Strengthening Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting (MAR) on Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) in Asia

(GCP/INT/988/JPN)

Final evaluation report

February 2011

Table of contents

I. Executive Summary (Main Findings and Recommendations)

Preface

The need to harmonise and improve reporting on forests has been recognized for many years. In the context of this project, COFO 2005 recommended strengthening FAO's technical assistance to countries in order to improve governance, reinforce institutional frameworks and activities in the collection, analysis and dissemination of relevant data. In response to this recommendation, the project Strengthening Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting (MAR) on Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) in Asia was funded with a budget of US$ 2,573,493 (original budget US$ 2,810,045) under the FAO/Government of Japan Cooperative Programme, and was implemented between April 2006 and December 2010.

In 2010 FAO organized the final independent evaluation of the project. The mission was composed of Mr. Giuliano Soncini, Natural Resources Management expert and Team Leader; Mr. Pem Kandel, Forestry expert and consultant; Mr. Rikiya Konishi, Forestry Officer and Donor Representative; and Ms. Akie Kutsukake FAO APO Observer. The mission started with a briefing in Rome on 07/11/2010 and ended on 27/11/2010; the debriefing was held at FAORAP in Bangkok. Mr. Konishi joined the mission from 07/11 to 19/11; Ms. Kutsukake from 10/11 to 25/11.

The evaluation approach adopted followed the standard FAO guidelines. The team analysed project documents in order to assess the correspondence between approved workplans/budget and implemented activities. The team held meetings and interviews with relevant stakeholders, both at FAO and national levels, and developed and tested a questionnaire that also took into consideration the Donor's needs for internal evaluations to be submitted to stakeholders in other project countries. The mission visited five countries - Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, Cambodia and Vietnam - splitting into two sub-teams for a few days after an initial phase of joint effort.

Project Objectives and Design

Justification. The project was relevant because the harmonisation of forest-based MAR was, and still is, one of the key forestry issues at the international and national levels. At the global level, there are a number of forestry conventions, policies and processes that are increasingly demanding updated and new information. Thus, harmonisation among them is important to reduce the burden of international and regional reporting for the countries, as well as to increase data quality.
At the international and national levels, MAR is also necessary for making more efficient use of costly information and providing inputs to the decision makers in order to define policies and satisfy international conventions and processes dealing with global issues like the global Forest Resource Assessment (FRA), biodiversity, carbon sequestration, sustainable development and the effects of climate change. Thus, the issue was rightly identified in order to address matters of SFM through improvements of the existing forest-related MAR systems.

Objectives. The chief objective was "*to develop a globally harmonised forest-related national MAR system that directly contributes to the improvement of sustainable forest management*". By laying the foundations for a system of regular scientific collection, analysis and reporting of forestry-related information, together with enhanced data accessibility and

sharing with civil society, the project was intended to contribute to improved decision-making, formulation of forest policies and strategic planning. However, given the level of complexity and the large number of participating countries, it was overambitious to expect the project to fully achieve all the expected results within the given timeframe and budget.

Project Design. The MAR project was implemented in a context where many stakeholders and processes were already present and actively working. However, it is necessary to emphasise that MAR was intended to contribute to a process of increased harmonisation, not standardisation. The project was considering international, regional to national level institutional arrangements for its implementation. The project started with a Chief Technical Advisor at FAO HQ to handle the initial development stage activities, a Regional Technical Advisor assigned to FAORAP Bangkok, to mainly oversee activities at the regional and national level, and National Project Coordinators (NPC) responsible for implementing national level activities. The Project had planned to set up about 12 steering committees at both the international and national levels to provide necessary oversight, to monitor the project and to suggest mid-course corrections whenever necessary.
Although the design appeared logical and efficient, the project ran into several institutional bottlenecks, ambiguity and communication issues during the development and the implementation phase as well. The reasons behind this were the different tiers of institutional setting, fragmentation of responsibility between FAO HQ and FAORAP and delays in technical backstopping. The presence of a CTA for less than 2 years and the subdivision of staff in Rome and Bangkok (RTA) generated some coordination problems with HQ once the CTA left the project.

Project Implementation, Efficiency and Management

Project Budget and Expenditure. The project budget composition is unusual, as the three biggest budget lines were Salaries (43 %), Contracts (24%) and Travel (12%), constituting 79% of the total budget. The planned project's activities were mainly workshops, networking and awareness raising in 13 core countries (out of 27 Asian and Pacific countries). The project was able to generate additional funds from donors (US$ 299,225) and contributions in kind from collaborating countries for at least US$ 70,984, corresponding to about 10% of the project's global budget allocated to countries activities.

Activities and Outputs. The key activity was to formulate an internationally harmonised set of technical guidelines and a reporting framework for MAR on SFM. The guidelines and database as indicated in the project document were not developed by the project itself, but the project contributed to improved and harmonised FRA guidelines.
At the national and regional levels, the project focus was on harmonised reporting formats of MAR on SFM, awareness raising and networking.

Government Support. The governments of the core countries substantially supported the project with staff, resources, equipment and facilities.

Project Management. The limited project staff (1 Chief Technical Advisor for two years, 1 Regional Technical Advisor for 5 years and 1 part-time secretary) were able to perform the required activities such as workshops and networking at the national and international levels. The RTA was in charge of handling the overall regional level project activities and coordination. National focal points were responsible for managing national level activities. Letters of Agreements (LoA) were signed between recipient countries and FAORAP to guide the activities and the funds release mechanism. Although the RTA was the only remaining

staff, he worked hard and played crucial role in making the national level MAR activities proceed in the planned direction.

Technical and Operational Backstopping. Backstopping was initially assured to the Bangkok staff by the HQ-based CTA. As this position was foreseen for 2 years only, at the end of his contract FRA and NFMA staff assured backstopping from HQ. FAORAP in Bangkok had 3 Forestry officers, all of them provided backstopping and one of whom was the Budget Holder, one of the three officers retired in April 2009.

Results and Effectiveness

Actual and Potential Effects and Impact. All 27 participating countries have appointed Focal Points to coordinate activities and enhance the network. Seven national Steering Committees were formed to look at the national level MAR on SFM, while six existing forestry committees acted as NSC. Within the region, 13 countries were selected and considered as the "core countries", where substantial activities were carried out through Letters of Agreement (LoAs) or Field Budget Authorisations (FBAs) to enhance national level MAR on SFM. The remaining countries were considered "beneficiary countries" and only participated in the international workshops organised by the project.
The project organised 33 national and 14 international workshops from 2006 to 2010, which were intended to create networks at the national and international levels, to diffuse and discuss information on harmonisation of technical issues such as land cover and forest classification, monitoring and assessment of forest resources, reporting, criteria and indicators currently in use, SFM and the introduction of new concepts like forest biomass and carbon data. In addition, a great number of technical papers have been produced, spanning from briefs of national forestry inventories and review of information systems to workshop proceedings and guidelines.
While issues such as harmonisation, networking and awareness raising are difficult to assess, from information received and comments gathered during interviews and meetings, the evaluation concludes that the project has made important contributions to enhance forest-based MAR systems at international, regional and national levels. However, further interventions are required to address present forestry issues such as the development of Monitoring, Reporting Verification (MRV) system of REDD.

Sustainability. The sustainability of project activities can be considered high, as the forestry sector has a high priority in Asian countries, and in particular because several project countries (eg: all 5 countries visited by the evaluation team) have received funds through the UN-REDD programme, including for the development of the MRV system. In addition, the level of understanding by the national staff of the 5 visited countries of MAR-SFM, along with the number of upcoming projects that will be active in this sector, will favour and support the activities initiated by the project.

Environmental Impact of Results. All project activities were meant to indirectly improve the state of the environment and of natural resources: the impact of some activities, like the contribution to harmonised databases on forestry resources, will be visible only in the long run.

Gender Equity in Project Implementation and Results. There was no specific provision for gender equity in this project and the number of staff participating in project activities largely depended on the gender composition of the various national forestry services. There

was approximately a 15% share of women who participated in workshops, meetings and training sessions organised by the project[1].

Cost-effectiveness. The effectiveness of the project depends also upon available resources and governing system. Although large differences have to be expected when the number of involved countries is so high and the advancement is so diverse, it can be reported that outputs are visible in core countries because of funds they received from the project.
In Cambodia, due to the project's financial input, database frameworks at the national and Forest Management Unit levels have been developed and tested. In addition, policy-level government authorities and stakeholders have realised the importance of a reliable forestry database management system for planning and policy decisions. In the Philippines, policy-makers have become aware of MAR[2]. In Vietnam, national institutions also show a good level of understanding, and activities are moving towards the right direction, although funds are the limiting factor for further advancement.
Although a high percentage of the project budget was used for administrative costs, workshops and training, it can be said that recipient countries mobilised the resources efficiently and effectively to achieve the expected goals. However, as mentioned earlier, the project has to be considered too ambitious, and this impacts on its effectiveness.

Major Factors Affecting the Project Results. One clear constraint of the project was that the available financial resources limited the presence of a CTA based in HQ for 2 years only; the project was run with relatively limited technical capacity and clear-cut direction.
The design was very ambitious given the issues to be tackled, and the fact that technical specifications for MAR had to be prepared by FRA and NFMA in FAO HQ was a great limitation for the project, as staff in FAORAP had to wait for technical inputs from HQ. It is worth noting that technical discussions are still ongoing, and now REDD has became one of the forestry policy instruments for mitigating climate change; international co-operations are focussing to MRV of REDD instead of MAR on SFM. There is great debate between MRV and MAR about the synergy, scope and status at international and national levels.

Conclusions. Although the development of harmonised forest-based international and national MAR systems is highly relevant in contributing to SFM, the project was very ambitious in its objectives, target area and expected results.
The Prodoc of the MAR project did not sufficiently detail activities and means of verification to assess outcomes and impacts, leaving the project staff with difficulties in assessing the project's advancement. The project design appeared logical, however many institutional bottlenecks, ambiguity and communication problems were experienced during the project's implementation, and this may mean that the complexity of the issue was underestimated.

The CTA, who was supposed to be in Rome for 2 years, in reality remained only for 1.5 years before retiring, and the detailed activities framework was not fully completed by the end of the first phase, leaving the task to the RTA without strengthening the backstopping capacity at FAORAP.

[1] It is important to mention here the number and high position of women in the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) in the Philippines. Likewise, a very high number of technical staff working at the GIS laboratory of the Forestry Inventory and Planning Institute (FIPI) in Vietnam was female.

[2] As an example we can name the "Sustainable forest ecosystems management Bill" that is currently in the Lower House and should be approved by end 2011.

The key outputs foreseen at the international level were to formulate framework and technical guidelines for MAR. Although international level activities were not completed in the first two years, the project contributed to upgrading and implementing international and regional frameworks and guidelines such as FRA guidelines, ITTO and ASEAN C&I for SFM.

The national level activities focused on preparing national and management-level forest-based MAR systems by using the international frameworks. National focal points were established to enhance the networking. The core countries utilised funds received from the project effectively and efficiently to achieve the expected goals and the beneficiary countries participated in the international workshops and training sessions. As a whole, national level activities in core countries were successful in achieving the expected objectives.

The project also had a thorough collection of information in the Asia-Pacific region and a vast production of documents related to MAR and forestry. This valuable information is not sufficiently represented in the current project's final report.

Harmonisation and standardisation of MAR is a complex task and a continuously evolving process. Although the project contributed to improved MAR systems on the international and national scale, national systems still follow diverse approaches and the institutionalisation of the system in the Asia-Pacific region has yet to be achieved.

Recommendations. After the overall analysis and evaluation of the project and the current context, the evaluation team has made the following recommendations:

- The project has gathered and produced a lot of information and documents at international and national levels about MAR on SFM; however, they are scattered and not easily accessible. The evaluation mission strongly recommends that the RTA will be hired for about one month in early 2011, to produce a "project achievements document". The RTA will compile and synthesise the enormous mass of information collected by the project. A draft table of contents is proposed to facilitate the document production (Annexe 6). No additional funds are needed as the project has some unspent funds available.
- The overall MAR-related activities should be handled by strengthening existing mechanism of FAO HQ and FAORAP: additional project support is needed especially for national level Forest Resource Assessment (FRA) to update information and enhance capacities by selecting the priority target countries of the Asian region. Several criteria can be used to prioritise the countries of intervention, it is understood that FRA and NFMA projects are the best placed to operate a selection, also in accordance with available funds and donors' own suggestions.
- Further interventions are required to institutionalize MAR at the national level. The current achievements can be rooted with relatively limited funds. It is strongly recommended that upcoming projects active in forestry monitoring and reporting will have specific budget lines to support the process.
- Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system of REDD has become one of the emerging tools in upgrading the forest-based information system in the region. The FAO should take a leading role for upgrading the existing framework of MAR-

SFM and methodology of the National Forest Inventory (NFI), which should address the requirements of MRV. This means MRV should be made as one of the subsets of MAR-SFM.

Lessons Learned

- The key objective of the project was to formulate an harmonised international MAR framework and technical guidelines under the global activities from FAO HQ during the two-year development phase and implement plans in the target countries, through FAORAP, during the three-year implementation phase. The institutional setting of the project was multifaceted and fragmented, and this created a number of ambiguities during project execution. Efficiency and effectiveness are often limited in projects like MAR-SFM, with vast scope and complex institutional arrangements.
- It is clear that the outputs and impacts of a project are directly proportional to the available resources and inputs. In the case of the MAR-SFM project, most of the budget was spent for salaries, travel and other administrative matters (in line with the nature of the project), and 24% was spent in core countries. The expected outputs and impacts were directly visible to the evaluation team in Cambodia, Philippines and Vietnam, three countries that received funds from the project and showed remarkable achievements in formulating and applying national-level frameworks for MAR.

- Forest-based MAR is a system of information management that is a continuous process. The establishment of an harmonised MAR system is still far from being achieved in the region. Therefore, it will require a large effort in term of funding, staff, capacity building and technical backstopping to improve forest-based information systems in the Asia-Pacific region.

II. Introduction

Strengthening Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting on Sustainable Forest Management (MAR-SFM) in Asia (GCP/INT/988/JPN) was a Japanese-funded project under the FAO/Government of Japan Cooperative Programme. The project aimed to facilitate development of harmonised forest-related national monitoring, assessment and reporting to directly contribute to improving sustainable forest management regimes in the Asia-Pacific region. The project was implemented from April 2006 to December 2010.

The project was active at both global and regional/national level as follows:

i) Global activities. To develop overall frameworks and guidelines, based at FAO-Headquarters from 2006 to 2007; and
ii) Regional/national activities. To support countries' activities in line with the developed MAR frameworks and guidelines, based at FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) for the remaining life of the project.

At the end of the second year, the project went through an internal mid-term review that took the form of a large workshop where participants assessed the activities, achievements and problems encountered, discussing and identifying the way forward for the project. (Bangkok, 09/2008). Some activities were redirected in accordance with changes in the surrounding technical/policy environment and field conditions.

The Project document also called for a terminal evaluation by a team composed of a Donor representative, participating governments' staff and FAO. In this backdrop, an independent team was formed and carried out the terminal evaluation work of the project from 7 to 27 November 2010. The Terms of Reference of the evaluation are presented in Annexe 1. The detailed mission itinerary and list of persons met is presented in Annexe 2, as well as the list of relevant documents consulted by the mission, Annexe 3.
Because of the wide Asia-Pacific scope and the high number of countries where the project was active (27, with 13 core countries), the evaluation mission could not visit and conduct interviews in all of them. Before the mission inception, project and other relevant FAO staff proposed a number of countries and various itineraries to the evaluation team. To optimise time and costs, the following itinerary was finally agreed upon:

07/11, Rome HQ. Briefing for G. Soncini and A. Kutsukake;
07-11/11, Bangkok FAORAP offices. P. Kandel and R. Konishi (2 days later Soncini);
11-14(17)/11, Jakarta. Soncini, Kandel, Konishi, Kutsukake and the Regional Coordinator, M. Otsuka;
15-19/11, Manila. Soncini and Konishi (subteam I)
18-21/11, Phnom Penh. Kandel and Kutsukake (subteam II)
19-26/11, Hanoi. Soncini, Kandel, Kutsukake and Otsuka;
26-27/11, Bangkok FAORAP. Debriefing, Soncini and Kandel.

Mr. Konishi joined the mission from 07 to 19/11, Ms. Kutsukake from 10 to 25/11.

The beneficiaries of the project included national governments with relevant ministries, international organisations, conventions and processes and, indirectly, civil society and forest-dependent communities. Therefore, the mission tried to consider all these beneficiaries during the evaluation processes.
The overall approach and methods followed by the mission were to review relevant project documents and reports, conduct interviews with relevant staff at FAO HQ, RAP and national staffs in order to understand the status and dynamics of the project.
Out of 13 core countries which received funds from the project to conduct national level MAR activities, Cambodia, Vietnam and Philippines have been selected to look at the national-level activities on MAR-SFM.
Indonesia was selected to represent the beneficiary countries (participants were only invited to the regional and international-level workshops/training sessions organised by the project).
Meetings and semi-structured discussions were held with key national-level stakeholders to assess the progress and impact of the project.
To collect information from countries where it was not possible to make a field visit, a brief questionnaire was developed, tested (in Indonesia) and submitted to relevant staff by e-mail. The questionnaire included some questions required by the donor's internal evaluation system; others were proposed by the evaluation team. Questions covered aspects like relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, national specificities, preliminary consultations, sustainability, major results, impacts, problems encountered, lessons learned and suggestions.
Out of 27 countries and 2 international organisations, 19 completed questionnaires were received, some of them compiling answers from several officers.
The summary of the questionnaires' answers is presented in Annexe 4.
A synthetic table with the complete list of countries and partner organisations, activities by country, etc. is presented in Annexe 5.

NOTA BENE: It has to be clearly stressed that because of the design and the very nature of the project, the fact that MAR is still evolving at the international/national levels and the type

of several activities that had to be assessed, it was very difficult to provide a clear measure of many aspects of the project. Harmonisation, networking and awareness raising are all activities that are difficult to assess. Furthermore, several other projects and programs are contributing in the international, national and sub-national scales. As a result, quantification of project outputs in isolation is complex.
What the evaluation team could identify was if the overall results of each of the project's activities were in line with expectations. and whether the level of achievements was sufficient considering the context and the resources that were made available.
It can be anticipated that, according to informed opinions and comments gathered during interviews and meetings, the project has made important contributions to enhancing forest-based MAR systems on international, regional and national scales.

III. Background and Context

The background in which the MAR-SFM project was developed was centred on the requests made during the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in June 1992, when a set of "Forest Principles" was developed that demanded worldwide Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) in compliance with the multiple functions and values of forest resources.

The Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) has further followed up this task by promoting the development of forest Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting (MAR) for SFM, recognising that such MAR should be simple in its reporting and action-oriented at both the international and national levels.

At the international level, MAR should provide opportunities to share experiences among countries and other stakeholders and to identify actions that could be taken at various levels to support SFM. At the national level, it should catalyse national discussions, analyses and actions that promote SFM. Finally, at all levels, MAR, should help to clarify the contribution of forests to the global environment and to human wellbeing.

Many international and regional processes, including the Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) of FAO demand international reporting on different aspects of forests or on the same aspect of forests but with varying definitions.

There is a need to harmonise and improve international reporting on forests to reduce reporting burdens on countries and improve the efficiency and utility of such monitoring and reporting. The extent and quality of national responses to these efforts vary among countries as well as among processes. In most of the countries, such monitoring and reporting are not related to policy development and planning, thus reducing their utility.

National forest information systems in most of the Asian and Pacific countries were underdeveloped and non-robust, lacking necessary and consistent information systems. They did not have sufficient capacity and necessary linkages to promote SFM. Forest management regimes in Asian and Pacific countries did not have positive correlation with sustainability.

The quality and extent of the information base for MAR varied widely among countries in Asia and the Pacific. Forest-related MAR processes in most of the countries, therefore, were

underdeveloped, poorly implemented and did not link to the development of forest policies and to national planning processes.

This poor state of MAR in the region has been increasing the spatial and temporal inefficiencies of the forest management regimes in Asian and Pacific countries.

In this context, the MAR-SFM project was designed to build up a globally harmonised forest-related national MAR system and apply it in the Asia-Pacific region to directly contribute to the improvement of SFM regimes there. Moreover, the project aimed to develop a single format for collecting forest-related information to reduce reporting duplication and to streamline and synchronize reporting requests made by the international processes.

The project was complementary with several other projects and programs, two of them run by FAO HQ:

- National Forest Inventories at the national level in most countries (NFI);
- International Tropical Timber Organisation (ITTO) development of Criteria and Indicators in forestry (C&I);
- FAO-FRA dealing with forest resources assessments at the global level.
- FAO-NFMA dealing with forest inventories, including biophysical and socio-economic data at the national level.

A certain overlapping could be expected, with the new project starting activities in a field where other projects were already present. It could be even seen as a favourable condition so long as specific activities are clearly differentiated and the overlap area is understood as a place of information exchange.

The major changes that the project went through were related to budget and one set of activities. The initial budget was US$ 2,810,045; after project inception, the Donor decided to reduce its contribution to all projects by about 5% per year, and the budget dropped to US$ 2,573,494 in 2008. This required some rearrangements in budget lines (this issue will be further discussed at point V, A. Project budget and expenditure).
The project was also able to mobilise additional funds from Japan, as well as national contributions and other donors' contributions to the project for at least a total of around US$ 371,000.

The technical aspects related to the development of a standard MAR were partially slowed down by other projects in FAO HQ which were at the same time unable of providing inputs for an alternative methodology, since it was still being developed/revised. Some purely technical project activities were therefore redirected to activities like networking, awareness raising and support at the national level – all components that were already present in the project workplan.

The duration of the project was 5 years and it officially started in January 2006. The 1st Phase of 2 years was tasked with defining the framework of activities, followed by a three-year 2nd Phase of implementing activities at the national level, ending in December 2010.

IV. Assessment of Project Objectives and Design

A. Justification

The issue of addressing SFM through improvements in the existing forest-related MAR systems was rightly identified. The project was relevant for the following reasons:

- Need to harmonise and standardise the international and national MAR processes to facilitate streamlining and reduce the burden of international and regional reporting by countries;
- Need to improve links between existing forest policies and other environmental, social and economic policies related to the interaction of forests with other land resources and with overall sustainable development processes;
- Need to disseminate information concerning the forestry sector and its development to all stakeholders and civil society;
- Need to develop a regional network dedicated to sharing information, experience and new knowledge among countries in the Asia-Pacific region (and the world).
- Need to satisfy international policy dialogues, institutions, conventions and processes dealing with global issues like biodiversity, carbon sequestration, soil condition, and the effects of climate change;
- Need to contribute to providing decision makers with updated information on forests in order to develop better policies.

The project has contributed to addressing the current situation on MAR-SFM to some extent; however, the intervention was not enough to tackle such a large issue. Many of those interviewed have reported the project as being "very ambitious" or "too ambitious".

The approach adopted by the project could be seen as acceptable, although the scale on which the project was expected to be active should have suggested that results were too dependent on non-controlled national progresses and staff abilities. The existing large differences between the 27 countries in the Asia-Pacific region were already known at the time the project was discussed with the Donor and the Prodoc finalised.

B. Objectives

The main objective of the project was to develop a globally harmonised forest-related national MAR system that directly contributes to the improvement of sustainable forest management. It aimed to address not only the sustained supply of goods and services from forest resources, but also the social, political, economic, and environmental contexts, including policies and institutions, in which these forest resources reside.

The goal of project was set to initiate a system of regular and scientific collection, analysis, and reporting of forestry-related information together with its enhanced access and sharing with national officers, technical staff and civil society, in order to facilitate better informed national level decision-making, improved formulation of forest policies and management planning.

The specific objectives of the project included:

- **To develop national network** of all national focal points of various forest-related national, regional and international processes;

- **To develop a regional network** dedicated to sharing information, experience and new knowledge among project countries, regions and the world;
- **To co-ordinate, harmonise and standardise the national MAR processes** of the countries in the Asia Pacific region;
- **To facilitate streamlining** and reduce the burden of international and regional reporting by the countries;
- **To promote use of MAR information in making key decisions**, formulating forest polices and developing forest planning in a country;
- **To improve links between existing national forest policies** with other related national policies like environmental, social and economic policies;
- **To strengthen linkages between processes** of development of sustainable forest management and the overall sustainable development processes in a country;
- **To disseminate information** concerning the forestry sector and its development to all stakeholders and the civil society;
- **To satisfy international policy institutions**, dialogues, conventions and processes dealing with global issues like global biodiversity, carbon sequestration, soil condition and the effects of climate change.

Although the issue was correct and some outputs were rationalised, the project was still very ambitious, and the objectives were too vast and general.
Problems like developing a Monitoring Assessment and Reporting system in order to harmonise or – more difficult, if not impossible – standardise activities in countries where similar systems already exist and reach the level of influencing policy-making were considered too vast to fully achieve results within the given timeframe and budget.
In addition, the fact that MAR has global importance means that developing it at the Asia-Pacific level could have some other implications in terms of activities advancement: MAR-SFM project could not work in isolation and the other FAO Projects dealing with forest monitoring and assessment were not ready to provide inputs to MAR-SFM, delaying this component of the project and related activities.
The high number of countries involved, the different levels of advancement, the variety of systems in use, the fact that several organisations were (and still are) working on the issue, proposing and developing different approaches, created a very complex background.

C. Project Design

The project rightly identified the immediate and ultimate beneficiaries of the activities, although their specific needs were not fully known before the activities started.

The project was designed to accomplish its objectives in two phases. The first two years were the Development Phase and the focus of the project was to conduct international activities such as the establishment of linkages with forest-related processes and the development of a globally harmonised framework, guidelines and database.
The Implementation Phase extended over the remaining three years and this period was to centre on the implementation of the harmonised MAR, including facilitation in the establishment of a database at the national level in selected project countries within the Asia-Pacific region through studies, reviews, training, workshops and expert consultations. The detailed design for the second phase had to be finalised based on a review of the activities and the outputs of the first phase.

The project was planned as a global project with smaller sub-components for regional and national activities. Thus, the project envisioned international, regional and national-level institutional arrangements for its implementation.
The limited project staff consisted of the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), based at FAO HQ in Rome, who handled the first development stage activities; the Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) based at FAORAP, Bangkok, mainly oversaw the national-level activities in the Asia-Pacific region. This arrangement could be considered effective, although in practice it led to a certain isolation of the Bangkok-based staff when the CTA position ended at the close of the First Phase.

The national institutions in the participating project countries had to implement activities at the national scale and collaborate. Each project country had to nominate an officer as National Project Coordinator (NPC), responsible for the project and for the implementation of project activities within the country. The project proposed setting up steering committees both at FAO Headquarters and at the national level to provide necessary oversight, to monitor the project and to suggest mid-course corrections whenever necessary.

In this broader framework, the project was expected to achieve the objectives within a five-year timeframe. Although the project design appeared logical and efficient, several institutional bottlenecks, ambiguity and communication issues were reported during the development and the implementation phases.
It is important to note that the presence of a CTA for 2 years and the positioning of the project staff in Rome (CTA) and Bangkok (RTC) generated some coordination problems with HQ. Once the CTA left the project, as global FRA and National Forest Monitoring and Assessment (NFMA) programs are based in FAO HQ, the MAR-SFM project reportedly experienced some "technical isolation".

In the project document, the nature and level of the expected risks were considered "minor".
They mainly consisted in delays in staff recruitment and MoU signing, along with inadequacy of information and support at the national level and partial or non-implementation of project outputs by some project countries. There was no planned provision for alternatives in case of delays or unsuccessful activities.

The evaluation team thinks that the project was too ambitious and it was unrealistic to consider achievable the harmonisation of a MAR system given the available time, resources and staff. This opinion is widely held and reported by most of the interviewees.
However, it is important to note that the project did a good deal of work supporting existing processes, networking and creating awareness of MAR.
What was underestimated was the scale of MAR issues at the global and regional levels, the number of stakeholders that needed to be brought together and the time required to reach the objective as stated.

V. Assessment of Project Implementation, Efficiency and Management

A. Project Budget and Expenditure

The project budget, revisions, total expenditure and remaining budget are presented in the following tables.

Budget Line	Budget Item	Original budget (US$)	%	Latest budget (Revision 2008 US$)	%
5.011	Salaries professional	1,136,000	40	1,000,153	39
5.012	Salaries general service	0	0	109,775	4
5.013	Consultants	148,400	5	146,933	6
5.014	Contracts	0	0	613,818	24
5.020	Locally contracted labour	0	0	1,057	0
5.021	Travel	275,000	10	318,675	12
5.023	Training	840,000	30	92,942	4
5.024	Expendable procurement	21,500	1	2,257	0
5.025	Non Expendable procurement	39,300	1	30,567	1
5.026	Hospitality	2,500	0	853	0
5.027	Technical support services	56,000	2	53,410	2
5.028	General operating expenses	132,286	5	34,336	1
5.029	Support cost	159,059	6	145,670	6
5.040	General overhead expenses	0	0	0	0
5.050	Chargeback	0	0	23,048	1
	TOTAL	**2,810,045**	**100**	**2,573,494**	**100**

It can be noted that the initial budget in 2006 was US$ 2,810,045, following a decision of the Donor to reduce funding by 5% per year, the budget was reduced to US$ 2,573,494, with a total decrease of US$ 236,551.
Funds were regularly made available; the project staff reported no problems with funds accessibility.
The budget lines present in the initial budget and those utilised for administrative purposes do not match. In some lines there was no money allocated in 2006 while in the 2008 revision funds were shifted to cover all budget lines.
There was also a proportional increase in funds for salaries.

The main points emerging from the budget analysis are as follows:

i) The percentage of funds allocated to 5.011 and 5.012 Salaries is very high, being 40% in 2006 and 43% in 2008.
ii) The second largest budget item in 2008 is 5.014 Contracts, being 24% of the total budget; it includes expenses for workshops and meetings.
iii) The third largest item is 5.021 Travel, which passed from 10% to 12% in 2008.

Although it seems that the percentage of budget allocated to salaries, workshops and travel was very high, the nature of the project itself, which was approved, has to be considered. The planned activities were mainly related to awareness raising, networking and supporting current processes related to MAR and SFM in 27 countries with the accent on the 13 core countries. This requires mainly project staff activities like organising workshops, supporting networks, moving national officers to workshops, etc.

Budget Item	Latest budget (Revision 2008 US$)	%	Expenditure 2006-2010	%	Remaining budget 25/11/2010
Salaries professional	1,000,153	39	993,700	39	6,453
Salaries general service	109,775	4	109,776	4	-1
Consultants	146,933	6	161,897	6	-14,964
Contracts	613,818	24	607,554	24	6,264

Budget Item	Latest budget (Revision 2008 US$)	%	Expenditure 2006-2010	%	Remaining budget 25/11/2010
Locally contracted labour	1,057	0	1,057	0	0
Travel	318,675	12	348,273	14	-29,598
Training	92,942	4	82,937	3	10,005
Expendable procurement	2,257	0	1,676	0	581
Non Expendable procurement	30,567	1	30,567	1	0
Hospitality	853	0	853	0	0
Technical support services	53,410	2	13,410	1	40,000
General operating expenses	34,336	1	37,450	1	-3,114
Support cost	145,670	6	134,532	5	11,138
General overhead expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeback	23,048	1	23,048	1	0
TOTAL	**2,573,494**	**100**	**2,546,730**	**100**	**26,764**

In the following table are summarised the funds that were allocated by the project to each country and the national contributions, the totals and percentages.

	Country/organization	Inputs from FAO (seen in Oracle or LOA)	Inputs from Recipient Organization (in LOA)	Total	% from FAO	% from RO
1	Bangladesh	11,040,26	3,207,02	**14,247,28**	77	23
2	Bhutan	11,294,00	3,028,26	**14,322,26**	79	21%
3	Cambodia	27,080,00	2,000,00	**29,080,00**	93%	7%
4	China	11,534,32	3,791,00	**15,325,32**	75%	25%
5	India	19,188,98	4,255,21	**23,444,19**	82%	18%
6	Malaysia	92,263,39	945,62	**93,209,01**	99%	1%
7	Mongolia	16,398,50	2,950,00	**19,348,50**	85%	15%
8	Myanmar	13,000,00	1,500,00	**14,500,00**	90%	10%
9	Pakistan	20,680,00	1,877,00	**22,557,00**	92%	8%
10	Philippines	44,256,00	3,212,26	**47,468,26**	93%	7%
11	PNG	11,392,14	6,225,68	**17,617,82**	65%	35%
12	Solomon	49,839,76	2,000,00	**51,839,76**	96%	4%
13	Vanuatu	102,792,27	25,707,06	**128,499,33**	80%	20%
14	Vietnam	16,000,00	2,000,00	**18,000,00**	89%	11%
15	ASEAN	66,222,21	2,500,00	**68,722,21**	96%	4%
16	SPC	122,323,00	5,785,00	**128,108,00**	95%	5%
	Total	**635,304,83**	**70,984,12**	**706,288,95**	90%	10%

In the following table are shown the additional funds that the project was able to generate. Japan alone provided around 110,000 US$ while the FAO-FRA project based at HQ provided 75,734 US$. This sum corresponds to 11.6 % of the revised budget. The fact that the project was receiving extra funds means that it was well-regarded in the forestry sector, at both regional and national levels.

Sources of additional funds	US$
Japan, Sapporo inception workshop	91,173
National contributions (in LoA)	70,984
FRA Kuala Lumpur Workshop	57,175
Korea (FAO HQ)	19,753
Japan, Tsukuba workshop	19,173

Sources of additional funds	US$
FRA Fiji Workshop	18,559
ITTO, sponsored delegates to participate in workshops	15,000
RESTEC	7,407
Total additional funds	**299,225**

B. Activities and Outputs

The Prodoc presented outputs and activities in a very structured scheme, with direct correspondence between the expected output and the activity necessary to obtain it.
Outputs and Activities were divided into Global and National levels. The following table shows the specific outputs and a systematic comparison of actual project outputs with those foreseen in the original project document and subsequent work plans after the five-year project life:

Global level outputs

Code	Output	Status
1.1	A prioritized list of international programs, processes, protocol and institutions that demand national reporting, are concerned with MAR on SFM.	**Completed**, list available.
1.2	An established process to set up dynamic linkages with prioritized international programmes, processes, protocol and institutions.	**Completed**, linkages established, contact persons/officers list available. Good activities with ASEAN, SPC Secretariat, ITTO, UNEP and INBAR.
1.3	A prioritized list of key project countries in the Asian region.	**Completed**, list available, activities done in 13 core countries.
2.1	An international technical framework to review and analyze the available national, regional and global information.	Activity **partially executed** as the FAO-FRA project is working on the issue at global level. The **project contributed** with a number of workshops: Kuala Lumpur 2008, ASEAN 2009 and 2010.
2.2	An internationally harmonised set of technical guidelines for MAR on SFM.	Activity **partially executed** as the FAO-FRA and NFMA projects are working on the issue at global level. Also GLCN and REDD are active on technical guidelines. The **project contributed** with a number of workshops: Japan Sapporo 2006 and Tsukuba 2010, Thailand 2010, Fiji 2009 and 2010.
3.1	An international set of harmonised elements of a database for MAR on SFM.	As 2.2. The database has been developed by FAO-FRA, NFMA, GLCN. The **project contributed** with the ASEAN 2008 and Thailand 2010 workshops.

Code	Output	Status
4.1	An information-sharing network for the MAR among major stakeholders both at the international and national levels.	**Initiated**, relevant activities include the workshops in Sapporo 2006, Chiang Mai 2006, Beijing 2007 and Fiji 2007. The **Pacific** region the electronic network is **developed and active**. It was initiated by the project and completed autonomously. It is **not happening in a similar way** in other **Asian countries** as condition were different and Governments work more independently.
A	Technical review (evaluation) of the project at the end of the Development phase (first two years) to guide the detailed planning of the II phase (implementation, last three years).	**Completed**. It took place in forrm of a workshop. Proceedings and report available.
B	Complete evaluation of the project (both Development and implementation phases)	**Completed**. (this evaluation).

National level outputs

Code	Output	Status
1.4	National Steering Committees on MAR on SFM.	**Completed**. 13 countries have a functioning Steering Committee; Vanuatu was the first in 11/2006, Thailand the last in 10/2007. Countries recommended using national networks and focal points or other existing committees/opportunities to reduce costs.
1.5	List of prioritized major stakeholders in MAR on SFM.	**Completed.** List existing
1.6	Country Reports – using the "Framework" and the "Guidelines" to review the information to identify the issues and measures relating to MAR for SFM.	**Completed.** Using the existing framework, the Country reports or Country studies available, done in collaboration with FAO HQ.
2.3 (a)	Progress towards harmonised definition of terms.	The situation has **improved**, activity done in collaboration with FRA and C&I. **Project contributed** with workshop in India 2006.
2.3 (b)	Identified alternative approaches for data compilation and review.	**Partially executed**. **Project contributed** with workshops in India 12/2006 and Thailand 09/2010. Papua New Guinea is updating the database management system.
2.3 (c)	Increased awareness of relevant personnel and stakeholders on MAR on	**Partially executed. Project contibuted** with all the workshops. Attendance is estimated being formed up to 60-70% by the same

Code	Output	Status
	SFM.	participants.
2.3 (d)	Review of national forest policies and their linkages with planning processes.	**Partially completed**. A very important point, being related to policy. Some countries like Vietnam are particularly active; others are Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh and India where a related workshop was held in 04/2009.
3.2	Progress towards establishment of database on harmonised elements.	**Partially completed. Project contributed** to initial steps in reporting formats, currently ongoing in PNG. Also Vietnam is very active. C&I (proposed by ITTO) constitute a process of harmonisation not accepted by FAO HQ, because although it is feasible at regional level, it became very difficult to apply it at global level. MAR project also utilised existing packages like the one proposed by ASEAN.
4.2	An established information-sharing network of major stakeholders at national level.	**Partially completed**. It has to be noted that a sum of 1,000 US$ per year and per country has been allocated. The sum does not leave much room for activities. Nepal, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka seem to be getting good results

Although activities at the international level, as foreseen in the project document (the general project framework and MAR guidelines), were not completed in the first two years, as a whole, the project contributed to upgrading and implementing international and regional frameworks such as FRA guidelines, ITTO and ASEAN C&I for SFM.

Harmonisation, networking, awareness raising, etc. are all activities that are difficult to assess. Furthermore, several projects and programs are contributing to the same issues on national and sub-national scales.
For this reason, a quantification of project output in isolation is complicated. In general, the project has made solid contributions to enhancing forest-based MAR systems on international, regional and national scales.

C. Government Support

The governments of the 13 core countries substantially supported the project with staff, resources, equipment and facilities. The project received national contributions for a total of around US$ 71,000, corresponding to less than 3% of the project's global budget. From interviews with national officers, it seems that the contribution could be considered much higher, as the 71,000 US$ is only the total of the amounts indicated in the Letters of Agreement that were signed between countries and does not factor in the real time dedicated to the project by national staff.

D. Project Management

As for project management, it emerges from the evaluation that the limited project staffs were able to perform the foreseen activities such as workshops and networking at the national and international level.

In the initial phase, the CTA was based at the Rome HQ and the RTA was stationed in Bangkok at the FAORAP office. The idea was that the CTA had to be active in HQ with easy access to contact persons, planning centres, networking activities, etc.
The RTA was expected to manage the overall national-level project activities under the guidance and responsibility of the CTA first, and of a senior Forestry Officer in Bangkok later.
The CTA contract expired at the end of the planning phase, and it was not possible to extend it because of budget and age limits.
From that date the RTA in Bangkok, assisted by a part-time secretary, managed the project's activities and the budget holder was the Forestry Officer at FAORAP.

To manage the national-level activities, the National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) or equivalent mechanisms were formed in core countries. National focal points were responsible for coordinating and implementing the national activities. The nature of activities and funds was agreed and Letters of Agreement (LoA) were signed between recipient countries and FAORAP. In some countries, instead of a LoA, funds were released through a Field Budget Authorisation (FBA). Technical staff was hired in many countries to receive the technical inputs, especially to formulate the MAR-SFM framework and database structure.

E. Technical and Operational Backstopping

The CTA, based at FAO HQ, initially assured direction and backstopping for the Bangkok-based staff. The CTA position was foreseen for only two years. The CTA left after one and a half years and the FRA and NFMA staff in HQ took over the backstopping.

The FAORAP in Bangkok had three Forestry Officers, one of whom retired in 04/2009. The SFO became the Budget holder at the end of the CTA contract. In the Development Phase (2006-2007), CTA and RTA were located at FAO Headquarters and FAORAP, respectively, with the RTA under the supervision of the CTA.
In the Implementation Phase (2008-2010), the only technical officer was the RTA, located in FAORAP. He was reported as having faced some difficulties with the working environment and administration; however, HQ and forestry officers in RAP provided support. During the briefing at FAO HQ, NFMA staff estimated around 15% of their time was dedicated to backstopping activities, including workshop attendance and regular exchanges of e-mails and information. Contacts and activities with FRA were less frequent, although two workshops were co-organised (with Korean additional funds).
Throughout the project, RTA and the staff of FAO Headquarters made mutual efforts to maximise backstopping support through workshops and events held both at FAO Headquarters and various countries in the Asia-Pacific region.
The RTA did not have a forestry background and had limited knowledge in forestry-related database management. However, he had been involved in forestry projects and accumulated experience on the issues during previous assignments and by participating in project workshops. He played a crucial role in supporting the regional and national-level activities.
Locating the RTA in RAP had its merits and demerits. One of the advantages was better and less expensive access to Asia-Pacific countries; on the other hand, there were more

difficulties in receiving needed technical backstopping, maintaining the relevant contacts and keeping up with mainstream advancement in global MAR activities.

VI. Assessment of Results and Effectiveness

A. Effects and Impact

Interviews and meetings revealed some positive effects resulting from the project's interventions. Seven National Steering Committees and six Forestry Committees (acted as NSC) were formed to look at the national-level MAR-SFM. Moreover, national focal points were designated in all 27 target countries to coordinate the functions and enhance the network.

The project carried out substantial activities in the 13 core countries. As a result, multiple effects have been seen in the harmonisation of MAR, database management and institutional capacity building.

National networks were established in 13 countries and national workshops were held 33 times from 2006 to 2010.
Altogether 13 international workshops were conducted in 8 countries, with a total attendance of 418 participants. These workshops were mainly aimed at creating and maintaining networks at the national and international level, diffusing and discussing information on the harmonisation of technical issues like land cover and forest classification, monitoring and assessment of forest resources, reporting, criteria and indicators currently in use, sustainable forest management and new concepts like forest biomass and carbon data.

The project produced a great number of technical papers, ranging from briefs on national Forestry Inventories (NFI) and reviews of information systems to workshop proceedings and related guidelines. However, they are scattered and apparently not in use in the countries where digital library systems are inadequate. Printed copies of the various documents still seem an important and efficient way to circulate information.

Impact evaluations of capacity building and networking are complex. Nevertheless, the mission tried to explore the level of understanding through meetings and discussions with stakeholders at the national and sub-national levels. The general impressions and answers received show that significant contributions have been brought by the project to motivate planners and policy makers about the importance of MAR on SFM.
The answers to the questionnaire that was circulated, presented in Annexe 4, generally point out a favourable impact of the project in awareness raising and networking, which were two of the project's expected results.

Since the project was active in a field where many players were already intervening, often with many different approaches and tools, it is difficult to measure the impact or the results that can be definitely stated as deriving from the MAR-SFM project. At the same time, it appears that the contribution to the advancement of monitoring and reporting made by the project is definitely important at the regional level.

A point that clearly emerged from the evaluation is that in many countries, a relatively limited amount of money, around 44,000 US$ in the case of the Philippines, 27,000 US$ in

Cambodia and 16,000 US$ in Vietnam, had a huge impact in terms of understanding and awareness raising in relevant Ministries and national forestry agencies. The support for the national focal points and network, along with the fact of having national staff participating in national and international workshops, contributed positively to the advancement and development of MAR at the national level.

At this stage it seems highly possible that there will not be one single system of monitoring and reporting, as the picture is becoming increasingly complex with new information needs and requests for totally new sets of figures (e.g.: carbon stocks and forest biomasses, above and underground; biodiversity, etc.). Forestry data needs are dynamic and changing within the national and international context; the organisations dealing with these figures will need new systems of collecting, storing and retrieving information, so some time – and funds – are needed before a higher level of integration will be reached.
The impact of some activities like the harmonised databases on forestry resources will be visible only over the long term.

B. Sustainability and Environmental Impact of Result

A number of activities conducted by the project are likely to be maintained in the future, as all forest-related activities from planning to management to policy require updated information, and Monitoring Assessment and Reporting are central to this end.
Future developments related to carbon stocks, standing biomasses, carbon trade etc. also need information and require MAR activities.
The future scenarios will definitely benefit from activities that received support from the MAR-SFM project in terms of awareness and understanding of the issues related to forest assessment and inventories.
The project has made a significant contribution to raising awareness about need for MAR in policy formulation and strategic planning: at the policy level, institutions are beginning to use MAR for forestry planning, decision making and international reporting.

From the field visit in Cambodia there emerged some issues specifically related to the country situation. This puts the sustainability of the project in Cambodia in question:

- Data collection is costly and time-consuming and is not yet institutionalized;
- Lack of coordination between REDD+ MRV, MAR, Remote Sensing and GIS unit;
- Forest and forestry data are outdated and incomplete;
- Professional competence in Cambodia is very low and forest-based MAR does not have a high profile on a national scale.

Focusing on forestry and forest management, the underlying idea of the project was to ensure sustainability in all social, ecological and economic dimensions of forest activities. All activities performed by the project were intended to improve the condition of the environment and of natural resources, so the impact is therefore positive.

Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) has been seen as one of the strategic options to contribute to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, conserving existing forests and enhancing forest carbon stocks. Future REDD components would allow developed nations to meet their required emissions-reduction targets in part by paying tropical countries to preserve their forests, which keeps carbon in trees and out of the atmosphere.

However, efforts to mitigate climate change through REDD depends on mapping and monitoring of forest carbon stocks and emissions over large forested areas. It demands Monitoring, Reporting and Verifications (MRV) systems at the country level. The Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system for REDD is an emerging tool in upgrading the forest-based information system in the region. All the visited countries have received funds through UN-REDD program and other REDD related institutions for REDD readiness, including developing of MRV system.

Again, it is difficult to measure the direct contribution of the project to aspects like sustainability, or the environmental impact of the results. However there are several indications suggesting that the activities of the project were heading in this direction.

C. Gender Equity in Project Implementation and Results

There was no specific provision for gender equity in this project and the number of staff participating in project activities largely depends on the gender composition of national Forestry services. Workshops and meeting attendance by women averaged 15%.

A remarkable number of women holding a wide range of positions was observed in the Philippines' DENR.
During visits at the Forest Inventory and Planning Institute (FIPI) in Vietnam, it was noted that a very high number of technical staff at the GIS facility were women. This can be considered as anecdotal, but is a possible indication of a trend that might take place in the future as the level of education increases among women.

D. Cost-Effectiveness

The project's effectiveness depends upon design, available resources and the management system that has been set up.
In the case of MAR-SFM, the overall design is acceptable, although it is necessary to make it clear that the objective as stated : *"...to develop a globally harmonised forest-related national MAR system that directly contributes to the improvement of sustainable forest management"* was too ambitious for the available funds and resources. Currently, there is not a system that is globally accepted.
The project performed activities related to the specific objectives (as reported in IV, B) in an effective way and, from country visits and meetings, it emerged that the limited sums made available for national components in core countries gave good results in terms of stakeholders' awareness, network growth, etc.

A very high percentage of the project budget was used for salaries, administrative costs, workshops and training. However, based on national-level observations and assessments, the evaluation mission concludes that fund recipient countries worked well and there was a wise allocation of the budget.
It is worth mentioning that there were no clear physical targets and predetermined budget lines for the activities. This mission was not in the position to measure the cost efficiency and effectiveness of the project. As such, the descriptions in the report should be considered as resulting from the evaluation team's internal discussion.

E. Major Factors Affecting the Project Results

The major factors that affected the project, both positively and negatively, are related to the dimension and complexity of the issue to be tackled, the budget and the staff.

MAR for SFM. As has already been pointed out, the issue of Monitoring Assessment and Reporting is a need of all forest-related activities: it is necessary for planning, providing information to policy makers, and will be increasingly relevant as the REDD gains importance as a policy instrument for mitigating climate change.
This is a favourable condition, as the project could have – and the results will have – great visibility.

Number of Countries. The number of states involved in the project was very high: 27 countries. From these, 13 were chosen as core countries, with more activities and funds involved. Two regional organisations, ASEAN and SPC, were also included as partners.
The Prodoc was considering 10 countries; the project was active in 13, this meant a slight dispersion of efforts.

Country specificities. The level of advancement in each country was different and each country had some specificities. We can mention: already existing MAR systems, different staff capacity and skills, various national institutions using different MAR systems. Forest classification terminology and classes were also different from country to country; sometimes within the same country, the area covered by forest mapping and ground validation was variable.
This fact was underestimated in the Prodoc: to make changes in the administrations and technical institutions is a long process.

Various approaches to MAR. Several organisations are active in this field, each with a specific approach: ITTO with C&I, ASEAN, UN-REDD, REDD+, MRV. Within the FAO, two projects are working at the national level –NFMI- and the global level –FRA-. New approaches include land cover changes through satellite imagery analysis and the association of biodiversity, biomass and socio-economic information. All these approaches share some data, which ideally should be stored and retrieved from a common database.
This point was also largely underestimated: harmonisation or standardisation is a long process and new programmes create new information needs. The fact that the project had to produce technical guidelines on MAR and develop a database was highly controversial, as FRA and NFMA were developing the same activity at a global level and slowed down the MAR project activity.
FAO HQ is more centralized and focuses on technical matters but national level stakeholders were waiting for quick responses and delivery.
There is still a great debate between MRV and MAR about the synergy, scope and status, as well as with ITTO C&I.

Financial resources. This point is crucial: the Japanese Forestry Agency made available around 2.8 million US$, later reduced to around 2.57 million US$. The project obtained around 300,000 US$ in additional funds from the Japanese government, other projects and contributions from core countries. Overall, the project had limited funds, considering the ambitious objectives and scope (five-year duration; 13 core countries). Thus, the project was suffering from budget scarcity, such that some activities, like supporting national networks, were funded with only 1,000 US$ per country/year.

At the same time, the budget that was given to core countries, ranging from around 11,000 US$ to 100,000 US$ per country, had very good effects on creating awareness, supporting MAR and motivating national officers.
In the MAR project case, in spite of a very limited staff, the CTA for 2 years, the RTA for 5 years and a part-time secretary, salaries absorbed more than 40 % of the available funds.
The budget in the Prodoc allocated 20,000 US$ for the development of technical guidelines and 30,000 US$ for the database. The practical implementation and diffusion of this component was on the personnel and travel budget lines.

Staff. The CTA was hired for only 2 years and the RTA could not handle all aspects of the planned activities. The FAORAP had limited time and capacity to provide technical backstopping for national level activities once the CTA position ended.
Backstopping from HQ was mainly from NFMA, although links existed with FRA.
The project was run with limited technical capacity and without fully clear direction, especially with regard to the technical guidelines on MAR and the linkages and synergies with related programmes at HQ. Based at FAO HQ, the CTA was hired for the first two years and in this period he did not finalise the framework as planned: it was completed by the RTA following the changes agreed upon during the Mid-Term Review.
The RTA was able to successfully implement most of the planned activities, mainly those related to network creation, awareness raising and support to ongoing activities on monitoring, assessment and reporting in forest resources.

VII. Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Conclusions

The evaluation mission has drawn the following conclusions about the project:

1. The issue of harmonising the forest-based MAR is relevant on both national and international scales. However, the project was overly ambitious in expected results and impact. The MAR-SFM project was too small in size and timeframe to achieve all those dimensions, such that the project could only contribute with a number of workshops for awareness raising and understanding among national officers, networking at the national and regional level and capacity building relative to MAR at the national level.

2. The main objective of the project was to facilitate development of harmonised forest-related national Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting for contributing directly to the improvement of Sustainable Forest Management regimes in the Asia-Pacific region.
The project aimed to formulate a technical framework and guidelines at the international level and implement it at the national level. Although the project did not produce such a framework and guidelines independently, it contributed to improving and using global FRA guidelines, along with ITTO and ASEAN Criteria & Indicators of sustainable forest management.
Contexts are different at international, regional and national scales. Thus, harmonisation and standardisation of MAR is a complex task and a continuous process.

3. The project involved 27 countries and 2 Asia-Pacific organisations, providing funds to 13 core countries of the region to improve MAR-SFM at national and sub national levels. The objective of the national MAR project was to prepare a format on MAR-SFM at the national

and forest management levels and to establish MAR by setting up a database management structure and strengthening the capacity of key forestry professionals and stakeholders. National focal points were established to enhance networking.
Some funds were available for implementing activities at the regional and national level; the recipient core countries used the funds that were made available to effectively achieve the national level objectives.
An important point that emerged is that with limited amounts of money it is possible to achieve great results at the national level in MAR. However, to fully achieve the main goal – that is, seeing MAR directly contributing to policymaking – it is necessary to run activities for a longer period.

4. The project document quality was generally acceptable, although it underestimated the difficulty and the size of the task, leading to a set of activities and outputs that only contributed to already existing processes, without being sufficiently incisive to fully reach the stated objective.
The project document was insufficient in detailing the objectives and the means of verification for outcomes and impacts, leaving the project staff with difficulties in assessing the project's progress once the CTA retired.

5. The available funds permitted the hiring of two officers: the CTA based in Rome HQ for two years (he remained in charge for one and a half year before retiring) and a Regional Technical Advisor based in FAORAP for 5 years. The RTA was under the CTA in the initial Phase, when the CTA provided backstopping and guidance. When the CTA retired, the RTA became the leader.
The detailed activities framework was not fully completed by the CTA, leaving the task to the Regional Technical Advisor, without upgrading the capacity of the position.
The number of countries and institutions involved was too high in proportion to the resources made available for national activities, thus reducing the impact at the country level.

6. At this stage, it seems that there is no prospect for a further phase of the project. According to what has been declared during several interviews, UN REDD and REDD+ will be the next programs to be funded by donors and MAR activities are likely to continue under that name, as a component still to be fully identified.
During some meetings with UNDP staff, dealing with REDD, it became known that the development of the project that includes FAO is perceived as too slow and risks hindering funds access. There were specific requests to improve planning and project preparation in order to avoid this risk.

7. An important point that also emerged from the evaluation is that the project, in spite of various difficulties that have been encountered, produced a wealth of documents and gathered a lot of information and valuable knowledge and created contacts and networks in the Asia Pacific region. All this could be useful to everyone who working on MAR or forestry issues in the future.
What is also clear is that all this information and knowledge is very difficult to access, being limited to activity reports and various documents.
The evaluation team considers that at this stage there is the risk of having the project closed, with an almost certain loss of expensive and useful information.

B. Recommendations

After the overall evaluation of the project and context analysis, this mission has made the following recommendations addressed to FAO:

1. The project has gathered and elaborated a wealth of information and documents at the international and national levels about MAR-SFM. However, they are scattered and difficult to access. Compiling and synthesising this information in one document is urgently needed in order to demonstrate the progress made by the project, showing the remaining gaps, highlighting the opportunities and so on. In Annexe 6 the evaluation team proposes a draft Table of Contents for this final document that should show and made accessible the most relevant information produced by the MAR- SFM project.
   The project has some remaining funds that could be used to hire the former RTA for about one month, in order to have this document compiled.
   There is insufficient time to produce this document before the project's expected end, on 31/12/2010, and there is no room for a duration extension now. The best solution seems to be hiring the RTA for additional work in the early months of 2011.

2. Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system of REDD is an emerging tool for upgrading the forest-based information system in the region. The FAO should take the lead in upgrading the existing MAR-SFM framework and National Forest Inventory (NFI) methodology to adopt the data needed for REDD and establish the MRV system at national and sub-national levels. In this process, FAO headquarter, FAO regional offices and National level FAO offices should be involved in improving quality and service delivery.

3. Linking MAR-SFM with MRV to conduct National forest Inventory, which is necessary to have fresh and reliable data generation.

VIII. Lessons Learned

Some key findings emerged from the evaluation, most of them related to project design and field activities at the national level.

1. The project's scope was too vast and the activities too complex to be completed by a project with limited staff and resources. This would mean a better prior analysis of the project objective and context, of the budget composition and planned expenditure, limiting the scope of the project to a balance between countries of intervention and available funds.

2. The institutional setting of the project was complex and created a number of uncertainties for project activities during the implementation.

3. The impact of a project is proportional to the available resources. Core countries that received even limited funds from the project demonstrated good results.
   In three visited countries, relatively small sums of money had remarkable effects (in the Philippines 44,000 US$, in Vietnam 16,000 US$, in Cambodia 27,000 US$), reinforcing and enabling the MAR environment deriving from previous ITTO and ADB projects, developing local capacities and a good understanding of the issues related to forest and land management. In the Philippines, the effect of MAR is now reaching policy level.

4. The process of harmonisation at the international level is currently estimated at being around 60%, while at the national level the estimates place it at around 30%. This means that the process of making the information compatible and comparable at national and international level will require a large effort in term of funds, staff, capacity building and technical backstopping.

Annexes

Annexe 1. Terms of Reference

Terminal Evaluation of the Project "Strengthening Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting (MAR) on Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) in Asia"
(GCP/INT/988/JPN)
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Rome/Bangkok
August 2010

Table of Contents

Acronyms (Abbreviations)

ADG/RR: Assistant Director General and Regional Representative
BH: Budget holder
CTA: Chief Technical Advisor
DAC: Development Assistance Committee
FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FOMA: Forest Assessment and Reporting Service
FOMR: Forest Resources Development Service
FPMIS: Field Programme Management Information System
FRA: Global Forest Resources Assessment
GLCN: Global Land Cover Network
GoJ: Government of Japan
HQ: FAO Headquarters
LTO: Lead Technical Officer
LTU: Lead Technical Unit
MAR: Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting
MRV: Measurement, Reporting, and Verification
NFMA: National Forest Monitoring and Assessment
OECD: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OED: Office of Evaluation
ProDoc: Project document
RAP: FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
RAPO: Forestry Department Group of RAP
REDD: Reducing Emissions of Deforestation and Degradation
RTA: Regional Technical Advisor
SFM: Sustainable Forest Management
SWOT: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats
TCSR: Resource Mobilization and Operations Support Service

ToR: Terms of Reference
UNEG: United Nations Evaluation Group

1. Introduction

These ToRs are prepared for the terminal evaluation of the Trust Funds Project: "Strengthening Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting (MAR) on Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) in Asia" (GCP/INT/988/JPN), funded by the Government of Japan. The project consisted of a global programme based at FAO Headquarters, and regional/national programmes based at FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (FAORAP) during the Development Phase from 2006 to 2007. During the Implementation Phase from 2008 to 2010, project implementation has been managed for regional/national programmes at the FAORAP in coordination with FAO Headquarters. The project's scheduled end date is 31 December 2010. This evaluation was foreseen in the project document in line with the FAO evaluation policy in order to take stock of project activities, and identify prospects and challenges for follow-up activities by FAO and collaborating countries.

2. Background of Project

There is a need to harmonise and improve international reporting on forests to reduce reporting burdens on countries and improve the efficiency and utility of such monitoring and reporting. However, the extent and quality of national responses to these efforts vary among countries as well as among the processes. Current national forest information systems in most of the Asian and Pacific countries are underdeveloped and non-robust, lacking necessary and consistent information. They do not have sufficient capacities and necessary linkages to promote SFM. Forest related MAR processes in most of the Asian countries, therefore, are underdeveloped, poorly implemented and not linked to the development of forest policies and the national planning processes. This poor state of MAR in the region is increasing the spatial and temporal inefficiencies of forest management regimes in Asian countries. The main objective of the project is to develop a globally harmonised forest-related national MAR system that directly contributes to the improvement of sustainable forest management (SFM). The project plans to initiate a system of regular and scientific collection, analysis, and reporting of forestry-related information coupled with its enhanced access and sharing with the civil society to facilitate better informed national level decision-making and improved formulation of forest policies and management planning.
Specific objectives of the project include:
a. Develop national and regional networks to share information, experience and knowledge within and among countries in the Asia-Pacific region;
b. Coordinate harmonisation and broadening of national MAR systems in the region;
c. Identify information needs on forests through national networks with a linkage to international policy dialogue on global issues like biodiversity, soil conservation, and climate change;
d. Mainstream forestry at the national level through strengthening linkages among forest, environmental, social and economic policies and accounting;
e. Facilitate the integration of SFM with overall sustainable development processes in countries; and
f. Disseminate information on forests and forestry development to all national stakeholders.

Appendix 1 shows a logical framework of the project. For both global and regional/national programmes, project activities are comprised of four elements:
1. development of institutional frameworks on forest MAR;
2. elaboration of harmonised frameworks/technical guidelines;
3. preparations of harmonised frameworks/technical guidelines; and
4. building information sharing networks.

A project document was endorsed on 28 November 2005. The project was approved officially by FAO on 12 January 2006. The initial donor input was US$2,810,045. The project started in April 2006 with the appointment of the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and the Regional Technical

Advisor (RTA) together with budget holders and lead technical officers. National focal points were nominated for the project in 26 countries. In September 2008, a tripartite mid-term review meeting was held to review project achievements and discuss next steps of activities with participants from a donor, beneficiary countries, and FAO. There was a suggestion that harmonisation of forest MAR activities be strengthened for the remaining period. The project budget underwent several revisions to reach the latest approved budget of US$2,566,463 by the decision of the Government of Japan.

3. Purpose of the Evaluation

The terminal project evaluation will assess the performance of the project from its formulation to its current stage in order to assess its design and implementations as well as its effectiveness and potential impact. Based on its analysis, the evaluation mission will also identify lessons for future similar projects (funded by Japan as well as other potential donors) as well as related national programmes/policies, including a consideration of the prospects for a possible extension of the project. Intended clients of the evaluation are stakeholders involved in project activities within FAO and in project countries.

4. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project in line with the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, including the following features as appropriate:

(a) Relevance and contribution of the project to national and regional development priorities and needs, FAO's Strategic Framework, the National Medium Term Priority Framework and the Millennium Development Goals;

(b) Comparative advantage of FAO as implementing agency for the project/ programme

(c) Theory of change underpinning the project idea;

(d) Quality and realism of the project design, including:
i. links and causal relationships between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact (specific and development objectives) in the Logical Framework and Annual Work Plans;
ii. relevance and appropriateness of indicators selected;
iii. validity of assumptions and risks;
iv. approach and methodology;
v. time frame and resources;
vi. institutional set-up;
vii. management arrangements; and
viii. stakeholder and beneficiary identification.

(e) Project management and implementation, including:
i. effectiveness and efficiency of operations management1;
ii. effectiveness of strategic management;
iii. efficiency and effectiveness of projects' coordination and steering bodies and mechanisms;
iv. set-up, efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring and internal review processes;
v. elaboration and implementation of an exit strategy;
vi. quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by FAO; and
vii. implementation gaps and delays if any, their causes and consequences, between planned and implemented outputs and outcomes; and assessment of any remedial measures taken.

(f) Project financial resources and financial management, including:
i. rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation;
ii. relevance of budget allocations in the project document and through Budget Revisions to project

objectives;
iii. cost-effectiveness of budget allocations in relation to project objectives.

(g) Project outputs and results, including the analysis of a sample of outputs and outcomes.
- A complete list of outputs prepared by the project team will be included as an annex to the evaluation report.

(h) Gender and social equality, including:
i. extent and quality of women's and minority groups' participation in project activities, their access to project resources and benefits, including capacity development;
1 This will encompass a review of staffing (including project officers/consultants, support staff, budget holders, lead technical officers, and other collaborating staff) and material inputs of the project.
ii. analysis of how gender relations, gender equity and processes of social inclusion were and will be affected by the project in the area/sector of intervention;
iii. contribution to women's and minority groups' visibility, participation in local development processes and empowerment; and
iv. extent to which gender and social equity were pursued in project management.

(i) The prospects for sustaining and possibly upscaling the project's results by the participating countries and institutions after the termination of the project. The assessment of sustainability will include:
i. Institutional, technical, economic and social sustainability of proposed technologies/innovations/processes;
ii. Project contribution and/or impact on natural resources in terms of maintenance and/or regeneration of the natural resource base (environmental sustainability).

(j) The actual and potential contribution of project outputs and outcomes to FAO's normative work and functions.

(k) Any other issues that the evaluation team may consider relevant and important.

5. Evaluation methodology and organization

5.1. Methodology

The terminal evaluation will be made through document reviews, interviews with related stakeholders in and outside FAO (including selected project countries and collaborating organizations), dialogue with the project staff (Regional Technical Coordinator), and discussions among evaluation mission members. Appropriate tools will be developed to conduct the evaluation, including an evaluation matrix with an indicator set, interview guidelines, and questionnaires.
The project will provide required materials to the team.
Interviews/dialogue will be made with various stakeholders by any means (e.g. meeting, phone, skype, video conference, e-mail, etc.). Apart from evaluation of regional/national activities managed at RAP in Bangkok, global activities managed at HQ will also be studied through document reviews and distant communications by phone, video, e-mail, etc.
The evaluation team will visit selected countries to observe and discuss project activities and related facilities or activity sites with identified sub-regional/national stakeholders. When appropriate, the evaluation team may be divided into two sub groups to visit two countries each separately (The evaluation team is to determine countries to be visited through discussions with the project staff in advance). The team will collect information related to the project in any forms during country visits, including documents/written materials, data, images, oral information, etc.

The evaluation will pay attention to the following approaches:
1) The evaluation will adopt a participatory approach and triangulation as a key method for validation of information and evidence. It will follow a consultative, iterative and transparent approach with

internal and external stakeholders throughout the whole process.
2) A range of tools will be used, including: consultation of existing reports, semistructured interviews with key informants and stakeholders and focus group discussions supported by check lists and/or protocols, direct observation during field visits, etc. Particular attention will be devoted to ensure that under-privileged groups will be consulted in adequate manner.
3) The Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) framework will be one major analytical tool for assessment of the projects' results. If appropriate, the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework will also be applied as the reference for assessing contributions to social, economic, and environmental sustainability.
4) The evaluation will strictly adhere to the UNEG Evaluation Norms & Standards.

5.2. Roles and responsibilities
The project will hire a national evaluation consultant in consultations with national focal points, with guidance from the Office of Evaluation. The project will also consult with the donor (Government of Japan) through TCSR regarding Japanese participation in the evaluation. (It will be necessary to make early travel arrangements for the evaluation team, including coordination with related national stakeholders and ticket/hotel booking.) Furthermore, the ToR stipulated the following responsibilities for the terminal evaluation:
1) FAO Budget Holder (BH) and the Lead Technical Unit (LTU) of the project/programme to be evaluated are responsible for initiating the evaluation process, drafting the first version of the Terms of Reference, recruiting the evaluation team and supporting its work during the mission. They are required to participate in meetings with the team, to make available information and documentation as necessary, and to comment on the final draft report.
2) The BH is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management Response (MR) to the evaluation, in which it expresses its overall judgment of the evaluation process and report and accepts, partially accepts or rejects each recommendation. For accepted recommendations, responsibilities and timetable for implementation are also indicated; for rejected recommendations, a justification should be provided. One year after the MR is issued, the BH will prepare the Follow-up report to the MR, to inform on progress in the implementation of the recommendations.
3) The FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) assists the BH and LTU in drafting the ToR, in the identification of the consultants and set-up of the evaluation team and in the organization of the team's work; it is responsible for the clearance of the ToR and of the team composition; it shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process. The Office has a quality assurance role on the final report, in terms of presentation, compliance with the ToR, timely delivery, quality of the evidence and analysis done.
4) The OED has also a responsibility in following up with the BH for the timely preparation of the MR and the follow-up to them.
5) The Evaluation Team is responsible vis-à-vis FAO for conducting the evaluation, applying the methodology as appropriate and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefings meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs to the final draft and final report.
6) The Team Leader guides and coordinates the team members in their specific assessment work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own.
7) The mission is fully responsible for its independent report which may not necessarily reflect the views of the Government or of FAO. FAO is not entitled to modify the contents of any evaluation report, nor is an evaluation report subject to technical clearance, beside the quality assurance control by the OED.

5.3. Consultation process
Formal and informal consultation with FAO, the Government, the donor and any other stakeholders will be encouraged in the evaluation in the following steps:
1) The mission will maintain close liaison with the OED, the FAO Representation(s) and all key stakeholders. Although the mission should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything

relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Government, the donor or FAO.
2) At the end of the data and information gathering phase, the team will present its preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to the key stakeholders, to discuss and obtain feedback from them. In national project evaluations, the debriefing will include the Government, the donor, the FAO Representation and any other partner or relevant actor. In the case of regional, inter-regional and global projects, the most efficient and effective solutions will be identified and arrangements made for the debriefing to take place with as many stakeholders as possible.
3) The Terms of Reference of the evaluation and the final draft report will be circulated among key stakeholders before finalization; comments and suggestions will be incorporated as appropriate.

5.4. The Evaluation Report

Based on the whole evaluation work, an evaluation report will be prepared. The evaluation team will present a draft report to related stakeholders of FAO and project countries after evaluation work. With comments from them, the team will finalize the report and send it to the stakeholders for their use. The timing of delivery of the final draft report will be determined through consultations with the BH and LTU as well as the project. The report will be prepared in the following procedure:
1) The evaluation report will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues and meets the evaluation criteria listed in the ToR. The report will be as clear and concise as possible, will focus on findings, conclusions and recommendations and include an executive summary. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report and for future reference.
2) The structure of the report should facilitate in so far as possible the links between body of evidence, analysis and formulation of recommendations, which will be addressed to the different stakeholders: they may be strategic and operational and will have to be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.
3) The Evaluation Team Leader and the team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the outline provided in annex to the ToR. The report will be prepared in English/French/Spanish, with numbered paragraphs. Translations in other languages of the Organization will be the responsibility of the OED.
4) The mission leader bears responsibility for submitting the final draft report to FAO within two weeks from the conclusion of the mission. Within two additional weeks, FAO will submit to the team its comments and suggestions that the team will include whenever appropriate to finalize the report.
5) The Budget Holder will circulate the final evaluation report to all key stakeholders and to the donor, through the relevant FAO Unit for external relations (TCSR). The BH will also upload the report in FPMIS.
6) OED will be responsible for making available as public documents the final evaluation report and the FAO Management response on its website.

6. Composition of the evaluation team

The composition of the evaluation team will be agreed among key stakeholders, as well as the roles within the team, based on competences and skills of each individual team member. OED will clear the final team set-up. The evaluation team will be organized in accordance with the following guidelines:
a) The evaluation team shall comprise the best available mix of skills and competences that are required to assess the initiative and the issues at stake; among others, it will include competence and skill in evaluation and preferably, experience in project countries where the initiatives are implemented; it will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.
b) The evaluation team will combine among its members the following fields of expertise:
• Forest monitoring, assessment and reporting
• Forest management policy and planning
• Project planning, management and evaluation
• Financial management
• FAO's working system

c) FAO will take the lead in proposing to other key stakeholders, suitable candidates to be part of the team. All parties, including project national focal points, are kindly invited to suggest suitable candidates. It is tentatively suggested that the team be composed by at least 3 (three) team members, who together will cover all the fields of expertise listed above. They would include: one Evaluation Consultant (Team Leader) selected in consultation with FAO-Headquarters (OED); one national consultant who is an expert of forest monitoring, assessment and reporting (MAR); and one donor representative (three persons in total). These members should be independent of project activities to ensure objective evaluation. However, the RTA will assist the evaluation team as resource person upon request.
d) All team members will have a University Degree and a minimum of 7 (seven) years of professional experience in their respective areas and in the field of development aid. All will be fluent in (language spoken in the countries). Mission members will have no previous direct involvement with the project either with regard to its formulation, implementation or backstopping. All will have signed the FAO Evaluation Service Declaration of Interest form.
e) These members assemble at the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP).
The Evaluation Team Leader will brief and guide the team members on overall evaluation and project-related matters, after reviewing related documents and consultations with related officers at the HQ. The national consultant will review project activities mainly from policy and technical aspects in the light of national needs and capacities for forest MAR. The donor representative will consider the relevance and effectiveness of funds assistance n both technical and administrative aspects. The team will make an overall synthesis of project activities from policy, technical and administrative aspects to formulate conclusions and recommendations.
f) The final composition of the team will be decided in close consultation with OED, according to the criteria set out above.

7. Evaluation timetable and organization of the evaluation mission

The terminal evaluation is planned from 7 to 27 November 2010 (21 days in total). The duration of the terminal evaluation is estimated at about 2.5 weeks: 2 days initially to review the documentation and brainstorm with the project staff and supervisors and backstoppers at HQ and RAP; 2 days to develop and fine-tune the evaluation instruments (e.g., questionnaires and interview guidelines); 7 days (including travel time) for country visits; 3 days for telephone (skype) interviews and video meetings; 4 days for report writing; and 2 days for finalization of the report through discussions; and 1 day for debriefing at RAP. The evaluation is based at RAP in Bangkok with visits to selected countries among Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, and Vietnam. The team will confirm countries to be visited through discussions with the project staff in advance for prior preparations for country visits. The final evaluation report will be made after draft versions of the report have been circulated to key stakeholders for review and comments.

8. Budget

The total budget for terminal project evaluation is tentatively estimated at approximately US$40,000 as follows, covering remuneration and travel costs of evaluation members (including one international consultant and one national consultant), communications, documentation, and administrative costs. The donor (the Government of Japan) is kindly requested to allocate funds to send its representative for the evaluation mission. The total budget will be approved by the BH and shared with all relevant internal stakeholders.

Annexes
1. Project document (including project framework)
2. The latest progress report
3. The latest budget sheet
4. Contents and outline for project evaluation reports

Annexe 2. List of places visited and key persons met by the mission

Organization	Names of interviewees, Title
8 November, FAO Headquarters	
FO	Mr. Jim Carle (Chief, FOMR) Mr. Dan Olof Altrell (Forestry Officer, FOMR) (Lead Technical Off.) Mr. Marco Piazza (Consultant, FOMR) Ms. Mette Loyche Wilkie (Chief, FOMA) Mr. Adam Gerrand (Forestry Officer, FOMA)
OED	Mr. Bernd Bultemeier (Evaluation Officer, OEDD) Ms. Tullia Aiazzi (Evaluation Officer, OEDD)
8-10 November, FAORAP, Thailand	
RAP	Mr. Patrick Bryan Durst (Senior Forestry Officer, Budget Holder) Mr. Appanah Simmathiri (National Forest Programme Advisor, RAPO - NRE/FO) Mr. Tetsuji Nakata (Human Resources Officer)
Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment	Mr. Chudchawan Sutthisrisilapa (Director and former FP 2006-07)
11 – 13 November, Indonesia	
UN-REDD	Ms. Verania Andria (Progr. Manager, sustainable Energy Envir. Unit) Mr. Rogier J.M. Klaver (Programme Officer)
FAOR	Mr. James J. McGrane (FAO Representative, a.i.)
Ministry of Forestry	Mr. Iman Santhosa (Deputy for FP) Mr. Chaendin M. (Head of Information Division on Forest Land Use) Ms. Ari Sylvia, (Head of Cooperation and Public Relation Sub Div.)
ASEAN Secretariat	Mr. Dian Sukmajaya
GTZ (ASEAN-S)	Ms. Daniela Goehler (Advisor, ASEAN-German Regional Forest Programme)
GTZ	Mr. Rolf Krezdorn (Programme Director, Forest and climate change programme)
JICA	Mr. Yasuhisa Tanaka (Chief Advisor, satellite image project) Ms. Satomi Tanaka (Coordinator)
KOICA	Mr. Kyu Tae Lee (Project Manager, A/R CDM and REDD project)
14-17 November, Philippines	
15 November, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Forest Management Bureau, Manila	
DENR Forest management bureau	Neria A. Andin Ceso III, Assistant Director Nonito M. Tamayo, Forester, Officer in Charge (FP)
DENR	Joybert F. Mijares, Forester/planning
DENR, Natural for. man. Div.	Nestor A. Bambalan, Sr. Forest management specialist
DENR Silviculture section	Raul M. Briz, Section in-charge
Forest economics division	Dolores R. Catindig Supervising forest management specialist
National forest manag. div.	Carlo P. Consolacion, Sr. Forester management specialist
	Joel E. Flores, Forest management specialist
Reforestation division	Remedios S. Evangelista, Officer in-charge,
Legal division	John G. Jaramillo, Officer in-charge,
Community Based Forest Management Division	Nilda S. Patiga, Officer in-charge, Program development section For. Ana Rose DF Opena, Networks develop. section Officer in charge
Southern Philippines Irrigation sector project-forest management bureau	Socrates F. Bartolo, project management specialist Jenalyn M. Lansigan, project specialist Rizalyn M. Ero, project accounts officer Noel B. Pacis, project assistant Raymond A. Villar, project specialist

Organization	Names of interviewees, Title
	Robert V. Rivera, Forest Management Specialist
DENR Office of Assistant Director	Lisette G. Monteno, Project evaluation/planning officer FAO-MAR project
16. November, DENR Region II, Narra Hall, Carig, Tuguegarao City	
DENR Forest management bureau	Rodrigo N. Napigue, Forester Conner, Apayao
DENR	Noel M. Barrientos, Senior Forest Mn.gmt Specialist/ Tabuk, Kalinga
DENR, Natural forest man. Div.	Joselito Razon, Forest Management Specialist
DENR Silviculture section	Tomas B. Tumangil, Forester
Forest economics Division	Joel Daquiag, Senior Forest Management Specialist-
National forest manag. Division	Romeo Cristobal Forester-
	Artemio P. Gavino, Forester San Isidro, Isabela
Reforestation division	Paul F. Afos, forester Baler, Aurora
Legal division	Merlito A. Villar, Environmental Management Specialist
Community Based Forest Management Division	Louie M. Velez, Forester Apayao
DENR Proj. eval. officer/office of assistant director	Ceferino V. Feliciano Company Forester
Networks Dev. Sect. CBFMD	Danilo C. Somera, Senor Forest Management Specialist - Apayao
	Domingo Z. dela Cruz, Forester
	Perpetuo B. Maningas, Forest Operation Manager
	Elmer R. Cuanan, Naguillan, Isabela
FAOR	Mr Kazuyuki Tsurumi (FAO Representative)
18-20 November, Cambodia	
Forestry Administration	Mr. Meas Makara (Director) Mr. Chea Sam Ang (Deputy Director) Mr. Khorn Saret (Chief, FP) Mr. Omaliss Keo (Deputy Director, UN-REDD Focal Point) Mr. Chheng Kimsun (Chief) Mr. Sok Srun (Coordinator, DANIDA project for TWG-F&E) Mr. Pak Chealy (Deputy Director) Ms. Sar Sophyra (Watershed and forestland manag. officer, RS&GIS) Mr. Edwin V. Payuan (Country Program Coordinator, RECOFTC)
JICA	Mr. Hiroshi Nakata (Technical Advisor to Director-General, FA)
22-25 November, Vietnam	
Department of Forestry (DoF)	Mr. Vu Thanh Nam
Forestry Inventory and Planning Institute (FIPI)	Mr. Dinh Huu Khanh (FP) Mr. Ngo Van Tu (Expert of GIS, Remote Sensing and M&E)
FAOR	Ms. Yuriko Shoji (FAO Representative) Mr. Vu Ngonc Tien (Assistant FAO Representative) Ms. Akiko Inoguchi (Forestry officer) Mr. Danilo Mollicone (Forestry officer, FOMD)
Forest Sector Support Partnership (FSSP)	Mr. Le Nho Hoan (Monitoring and Information Officer)
UN-REDD	Mr. Pham Manh Cuong (FP for UN-REDD)
26-27 November, FAORAP, Thailand	
RAP	Mr. Hiroyuki Konuma (ADG/FAORAP) Mr. Patrick Bryan Durst (Senior Forestry Officer, Budget Holder)

FP: Focal Point

Annexe 3. List of documents and other reference materials consulted by the mission

The main documents consulted by the evaluation team is as follows:

1. Project Document, Final version
2. Progress Reports Jan 2006-Jun 2010 GCP-INT-988-JPN (8 reports);
3. Mid term review report;
4. Brief Note on MAR-SFM Working Paper Series (AP) on NFI- Brief. (19 countries)
5. MAR Terminal Report (Draft 31/08/2010);

Many other documents related to workshops were also consulted on specific issues.
The vast documents production of the project is as follows.

1. Forest Resources Development Service. 2006. Proceedings of Inception Workshop - Strengthening Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting on Sustainable Forest Management in Asia (MAR Working Paper 1). FAO-HQ, Rome. 22pp.
2. Forest Resources Development Service. 2006. Guidelines on Establishment and Management Of National Network for Monitoring Assessment and Reporting on Forests (NN-MAR) (MAR Working Paper 2). FAO-HQ, Rome. 9pp.
3. Forestry Department Group. 2006. Regional Workshop on Development of Regional Umbrella Annual Plan of Activities under the MAR-SFM Project - Proceedings - 31 October - 2 November 2006, Chiang Mai, Thailand. (GCP/INT/988/JPN) (MAR Working Paper 3). FAORAP, Bangkok. 69pp.
4. Forest Resources Development Service. 2006. Proceedings of the Training Workshop on Harmonization of land Cover and Forest Classification in Remote Sensing - Asia Pacific Region. 4-8 December 2006. Dehradun, India (GCP/INT/988/JPN) (MAR Working Paper 4). FAO-HQ, Bangkok. 16pp.
5. Giri Tejaswi. 2007. Manual on Deforestation, Degradation, and Fragmentation using Remote Sensing and GIS (MAR Working Paper 5). FAO-HQ, Rome. 49pp.
6. Cecilia Alarcón Salinas. 2007. A GIS Primer on How To Illustrate Spatial Data and Information Generated through National Forest Inventories (MAR Working Paper 6). FAO-HQ, Rome. 64pp.
7. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Report of Survey on the Contents of National Forest Inventory (MAR Working Paper 7). FAO-HQ, Rome. 37pp.
8. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Proceedings of Training Workshop on Broadening, Harmonization and Cross-Sectoral Integration of National Forest Inventories in Asia-Pacific Region (MAR Working Paper 8). FAO-HQ, Rome. 39pp.
9. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Project Proposal - GCP/GLO/194/MUL: Strengthening Forest Resources Management and Enhancing its Contribution to Sustainable Development, Landuse and Livelihoods (MAR Working Paper 9). FAO-HQ, Rome. 74pp.
10. Servicio de Desarrollo de Recursos Forestales. 2007. Encuesta Breve sobre los contenidos de los Inventarios Forestales Nacionales (Papel de trabajo de MAR 10). FAO-HQ, Rome. 32pp.

12. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Bangladesh (MAR Working Paper 12). FAO-HQ, Rome. 24pp.

13. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Bhutan (MAR Working Paper 13). FAO-HQ, Rome. 28pp.

14. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Brunei Darussalam (MAR Working Paper 14). FAO-HQ, Rome. 19pp.

15. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Cambodia (MAR Working Paper 15). FAO-HQ, Rome. 18pp.

16. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in China (MAR Working Paper 16). FAO-HQ, Rome. 15pp.

17. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in India (MAR Working Paper 17). FAO-HQ, Rome. 27pp.

18. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Indonesia (MAR Working Paper 18). FAO-HQ, Rome. 14pp.

19. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Japan (MAR Working Paper 19). FAO-HQ, Rome. 16pp.

20. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Lao PDR (MAR Working Paper 20). FAO-HQ, Rome. 17pp.

21. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Malaysia (MAR Working Paper 21). FAO-HQ, Rome. 20pp.

22. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Mongolia (MAR Working Paper 22). FAO-HQ, Rome. 19pp.

23. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Myanmar (MAR Working Paper 23). FAO-HQ, Rome. 18pp.

24. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Nepal (MAR Working Paper 24). FAO-HQ, Rome. 17 pp.

25. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Pakistan (MAR Working Paper 25). FAO-HQ, Rome. 14pp.

26. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in the Philippines (MAR Working Paper 26). FAO-HQ, Rome. 20pp.

27. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in South Korea (MAR Working Paper 27). FAO-HQ, Rome. 13pp.

28. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Sri Lanka (MAR Working Paper 28). FAO-HQ, Rome. 19pp.

29. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Thailand (MAR Working Paper 29). FAO-HQ, Rome. 20pp.

30. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Brief on National Forest Inventory (NFI) in Vietnam (MAR Working Paper 30). FAO-HQ, Rome. 16pp.

31. Forest Resources Development Service. 2007. Information and Knowledge Management for Sustainable Forest to Management in Asian Country (MAR Working Paper 31). FAO-HQ, Rome. 14pp.

32. Forestry Department Group. 2007. Proceedings of the Workshop on Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting for Sustainable Forest Management in the South Pacific Region (MAR Working Paper 32). FAO-HQ, Rome. 27pp.

33. Forestry Department Group. 2007. Analysis of Questionnaires and Statistics on Forest MAR in the South Pacific Countries (MAR Working Paper 33). FAO-HQ, Rome. 18pp.

34. Forestry Department Group. 2008. Proceedings of the Mid-Term Tripartite Review Meeting on Strengthening Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting on Sustainable Forest Management in Asia (MAR Working Paper 34). FAORAP, Bangkok. 19pp.

35. Global Forest Assessment and Reporting Team/Forestry Department Group. 2009. Proceedings of the Regional Workshop on Strengthening of Harmonisation of National Reporting to FRA 2010 and Other International Processes on Forests in Asia (MAR Working Paper 35). FAORAP, Bangkok. 19pp.

36. Anders Wellving. 2010. Information Systems for Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting of Forest Resources - A Case Study in Cambodia and Lao PDR MAR Working Paper 36). FAORAP, Bangkok. 19pp.

37. Anders Wellving. 2010. Information Systems for Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting of Forest Resources – Result of A Questionnaire in South-East Asia and Pacific (MAR Working Paper 37). FAORAP, Bangkok. 19pp.

38. National Forest Management Unit. Format on National Monitoring Assessment and Reporting on Sustainable Forest Management. 2008. Forestry Administration, Phnom Penh. 35pp.

39. Academy of Forest Inventory and Planning. 2008. Diagnostic Study on the Development of Forestry Monitoring System & Harmonization of International Reporting on Forest in China. State Forestry Administration, Beijing. 33pp.

40. Forest Research Institute. 2009. Strengthening, Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting on Sustainable Forest Management (MAR-SFM) in India. Indian Council of Forestry Research & Education, Dehradun. 103pp.

41. Chimidnyam Dorjsuren. 2008. Country Progress Report: Recommendation for harmonization and standardization of MAR terms. Forest Water Research Centre, Ulaanbaatar. 14pp.

42. Jamsran Tsogtbaatar. 2008. Study Report on Methodologies and Tools for Harmonized Monitoring and Assessment. Forest Water Research Centre, Ulaanbaatar. 8pp.

43. Dugerjav Enebish. 2008. Report on Capabilities of National Network for Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting. Forest Water Research Centre, Ulaanbaatar. 13pp.

44. Pakistan Forest Institute. 2008. Evaluation of Forest Monitoring, Assessment & Reporting Systems in Pakistan. Ministry of Environment, Islamabad. 69pp.

45. Forest Management Bureau. 2009. Project Completion Report: Raising Awareness and Strengthening Capacities on the Application of the Forest Auditing System using the Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management (C&I for SFM) in the Philippines. Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Manila. 97pp.

46. Helen Corrigan. 2009. Forest Data and Resource Assessment of Forestry in Vanuatu. Ministry of Agriculture, Quarantine, Forestry and Fisheries, Port Vila. 20pp.

47. Forestry Inventory and Planning Institute. 2009. Report on National Programme of Vietnam on Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting on Forests under the Project:

Strengthening Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting on Sustainable Forest Management in Asia. Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Hanoi. 43pp.

48. Forestry Inventory and Planning Institute. 2009. National Programme of Vietnam on

Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting on Forests under the Project Strengthening Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting (MAR) on Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) in Asia Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Hanoi. 49pp.

49. Thang Hooi Chiew, Ismail Harun, and Samsudin Musa. 2009. Report of Regional Training Workshop on Strengthening Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting on Sustainable Forest Management In ASEAN. ASEAN Secretariat, Jakarta. 383pp.

50. Michael Mussong. 2008. Results of MAR-Workshop (November 18, Nadi, Fiji) and

Further Steps towards a Harmonised MAR-System on SFM in the Pacific Island Countries. Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Nadi. 19pp.

51. Michael Mussong. 2008. Survey on the Status of Forest Data in Selected Pacific Island Countries. Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Nadi. 21pp.

52. Michael Mussong. 2010. Standardisation of Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting (MAR)

for Sustainable Forest Management in the Pacific: Proposal for Terrestrial Monitoring Methodologies. Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Nadi. 29pp.

53. Jimmy Wanefaia Irokete. 2010. Permanent Sample Plot Design Project for Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting in the Solomon Islands. Forest Resources Management Planning & Technical Services Division, Honiara. 19pp.

54. MAR Newsletter (Vol. 1 No. 1-3; Vol.2 No.1-3; Vol.3 No. 1-3; Vol. 4 No.1-3)

55. MAR Website: : http://www.fao.org/forestry/mar/en/

Annexe 4. Questionnaire

Summary of Questionnaire Survey

The aim of the questionnaire was to understand the results of the project and to improve future projects through feedback and lessons learned. Taking into consideration the difference of level of involvement in the project, two different questionnaires were prepared: one was for distributing to core countries, and another was for beneficiary countries. The questionnaire consists of a maximum of 12 questions, including some questions in accordance with OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, namely, (i) relevance (ii) effectiveness (iii) efficiency (iv) sustainability and (v) impacts.
The questionnaire was distributed to all the 25 countries as well as the 2 regional organizations, and the evaluation team obtained 19 answers from 13 different countries and organizations. (Bhutan, China, Mongolia, Myanmar, Solomon Islands, Pakistan, Philippines, Papua New Guinea, Vietnam, Brunei, Japan, ASEAN Secretariat and SPC)

The following description is a summary of the questionnaire survey; full answers are presented in the following pages.

Q1. <Descriptions of major activities>
Various activities were executed based on the respective LoAs.

Q2. <Cash/in-kind contribution>
It varies from country to country based on LoAs.

Q3. <Relevance> Score: 3.5/4.0
The project was considered very much relevant to SFM in each country and has contributed to raising awareness of national policies.

Q4. <Impacts> Score: 3.4/4.0
The project had been considered highly influential and had been given some countries a strong motivation to formulate and/or revise national policies.

Q5. <Effectiveness> Score: 3.0/4.0
The project was seen as achieveing the expected results to some extent, but only to limited staff and participants of the workshops due to lack of budget. More concerned officials need to be involved in the project and attended the workshops in order to obtain desired effect.

Q6. <Efficiency> Score: 3.3/4.0
Some countries lack human resources to implement the activities in a timely manner. With regard to regional workshops, many countries applauded FAO for the great coordination, preparation and backstopping.

Q7. <Consideration to actual condition> Score: 3.2/4.0
The project took in account the national specificities and the local conditions.

Q8. <Preliminary consultation> Score: 3.2/4.0
It appears that most countries had necessary consultations with relevant stakeholders.

Q9. <Sustainability> Score: 3.2/4.0
Sustainability is open to doubt except for the countries which MAR schemes have already

been institutionalized. Strong motive, commitment and awareness at the decision making level is indispensable for continuing the activities.

Q10. <Major results> Score: N/A
Most countries stated that this project increased awareness of the relevant agencies in the countries. Some countries responded that national network was established and this project helped to identify the needs and issues to be tackled with. However, there are few answers mentioning that the national capacities had been improved.

Q11. <Major impact> Score: N/A
There were a few comments that this project would be a sort of driving force for continuing other national activities relevant to SFM.

Q12. <Problems, Lessons learned and Suggestions> Score: N/A
Some countries faced with a difficulty to conduct project activities within the given time which was relatively too short for them due to lack of resources and/or complexity of the technical and institutional aspect. Several countries suggested that MAR programme should be excuted or continued under the longer-term framework rather than Trust Fund project.

Full answers to Questionnaires

Q1. What types of activity did the MAR project support in your country?

Core countries	Description of activities
Bhutan	Broadly the following activities were indentified: 1. Conducting assessment of needs and capabilities of MAR –SFM 2. Identify information and data for National Network (NN) database and tools. 3. Conduct training for NN members on harmonisation of MAR information. 4. Development of website
China	Diagnostic study was carried into practice during March 2007- July 2008.
Myanmar	MAR Project provided financial support (totally 24,050 US $ for 2009, 2010). Forest Department applied this financial support for collecting official requirements, such as computers, printers, etc… (Only used 7664.40 US $) as base equipment for MARS related National Management Inventory and Forest Management Plans. Authorities from Myanmar have been invited to various Seminars and Workshops. Precious knowledge has been gained from these activities in formulating MARs related activities in Myanmar.
Mongolia	Establish a national network (NN) and a national steering committee (NSC) Workshop on harmonisation of MAR information systems Capacity building for forest specialists Study of recommendations for harmonisation/standardization of MAR terms Study of methodologies and tools for harmonised Monitoring assessment reporting system
Pakistan	Strengthening national network Appraisal of the current forest assessing, monitoring and reporting systems in use of provincial and federal institutions and MAR-SFM strategy for the future. Workshop
Solomon Island	Supported for the introduction of the PSP (Permanent Sample Plots) in the selected regions as a Development Phase for Forest assessments of the many concerns of the forest resources particularly on Forest Stocking, Carbon Stocking, and Biomass etc., which has lack quality data for quantification and evaluation. Contributed to initial recognition of the direct and indirect benefits that landowners will get in understanding their forest resources and making management decisions on how they will use their forest thru SFM strategies for a better future. Transferred technical knowledge on the study to the Forest Officers thru MAR training

Core countries	Description of activities
	Supported for acquiring of technical equipment for field operations. (Will support current Government Policy on the Carbon mitigation actions on the many carbon forest dynamics for quantification and evaluation on the many levels under global and regional arrangements.)
Philippines (1)	Capacity building and awareness building activities for DENR and FMU on C&I and Audit System
Philippines (2)	N/A
Philippines (3)	N/A
Philippines (4)	C&I for SFM and its Auditing System
Philippines (5)	Pilot test of MAR
Papua New Guinea	The project could have provided some tangible activity, however due to a lack of coordination on our (PNG) part, nothing of substance took place apart from the $10,000 that we applied for to upgrade the existing databases that we have.
SPC (1)	Areas of regional support to the Pacific countries provided through the Land Resources Division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC LRD) included: • 2007 – Pacific MAR Workshop which recommended, amongst others things, the development • 2008 – study undertaken to look at data availability and importance and also areas of expertise and experience in the participating Pacific countries that could be shared amongst the countries • 2008 – Pacific MAR workshop which discussed the above study and also recommended, amongst other things, the identification or development of adapted and cost-effective methodologies for monitoring, assessment and reporting on the agreed MAR criteria • 2009 – training of appropriate staff in Kiribati on the operation of the vegetation monitoring system established with some support from the MAR project • 2009 – selection, adaptation and field testing of MAR methodologies in Kiribati and Fiji, represent small and large country situations • 2010 – Pacific MAR workshop to discuss, trial and endorse the selected MAR methodologies • 2010 – draft manual for the above methodologies finalized
SPC (2)	Int. resource person: joint development of a terrestrial MAR-design for the PICs
Viet Nam	Harmonise forestry indicators between Vietnam and Region and International level. Increase knowledge of key forestry officers.
ASEAN (1)	• Strengthening of the existing online and offline MAR systems used for ASEAN C&I • Organizing a training workshop for the use of offline MAR in ASEAN Member States •Organizing a coordination workshop on regional and national C&I frameworks and MAR implementation mechanism
ASEAN (2)	N/A
Beneficiary countries	
Brunei Darussalam	N/A
Japan	N/A

Q2. Please evaluate the contribution in cash or in kind made by your country to the MAR project (in US$)

Core countries	Description
Bhutan	In-kind for HR and DSA, travel expense etc.
China	Financial input was provided for the relevant activities including information collection, expert consultation workshop, publications, printing and expendables by the Recipient Organization. Moreover, basic facilities such as working room, computers and printer were also provided, besides establishment of working group and provision of their salary during the *Diagnostic Study Activities.*
Myanmar	In-kind for HR
Mongolia	USD 13.200 for workshop and study but it was not enough to establish MAR system or improve harmonisation/standardization of MAR terms in national level
Pakistan	US$ 1.877 in-kind
Solomon Island	SBD $25,000 for the support during the consultation phase on Malaita for actual PSP establishment.

Core countries	Description
	In-kind for HR and equipment
Philippines (1)	In-kind for HR and equipment
Philippines (2)	N/A
Philippines (3)	N/A
Philippines (4)	In-kind for HR
Philippines (5)	In-kind for HR
Papua New Guinea	
SPC (1)	SPC LRD has contributed funds and also staff time in support of all the above activities. At the same time we have also enlisted the support of another Pacific regional organization, SOPAC, which contributed expertise in GIS and remote sensing right throughout.
SPC (2)	N/A
Viet Nam	$4500 in-kind
ASEAN (1)	• For the implementation of MAR project activities mentioned above, ASEAN side has contributed mainly in man power since two workshops were held in Laos and Indonesia, while IT technician from the ASEAN Secretariat was assigned for the improvement of offline MAR.
ASEAN (2)	N/A
Beneficiary countries	
Brunei Darussalam	N/A
Japan	N/A

Q3. Do you think that the MAR project was relevant to Sustainable Forest Management in your country?

Core countries	Score	Description	Key words
Bhutan	4	1. The project was very relevant to usher forward the concept of sustainable forest management in the country. 2. The Project also helped us to identify many information gaps and needs that were required for taking forward the concept of SFM in the country.	Helped to usher forward to SFM identified information gaps and needs
China	3		
Myanmar	N/A	Actually MAR Project was relevant to SFM. As we mention in Q1, we used MAR supporting just for collecting materials. Forest Department establishes and implements the management activities by its owned budgets to implement SFM	
Philippines (1)	N/A	MAR revolves SFM	
Mongolia	3		
Pakistan	3	MAR was in line with the National Environment/Forest Policy and helped in identifying the requirements of Government exchequer, investors and donors on uniform and integrated MAR system.	
Solomon Island	1	There are gaps in the MAR system in our country when update information on forest resources. To have reference to existing PSP units in systematic locations under the MAR-PSP design is a better direction for getting the quality data for better evaluation of the forest resources. Those data will contribute to the many management purposes of the FR to achieve SFM.	
Philippines (2)	N/A		
Philippines (3)	4	Influential on the Govt. officials and resource planning managers	Influential
Philippines (4)	4	Has been institutionalized and forms an integral part of SFM	Integral
Philippines (5)	4	MAR is a tool for monitoring the country's attainment	A tool for SFM
Papua New	3	The MAR project was relevant, however PNG did not make use of	

Core countries	Score	Description	Key words
Guinea		it.	
SPC (1)	3	Without knowledge of the status of forests, monitoring for SFM will not be possible. Many of our Pacific countries do not have adequate data on their forests and also do not have the capacity to collect and process the data and to report. The opportunity to participate in the project showed them the importance of proper data and how these could be obtained and analyzed. But this will be a continued process from now on, which we will be supporting with SOPAC.	Raised awareness of the importance of SFM
SPC (2)	4	Very important due to the fact that no country has already a MAR system on SFM and all countries need information for national forest policy and international processes.	Raised awareness of (inter) national policy
Viet Nam	4	We have used ourselves forestry indicators for a long time. However, when we open the door for the international investment and development, it faces a lot of problem on the information. This study help us to have an overall modification of our forestry indicator and how to measure, collect them	Motivated to change methodology
ASEAN (1)	4	It is very much relevant for ASEAN since ASEAN C&I was adopted in 2007 and ASEAN has been trying to establish and utilize MAR to assess Sustainable Forest Management at regional, national and forest management unit (FMU) levels	Relevant for regional policy
ASEAN (2)	4	As a resource person in conducting the three regional workshops. One could conclude that they were very relevant to SFM in ASEAN Member States (AMS). This is in view that the 'ASEAN Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Management of Tropical Forests' (ASEAN C&I) and the 'Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting Format for Sustainable Forest Management in ASEAN' (MAR Format) were developed based on the 2005 'Revised ITTO Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Management of Tropical Forests, including Reporting Format' and the seven common elements for SFM of the 2003 'International Conference on the Contribution of Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management: the Way Forward' (CICI 2003) that was held in Guatemala City, Guatemala.	Relevant to SFM
Beneficiary countries			
Brunei Darussalam	4	It really helps us in ensuring the national set of forestry practices geared towards the SFM.	
Japan	4	N/A	
Average	3.5/4.0		

Note: The project had been considered very much relevant to SFM in each country and has contributed for raising awareness of national policies.

Q4. Do you think that MAR project had or will have influence on the forestry policy in your country?

Core countries	Score	Description	Key words
Bhutan	4	1. The National Forest Policy has been revised and put up to the Government for approval. 2. Timber Pricing and Marketing policy has been developed and submitted for approval. 3. Subsidized rural house building timber allotment policy is under development 4. Social and community forestry strategy developed.	Some policies has been revised/developed
China	3	N/A	

Core countries	Score	Description	Key words
Myanmar	N/A	Current forest policy is already in line with MAR project priorities.	Being in line with current policy
Mongolia	4	It will influence on the forest policy in my country	
Pakistan	3	National Forest Policy of Pakistan is currently in the process of approval by the Federal Cabinet. It has a major component on Forest Monitoring and Assessment which draws its recommendations and provisions from the nationwide consultation undertaken during implementation of MAR project in Pakistan.	National policy is in progress of approval
Solomon Island	3	Influence on Forest Policy will occur. There are policy objectives that need some reform in the legal framework to provide effective MAR activities. Legal provisions to safe guard those activities and protect those concerns or those involved is a must.	
Philippines (1)	4	Influences on FMU operations, govt. planning programme and policy formulation.	Influences on FMU operations
Philippines (2)	4	Obtained useful inputs for formulating policies well suited to local conditions.	Useful for the tool of formulating policies
Philippines (3)	3		
Philippines (4)	4	Influence on country and regional policies	Influences on national/regional policies
Philippines (5)	3		
Papua New Guinea	3	Yes – it could have provided we had fully implemented some of the activities under the Project	
SPC (1)	3	Yes, of course. Fiji is now starting to establish PSPs as well in Tonga for the monitoring of forests in the long-term. As mentioned already, a vegetation monitoring system for Kiribati has been established and this continues to be supported. Other countries, which are going to be supported with a similar system, will include Marshall Islands and Tuvalu.	
SPC (2)	3	In some countries yes (some made a start already) in others (especially in the very small countries) not due to lack of human and financial resources	Limited influence due to lack of resources
Viet Nam	3	It gradually affects to the Vietnamese indicator system. It needs time to improve the forestry policy in term of information management.	Takes time to influence on national policy but affects indicator system.
ASEAN (1)	3	Many ASEAN Member States have adopted or in the process to adopt their national C&I very similar to ASEAN C&I. This MAR project has given a timely support to find out ways and means to align national and regional C&I and MAR implementations.	Gave timely support to member countries.
ASEAN (2)	N/A		
Beneficiary countries			
Brunei Darussalam	4	It strengthens the existing policy.	Strengthens policy
Japan	4	MAR concept has already been incorporated into forestry policy of Japan	
Average	3.4/4.0		

Note: The project had been considered highly influential and had been given some countries a strong motivation to formulate and/or revise national policies.

Q5. Do you think that the MAR project has provided the expected results such as increasing stakeholders' awareness, favoring networking at national and/or international levels, improving technical guidelines, etc?

Core countries	Score	Description	Key words
Bhutan	3	1. Yes. National Networking has been developed and now this Network is functioning properly 2. Through this Network the SFM data collection has greatly been enhanced and systematized.	Developed network, enhanced data collection
China	3	N/A	
Myanmar	2	Only Forest department has been able to absorb MAR projected activities.	Partial. Only Forest Department enjoyed the benefits
Mongolia	3		
Pakistan	3	Successfully achieved.	
Solomon Island	2	That is a direction and need maturity for improved results. Over time effective coordination at all levels will show the importance of the MAR project.	
Philippines (1)	4		
Philippines (2)	N/A		
Philippines (3)	N/A		
Philippines (4)	4		
Philippines (5)	3	Only to limited staff	Only to limited staff
Papua New Guinea	2	Same as Q1	
SPC (1)	3	To the extent mentioned above, yes. But work on this need to be continued.	Activities should be continued
SPC (2)	4	Awareness: yes; networking: mostly yes; technical guidelines: yes: MAR field manual developed	
Viet Nam	2	The fund is limited. Therefore, the number of forestry officers in the working group is few. In addition, this study like a first step to inform that there are some new indicators were needed to be considered.	Only to limited staff (lack of budget)
ASEAN (1)	3	• This project helped promoting the use of MAR at FMU, national and regional levels in ASEAN. Officials (from 10 countries) involved in forest policy have participated in this project.	
ASEAN (2)	3	The three regional workshops as mentioned above have indeed increased stakeholders' awareness in Asean Member States and in the networking of personnel among the government officials who attended the workshops and who are responsible in implementing criteria and indicators for SFM processes in their respective countries, as well as in reporting their progress.	Workshops increased awareness of member countries.
Beneficiary countries			
Brunei Darussalam	4	It helps to spread out the importance of SFM	
Japan	3	The workshops held in Japan surely influenced on awareness of stakeholders, but already existing networks are not directly related to MAR network.	
Average	3.0/4.0		

Note: The project was regarded to achieve the expected results to some extent, but only to limited staff and participants of the workshops due to lack of budget. More concerned officials need to be involved in the project and attended the workshops in order to obtain desired effect.

Q6. Do you think that the MAR activities have been carried out in timely and cost-effective manners?

Core countries	Score	Description	Key words

Core countries	Score	Description	Key words
Bhutan	2	1. Not all MAR activities could be implemented timely because of many interval pressing works. 2. As a result there were delayed however many were implemented and the result obtained were satisfying.	No, due to many interval urgent works
China	3		
Myanmar	2	No. Various conditions have deterred timely implementation of MARs activities in Myanmar.	No, due to various conditions
Mongolia	4		
Pakistan	3	MAR-SFM office in Bangkok very effectively took care of the time and cost effectiveness of all the planned activities.	
Solomon Island	2	Annual program will have enough time for implementation to run smoothly.	
Philippines (1)	4		
Philippines (2)	N/A		
Philippines (3)	N/A		
Philippines (4)	4		
Philippines (5)	3		
Papua New Guinea	2	For PNG, it was poorly handled by the previous management.	No, due to poor management
SPC (1)	4	They have been as far as we are concerned. Support from the MAR project has been excellent.	Yes, excellent backstopping
SPC (2)	4	Taking into account the relative short period (effective 2.5 years), the big number of participating countries and the outcome (development workshops – training workshops and manual development) the project was extremely cost-effective	Yes, overall project coordination was excellent
Viet Nam	3	Yes, it is carried out timely and at the lowest cost.	
ASEAN (1)	4	It is cost effective and timely with ASEAN's initiatives	Timely implementation in accordance with regional initiatives
ASEAN (2)	4	The timing in conducting the three regional workshops as mentioned above is considered appropriate as the ASEAN C&I and the MAR Format were only endorsed by the ASEAN Ministers on Agriculture and Forestry (AMAF) in November 2007 after being approved by the ASEAN Senior Officials on Forestry (ASOF) in July the same year. A total of 42 ASEAN personnel attended the first workshop in Malaysia, while 35 participants attended the second workshop in Lao PDR, with 20 participants attending the third workshop in Indonesia.	
Beneficiary countries			
Brunei Darussalam	4	Yes. More frequent is advisable.	Yes, but more frequent is advisable
Japan	4	Yes, the MAR activities, specifically workshops, have been implemented in timely and cost-effective manners. (i.e. workshops were held in economical places, arranged by local counterparts, and contents were substantial and related to current RS and C&I topics)	Yes, WS was cost-effective and timely
Average	3.3/4.0		

Note: Some countries lack human resources to implement the activities in a timely manner. With regard to regional workshops, many countries applauded FAO for the great coordination, preparation and backstopping.

Q7. Do you think that the MAR activities have been conducted considering the national specificities and the local conditions?

Core countries	Score	Description	Key words
Bhutan	4	Yes. All MAR that were implemented have been conducted	

		considering the national requirement based on local conditions.	
China	3		
Myanmar	3	Concerning with Forest Inventory and Management Plan revising and policy updates; MAR activities have been conducted considering the national specification and the local conditions.	
Mongolia	2		
Pakistan	3	National programme was designed in line with the actual needs of the Federal and Provincial stakeholders' Forestry Sectors and particularly these organizations involved in MAR.	
Solomon Island	3	The development phase in the pilot regions will provide some guideline on how the MAR activities will be conducted on a national scale.	
Philippines (1)	4		
Philippines (2)	N/A		
Philippines (3)	N/A		
Philippines (4)	4		
Philippines (5)	3		
Papua New Guinea	2	same as Q6	
SPC (1)	4		
SPC (2)	3	Due to the very different situation (forest, terrain, human and financial resources etc.) in the participating countries (atolls to PNG) and the limited time and cost frame of the project there is no other possibility than to make (for the first) compromises. Adaptations were carried out wherever possible. However, the MAR-design is flexible to adapt more to country specific need in the future.	MAR-design is flexible to adapt more to country specific need in the future.
Viet Nam	3	The study has been done in the manner that national and international levels are considered. But the local condition is not taken into account very much.	National/internationa l level, - Yes. Local condition – No.
ASEAN (1)	4		
ASEAN (2)	4	During the three workshops in-depth were held to elaborate national specificities in how to provide the statistics and information requested by the ASEAN C&I, especially at national level reporting through the developed Online MAR Format which is hosted at the ASEAN Secretariat in Jakarta, Indonesia. Constraints and impediments encountered by ASEAN Member States in filling out the MAR Format at both the national and forest management unit (FMU) levels were also deliberated during the three workshops.	Constraints and impediments were deliberated during the workshops.
Beneficiary countries			
Brunei	N/A		
Japan	N/A		
Average	3.2/4.0		

Note: The national specificities and the local conditions were considerably taken into account.

Q8. Do you think that the MAR activities have been conducted after thorough consultation with your organization?

Core countries	Score	Description	
Bhutan	4	Yes. All MAR activities were conducted after consultation with relevant stakeholders	
China	3		
Myanmar	2	Shifting of national focal points and also their positions within the Ministry make this impossible.	

Core countries	Score	Description
Mongolia	2	
Pakistan	3	same as Q 7
Solomon Island	3	Realized how MAR activities would support to answer the questions that are confronted by the existing gaps in the current system.
Philippines (1)	4	It took time to absorb provincial views
Philippines (2)	N/A	
Philippines (3)	N/A	
Philippines (4)	4	
Philippines (5)	3	
Papua New Guinea	2	Same as Q6
SPC (1)	4	Yes. It is an important area for our Pacific countries and we were most happy to be involved.
SPC (2)	4	A questionnaire was analyzed and several workshops took place; some countries were visited during the preparation and testing phase
Viet Nam	4	Yes, we have been discussed this study beforehand.
ASEAN (1)	4	Well coordinated
ASEAN (2)	3	The three regional workshops as mentioned above were only conducted after being discussed and approved by the meetings of ASOF and when funding from third party was secured.
Beneficiary countries		
Brunei Darussalam	N/A	
Japan	N/A	
Average	3.2/4.0	

Note: It appears that most countries had necessary consultations with relevant stakeholders.

Q9. Do you think that activities initiated by the MAR project in your country will continue after the end of project?

Core countries	Score	Description	Key words
Bhutan	4	Yes. All activities initiated are as per the National Program and requirement therefore these activities will continue even after the MAR Project.	
China	3		
Myanmar	2	We are implementing the SFM by revising inventories, management plans and C&I workshops etc…	Has been focusing on different activities.
Mongolia	4		
Pakistan	3	Concerned organizations are adopting key recommendations of the MAR Report, national workshop and meetings of MAR-NN.	Concerned agencies started to adopt lessons learned
Solomon Island	3	The challenge is ahead, we need to be committed to ensure that we maintain the scale of activities to some standard for future developments and usage. There are options to make it grow.	Needs a certain commitment to move ahead.
Philippines (1)	4	Yes, as it is already institutionalized.	Already institutionalized
Philippines (2)	N/A		
Philippines (3)	N/A		
Philippines (4)	4		
Philippines (5)	4		
Papua New Guinea	2	We will have learnt from the failure (on our part) in this Project and ensure that future projects are implemented to schedule and within reasonable time and capacity	Careful investigation is necessary for future project

Core countries	Score	Description	Key words
SPC (1)	3	Certainly from the regional level, we will continue to support countries to initiate and maintain MAR-related activities at the country levels to try and achieve the goals for MAR.	
SPC (2)	N/A	Hope so	
Viet Nam	3	The result of this study will be gradually considered by manage level and improved it to match better to the situation in Vietnam.	The result of project study will be gradually considered.
ASEAN (1)	3	Yes, the project supported ongoing ASEAN C&I activities and establishment of MAR systems.	
ASEAN (2)	N/A		
Beneficiary countries			
Brunei Darussalam	N/A		
Japan	N/A		
Average	3.2/4.0		

Note: Sustainability is open to doubt except for the countries which MAR schemes have already been institutionalized. Strong motive, commitment and awareness at the decision making level is indispensable for continuing the activities.

Q10. Please indicate the major results obtained by the MAR project.

Core countries	Description
Bhutan	1. Development of various Policies, guidelines and Forest Department website: www.dof.gov.bt 2. Identification of information need and gaps
China	1. The report on the diagnostic study results in China. 2. Identification of important international activities related to SFM and corresponding I &C. 3. Valuable information on forest resources monitoring, assessment and reporting from the common technical guidelines prepared by the MAR project.
Myanmar	Forest Inventory and Management Planning Unit; revising all FMU level management plans.
Mongolia	1. Raised awareness for harmonisation and established standardization on forest data and forest monitoring system in the Region. 2. Introduced updated technology and developed forest monitoring system 3. Improved trend of the forest monitoring system in country
Pakistan	Established NN-MAR to hold meetings on need-basis.
Solomon Island	1 established MAR-PSP and MAR-PSP Field Technical Officers are trainined. 2. Raised awareness on the importance of MAR-PSP. 3. Setup database
Philippines (1)	Expanded warm network for SFM
Philippines (2)	N/A
Philippines (3)	N/A
Philippines (4)	C&I is institutionalized and now an important tool for Management and planning
Philippines (5)	Will have multiplier effect as many officials were involved in the project
Papua New Guinea	Generally, PNG had not achieved much from this project, apart from the $10,000 that became available in 2010.
SPC (1)	• Better awareness of the concerned countries in the Pacific of the need for MAR • Formulation, testing and endorsement of Pacific adapted methodology for MAR, which is starting to be used • Establishment of a vegetation monitoring system for small atoll islands, starting with Kiribati • Establishment of an expert database for the Pacific

Core countries	Description
SPC (2)	Joint MAR design for most PICs – field manual for implementation
Viet Nam	. Harmonise Vietnamese forestry indicators and international indicators. . Recommend new indicator should be monitored and how to measure these indicators
ASEAN (1)	• Improvement of offline MAR module that can be used as a standalone application at FMU level • A comparative analysis between the ASEAN and each national C&I for Sustainable Forest Management as well as review of MAR implementation mechanisms • Recommendations for future steps
ASEAN (2)	Some of the major recommendations arising from the workshops are (i) prepare a set of instructions, as compendium to the Online MAR Format on Sustainable Forest Management at the national level, on the ways and means to provide the information requested by the ASEAN C&I, especially the quantitative information; (ii) request AMS to submit their progress in implementing the ASEAN C&I for those indicators that are currently implementable in AMS through the Online MAR Format at the national level using the information and data for the calendar year 2009, while for the other ASEAN indicators which are currently partially implementable in AMS within 3 years; and (iii) review at the end of March 2011 the efficiency and effectiveness in inputting information into the Online MAR Format on Sustainable Forest Management at the national level, especially the quantitative information as requested by the ASEAN C&I.
Beneficiary countries	
Brunei Darussalam	Standardization and harmonisation of the forestry practices and the tools
Japan	Built capacities of attendance from Japan and raised awareness of importance of MAR through Workshops. Also workshop on RS was held with foresters and RS technicians. That enabled to exchange expiries both in forestry and RS technologies. Sometimes, RS technicians are lack of forestry knowledge that hampers establishing operational RS technology in the fields.

Note: Most countries stated that this project increased awareness of the relevant agencies in the countries. Some countries responded that national network was established and this project helped to identify the needs and issues to be tuckled with. However, there are few answers mentioning that the national capacities had been improved.

Q11. Please indicate the major impacts of the MAR project.

Core countries	Description
Bhutan	Initiation of Policy development and reform.
China	1. Positive promotion of national SFM process 2. Valuable reference to strengthen national capacity of forest resources monitoring.
Myanmar	Management Planning and Inventory techniques
Mongolia	
Pakistan	Members of the NN are well informed and the organizations who used to work in isolation were strengthened and well collaborated with others. They started sharing data/information on need basis.
Solomon Island	Land Tenure arrangement for establishing PSP units Created high expectation on positive development of many forest resources concerned and new job responsibility for officers concerned PSP unit protection under growing population pressure in the long term Obtained budget support by the Ministry of Forestry
Philippines (1)	Strengthened institutionalization. Shared unified view and ideal of SFM
Philippines (2)	
Philippines (3)	
Philippines (4)	

Core countries	Description
Philippines (5)	Lessons learned will be useful to implement MRV and other projects
Papua New Guinea	Same as Q10
SPC (1)	It will be difficult to measure the impact now. But I think the one that we can indicate now is the role of MAR in broadening Pacific forester's perspective of forests from the narrow timber focus to one that incorporates biodiversity and other ecosystem services.
SPC (2)	At least 3 countries (Fiji, Solomon, Tonga) made already a start with implementation
Viet Nam	Awareness of new indicators has been increased very much.
ASEAN (1)	The project supported current regional implementation on C&I and ASEAN was able to identify the constraints and actions to take further at national and regional levels.
ASEAN (2)	The major impacts of the MAR project in conducting the three regional workshops are (i) trained personnel in AMS to report progress in implementing sustainable forest management through the use of the ASEAN C&I and the MAR Format at both the national and FMU levels; and (ii) further development in strengthening the Online and Offline MAR Format for sustainable forest management in ASEAN at the national the FMU levels respectively; and (iii) facilitated cross-learning and exchange of experiences between AMS in the application of the MAR Format through the ASEAN Forest Clearing House Mechanism (CHM).
Beneficiary countries	
Brunei Darussalam	It helps to further develop the national forest programs, giving more ingredients and value on the national forestry policy – solidify the foundation
Japan	It may be or may not be directly related to MAR project, MAR concept is highlighted under current Forest Reform Plan as one form of PDCA cycle.

Note: There were a few comments that this project would be a sort of driving force for continuing other national activities relevant to SFM.

Q12. Please indicate problems encountered, lesson learned and suggestions on how to improve this type of project?

Core countries	Description
Bhutan	Budget transferring took long time.
China	It is suggested to launch new MAR project to further promote relevant study on the issues of SFM and REDD plus, and accelerate the development of national forest resources monitoring, assessment and reporting in Asia countries.
Myanmar	In order to establish the FAO plan under MAR, human resources, times and costs are needed. FAO project should be undertaken in line with already existing activities in the country. MAR should provide technical and financial support for the country without time frame. Sometimes it is difficult to implement within the given time due to lack of human resources.
Mongolia	Improve support for capacity building and for the establishment of National forest monitoring system
Pakistan	MAR regional initiative should be transformed into a long term programme instead of a time-limit project because most activities require sustainability, coherent and consistent support from FAO. MAR focal points need to be trained and the national organizations should be equipped. Comprehensive capacity building programme needs to be launched on MAR-SFM.
Solomon Island	Protection of PSP units under legal machineries Work should be included in the annual work/budget plan Interval of Re-measurements of PSP (1,2,3 year/s interval) to see some difference of forest growth or disturbances. Professional/technical support should be made by FAO or by Donor
Philippines (1)	It is possible to have a single reporting format for better appreciation
Philippines (2)	
Philippines (3)	
Philippines (4)	
Philippines (5)	
Papua New	PNG need to assess carefully any project activities and consider how it can be involved in it and the

Core countries	Description
Guinea	benefits that it can gain from it before agreeing to be part of the project.
SPC (1)	Working at the regional level, the main challenge is how we could respond effectively to the wide and varying needs of our member countries. The countries range from PNG with a massive land area and also forests to a small atoll country like Kiribati, which is only a meter above sea level with practically no forests. And working in the Pacific has its challenges as well in communications and travel, which are limited and very costly.
SPC (2)	Biggest problem: lack of (scientific) staff More funds for doing more practical training and in more countries.
Viet Nam	It should be have more support on the new technical issue by FAO consultants during the implementation.
ASEAN (1)	This project supported to MAR at regional level. Concurrently, there are a number of MAR projects supported at national level in some ASEAN countries. There may be more advantageous if those sub-projects could be designed in one package.
ASEAN (2)	To provide specific hands-on training in the application of the MAR Format at the country and FMU levels in each AMS and assist each country to further develop and establish effective coordination mechanisms at all levels for improved inter- and intra-agency collaboration for the timely provision of information and/or data required by the MAR Format.
Beneficiary countries	
Brunei Darussalam	The level of involvement is very limited and thus, the sharing of information is confined to specific countries only. Projects should also be implemented taking into consideration the country specific need as to produce better outputs and knowledge on MAR for SFM.
Japan	Policy and measures for MAR are often carried by Prefectural and Municipal governments and data collection is not free. That means that delegation of power and sufficient budget for MAR activities would be essential. So in order to highly integrate MAR system, forest policy review and allocation of fund would be necessary, especially if we aim at full-fledged MAR system.

Note: Some countries faced a difficulty to conduct project activities within the given time which was relatively too short for the local conditions due to lack of resources and/or complexity of the technical and institutional aspect. Several countries suggested that MAR programme should be excuted or continued under the longer-term framework rather than Trust Fund project.

Annexe 5. Activities by country

Project GCP/INT/988/JPN. List of Countries and activities

No.	Country	Focal Point	National Steering Committee	Existing Forestry Committee	Core Country	Beneficiary	LoA	FBA	National Network	National WS	Internat. WS	MAR Programs, C&I
1	Australia	X		X		S						
2	Bangladesh	X			X		X	X	X	X		X
3	Brunei	X				X						
4	Bhutan	X			X		X		X	X		X
5	Cambodia	X		X	X		X	X	X	X		X
6	China	X		X	X		X			X	X	X
7	Fiji	X				X					W*3	
8	India	X	X		X		X		X	X	X	X
9	Indonesia	X				X			X	X	X*O	
10	Japan	X		X		S, D					X*2	
11	Laos	X				X					X*O	
12	Malaysia	X		X		X					X*O	
13	Mongolia	X	X		X		X		X	X		X
14	Myanmar	X	X		X			X	X			
15	Nepal	X				X						
16	New Zealand	X		X		S						
17	Pakistan	X	X		X		X		X	X		X
18	Papua New Guinea	X	X		X		X		X			
19	Philippines	X			X		X*2		X	X		X
20	South Korea	X		X		S						
21	Samoa	X				X						
22	Solomon????	X			X		X					
23	Sri Lanka	X				X			X			
24	Thailand	X	X						X	X	X*3	
25	Timor Leste	X				X						
26	Vanuatu	X	X		X		X*2		X	X		X
27	Vietnam	X			X			X*2	X	X		X
28	ASEAN (Jakarta)				R		X*2				O*3	X
29	SPC (Fiji)				R		X*2				W*3	X
	Totals	**27**	**7**	**6**	**13**	**9**	**17**	**5**	**14**	**12**	**13**	**12**

R = Regional, S = Sponsor, D = Donor, Project Steering Committee = not operational

Annexe 6. Draft table of content of the final document compiling project achievements

Table of content "MAR achievements" (find an appropriate title)

International context

Description of all the processes about sustainable forest management (SFM)
FAO (FRA, NFMA (including NFI), REDD (including MRV)
Montreal process
ITTO International Tropical Timber Organisation
FSI Forestry Stewardship Council
PFC Pan-european Forest Certification
ASEAN
Others...

The new players
REDD (Institutions: UN, WB, +, FCPF Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, GEO Global Earth Observation, etc.)
Convention on Biological Diversity
Others...

Existing frameworks on Forest-based Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting systems
FAO
IPCC Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change)

Gap analysis
Various systems, indicators in use
Similarities and differences, where is likely/possible to harmonise

Way forward
Opportunities to harmonise
What has already been done
What is realistically likely to happen

National context

Overview of all the MAR countries (areas, population, protected areas, forest area, forest degradation, forests status, population density, agriculture, livestock, etc., also from FAO Global forests resources asessment 2010 just released)
Overview of project countries (related to MAR project, including Ministries, gathering or producing data, contacts, Focal Points, etc.)
Summary tables with activities run by MAR
Summary tables with activities run by other projects
Outputs

Gap analysis
Various systems, indicators in use
Similarities and differences

Way forward
Opportunities to harmonise
What has already been done
What is realistically likely to happen

NOTES

Text must be concise and as simple as possible
Use “boxes” to highlight issues and conclusions
Use summary tables to help readers compare numbers, issues, etc.
Graphics to make synthesis of information and trends (Histograms, lines, cakes, radars, etc. are all available)
When the information is resulting from MAR or with MAR contribution Find a system to highlight it (box, unique colour, logo, other graphics)
State the source of information (reports, workshops, meetings, consultants, others)