Page

2017:01 *Making Waves: Implications of the irregular migration and refugee situation on Official Development Assistance spending and practices in Europe*, Anna Knoll, Andrew Sherriff

2016:11 *Revitalising the policy for global development,* Per Molander

2016:10 *Swedish Development Cooperation with Tanzania – Has It Helped the Poor?,* Mark McGillivray, David Carpenter, Oliver Morrissey, Julie Thaarup

2016:09 *Exploring Donorship – Internal Factors in Swedish Aid to Uganda,* Stein-Erik Kruse

2016:08, *Sustaining a development policy: results and responsibility for the Swedish policy for global development* Måns Fellesson, Lisa Román

2016:07 *Towards an Alternative Development Management Paradigm?* Cathy Shutt

2016:06 *Vem beslutar om svenska biståndsmedel? En översikt,* Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys

2016:05 *Pathways to change: Evaluating development interventions with Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA),* Barbara Befani

2016:04 *Swedish responsibility and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals,* Magdalena Bexell, Kristina Jönsson

2016:03 *Capturing complexity and context: evaluating aid to education,* Joel Samoff, Jane Leer, Michelle Reddy

2016:02 *Education in developing countries what policies and programmes affect learning and time in school?* Amy Damon, Paul Glewwe, Suzanne Wisniewski, Bixuan Sun

2016:01 *Support to regional cooperation and integration in Africa – what works and why?* Fredrik Söderbaum, Therese Brolin

2015:09 *In search of double dividends from climate change interventions evidence from forest conservation and household energy transitions,* G. Köhlin, S.K. Pattanayak, E. Sills, E. Mattsson, M. Ostwald, A. Salas, D. Ternald

2015:08 *Business and human rights in development cooperation – has Sweden incorporated the UN guiding principles?* Rasmus Klocker Larsen, Sandra Atler

2015:07 *Making development work: the quality of government approach,* Bo Rothstein and Marcus Tannenberg

2015:06 *Now open for business: joint development initiatives between the private and public sectors in development cooperation,* Sara Johansson de Silva, Ari Kokko and Hanna Norberg

2015:05 *Has Sweden injected realism into public financial management reforms in partner countries?* Matt Andrews

2015:04 *Youth, entrepreneurship and development*, Kjetil Bjorvatn

2015:03 *Concentration difficulties? An analysis of Swedish aid proliferation*, Rune Jansen Hagen

2015:02 *Utvärdering av svenskt bistånd – en kartläggning*, Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys

2015:01 *Rethinking Civil Society and Support for Democracy*, Richard Youngs

2014:05 *Svenskt statligt internationellt bistånd i Sverige: en översikt*, Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys

2014:04 *The African Development Bank: ready to face the challenges of a changing Africa?* Christopher Humphrey

2014:03 *International party assistance – what do we know about the effects?* Lars Svåsand

2014:02 *Sweden´s development assistance for health – policy options to support the global health 2035 goals,* Gavin Yamey, Helen Saxenian, Robert Hecht, Jesper Sundewall and Dean Jamison

2014:01 *Randomized controlled trials: strengths, weaknesses and policy relevance,* Anders Olofsgård

Swedish investment of the climate change initiative funds in Cambodia have led to positive outcomes. Examples include enhanced capacity at national level to respond to climate change in a coordinated way, and reduced community vulnerability at local level.

EBA
www.eba.se

Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys (EBA) är en statlig kommitté som oberoende analyserar och utvärderar svenskt internationellt bistånd.

The Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA) is a government committee with a mandate to independently analyse and evaluate Swedish international development aid.